AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE
UNITED STATES

Published by the
Office of the Federal Register
National Archives and Records Administration

For sale by the
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

Foreword

During the first half of 1994, America moved forward to enhance security at home and abroad—creating opportunity, shrinking bureaucracy, and giving our people the means to realize the American Dream. By June 1994, our Administration's economic plan had helped create close to 4 million new jobs. Fifteen million working families with children and countless small businesses enjoyed a tax cut.

In our efforts to keep our country strong and secure, our government became a better partner with the American people. During a time of great change, our Administration invested in education and training to help all Americans earn the tools they need to compete and win in the global economy. I signed "Goals 2000" into law, setting world-class standards for our schools and giving local communities the flexibility to achieve excellence. I signed the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act," bringing teachers and businesses together to help non-college bound students move directly from school to work. Across the country, AmeriCorps members earned money for college while serving our country—tutoring young people, cleaning up neighborhoods, and making communities safer for all of us. Thanks to our reforms of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, we were able to come to the aid of families from northern California to southern Florida.

Security at home requires even more of us. To help restore safety in our homes and neighborhoods, we fought for passage in Congress of a tough, smart crime bill, that included provisions for putting 100,000 new police officers on our streets. At our urging, the House of Representatives passed a ban on 19 deadly assault weapons. In an effort central to the strength of our families, our economy, and our future, Americans took up the challenge of health care reform. Together, we engaged in an important debate in Congress and across the country and worked toward bringing health care security to every American.

We worked to keep America strong abroad, as well. As it has been for half a century, our Nation remained the world's greatest force for freedom and democracy. Commemorating the 50th anniversary of the D-Day invasion at Normandy, I had the privilege to join with our allies in remembering a generation who helped preserve the blessings of liberty for us all. This year, Americans and people around the world realized anew the rewards of our leadership. We opened markets from Latin America to Asia to American goods. We supported democracy in Russia, which I visited, and in South Africa, where Vice President Al Gore and the First Lady witnessed the triumph of free and fair elections. And we advanced the cause of peace around the globe.

This volume reflects America's ongoing commitment to rewarding those who work and study and dream of building a better life. Our citizens can take great pride in their progress. Their accomplishments assure us that America's best days are still to come.

William J. Clinton

Preface

This book contains the papers and speeches of the 42d President of the United States that were issued by the Office of the Press Secretary during the period January 1–July 31, 1994. The material has been compiled and published by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration.

The material is presented in chronological order, and the dates shown in the headings are the dates of the documents or events. In instances when the release date differs from the date of the document itself, that fact is shown in the textnote. Every effort has been made to ensure accuracy: Remarks are checked against a tape recording, and signed documents are checked against the original. Textnotes and cross references have been provided by the editors for purposes of identification or clarity. Speeches were delivered in Washington, DC, unless indicated. The times noted are local times. All materials that are printed full-text in the book have been indexed in the subject and name indexes, and listed in the document categories list.

The Public Papers of the Presidents series was begun in 1957 in response to a recommendation of the National Historical Publications Commission. An extensive compilation of messages and papers of the Presidents covering the period 1789 to 1897 was assembled by James D. Richardson and published under congressional authority between 1896 and 1899. Since then, various private compilations have been issued, but there was no uniform publication comparable to the Congressional Record or the United States Supreme Court Reports. Many Presidential papers could be found only in the form of mimeographed White House releases or as reported in the press. The Commission therefore recommended the establishment of an official series in which Presidential writings, addresses, and remarks of a public nature could be made available.

The Commission's recommendation was incorporated in regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, issued under section 6 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 1506), which may be found in title 1, part 10, of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A companion publication to the Public Papers series, the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, was begun in 1965 to provide a broader range of Presidential materials on a more timely basis to meet the needs of the contemporary reader. Beginning with the administration of Jimmy Carter, the Public Papers series expanded its coverage to include additional material as printed in the Weekly Compilation. That coverage provides a listing of the President's daily schedule and meetings, when announced, and other items of general interest issued by the Office of the Press Secretary. Also included are lists of the President's nominations submitted to the Senate, materials released by the Office of the Press Secretary that are not printed full-text in the book, and proclamations, Executive orders, and other Presidential documents released by the Office of the Press Secretary and published in the *Federal Register*. This information appears in the appendixes at the end of the book.

Volumes covering the administrations of Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush are also available.

The Public Papers of the Presidents publication program is under the direction of Frances D. McDonald, Director of the Presidential Documents and Legislative Division. The series is produced by the Presidential Documents Unit, Gwen H. Estep, Chief. The Chief Editor of this book was Karen Howard Ashlin, assisted by Margaret A. Hemmig, Carolyn W. Hill, Rachel Rondell, Cheryl E. Sirofchuck, and Michael J. Sullivan.

The frontispiece and photographs used in the portfolio were supplied by the White House Photo Office. The typography and design of the book were developed by the Government Printing Office under the direction of Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer.

Martha L. Girard
Director of the Federal Register

Trudy Huskamp Peterson
Acting Archivist of the United States

Contents

Foreword . . . v

Preface . . . vii

Cabinet . . . xi

Public Papers of William J. Clinton,
January 1–July 31, 1994 . . . 1

Appendix A
Digest of Other White House Announcements . . . 1353

Appendix B
Nominations Submitted to the Senate . . . 1371

Appendix C
Checklist of White House Press Releases . . . 1385

Appendix D
Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register . . . 1399

Subject Index . . . A–1

Name Index . . . B–1

Document Categories List . . . C–1

Cabinet

Secretary of State	Warren M. Christopher
Secretary of the Treasury	Lloyd Bentsen
Secretary of Defense	Les Aspin William J. Perry (effective February 3)
Attorney General	Janet Reno
Secretary of the Interior	Bruce Babbitt
Secretary of Agriculture	Mike Espy
Secretary of Commerce	Ronald H. Brown
Secretary of Labor	Robert B. Reich
Secretary of Health and Human Services	Donna E. Shalala
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development	Henry G. Cisneros
Secretary of Transportation	Federico Peña
Secretary of Energy	Hazel Rollins O'Leary
Secretary of Education	Richard W. Riley
Secretary of Veterans Affairs	Jesse Brown
United States Representative to the United Nations	Madeleine Korbel Albright
Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency	Carol M. Browner
United States Trade Representative	Michael Kantor

Director of the Office of Management and Budget	Leon E. Panetta Alice M. Rivlin (acting, effective July 17)
Chief of Staff	Thomas F. McLarty III Leon E. Panetta (effective July 17)
Counselor to the President	Thomas F. McLarty III (effective July 17)
Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers	Laura D'Andrea Tyson
Director of National Drug Control Policy	Lee Patrick Brown

Administration of William J. Clinton

1994

The President's Radio Address

January 1, 1994

Good morning, and happy New Year. I hope you're enjoying this day with your family and your friends. I hope you feel that you have a lot to be thankful for on New Year's Day. I know that I certainly do.

I am grateful that our economy is coming back to life, that optimism and direction are back. The deficit is down. Interest rates and inflation are down. Investments and consumer confidence are up. We have more trade opportunities with NAFTA and with the GATT world trade agreement. Millions of you have refinanced your homes and businesses. The private sector has created about a million and a half new jobs in just 10 months, more than were created in the previous 4 years.

But our Nation is about more than economics. It's also about our sense of community, the obligations we have to each other. For too long we've been coming apart instead of coming together. In 1993, we began to reverse that, and I'm grateful.

We established the national service program to allow our young people to serve their communities and earn money for their college educations. We reorganized the student loan program so that all students can now afford to borrow money from this program because they can repay on lower interest rates and based on the incomes they earn, not just the money they borrow. We made democracy more of a reality for millions of people with the motor voter bill, which makes it easier to register to vote. We wrote our best family values into law with the family leave law, which says to parents, if you have a newborn child or an ill parent, you can be with them, you can take a little time off from work without losing your jobs. We also strengthened our families when we gave tax relief to 15 million working families on modest wages with children so that they can stay off welfare, stay at work, and still succeed as parents. And after 7 years of gridlock, Washington finally woke to the growing fear of violence on our streets when Congress passed and I signed the Brady bill.

All over America, beyond Washington, people are beginning to take more responsibility for themselves, for their children, for their communities, working to save jobs, improve schools, and make our streets safer. In 1994, we must resolve to do even more, to help the middle class with more jobs and with income growth, to help the poor who are trapped in whole neighborhoods where there's no work, few stable families, and where violence is the norm. There is still a great deal to do.

So in 1994, let us resolve to improve the health security, the personal security, and the job security of the American people who work hard and play by the rules. With all the changes sweeping our Nation and the world, let us resolve to make these changes our friends and not our enemies.

In 1994, we must work to keep the economic recovery going. We must pass comprehensive health care reform that provides benefits that can never be taken away. We must put more police on the street and take more assault weapons off the street. We must adopt world-class standards for our schools and provide lifetime training for our workers.

Millions of Americans, even those with good health insurance, must live in fear of losing their health coverage. Another 2 million Americans lost their insurance in 1993. Our health care reform plan is a guaranteed system of private insurance that will cover every American. We'll maintain the health care system in private hands, improve the quality of health care, increase the choices you have as a consumer, and protect the doctor-patient relationship. And all the while, if we do it in the way we've recommended, we will reduce mountains of paperwork and billions of dollars of unnecessary costs in the present system. Health reform is a good deal for our families and our future, and it should pass in 1994.

I also want Congress to pass the crime bill without delay. Our proposal will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, expand boot camps for young offenders, get handguns out of the hands of minors, ban assault weapons, and have stiffer sentences for violent repeat offenders.

This year, I'm also determined to start creating a world-class system of lifetime education and training, especially for those who lose their jobs. This means setting high standards first for our public schools and challenging every State to meet them—world-class standards. It means new investments, from Head Start for preschoolers to job training for young people to retraining for experienced workers. Better schools and better skills are the best way to promote competitiveness for our economy and equal opportunity for every American.

And we must continue to work to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life. Our welfare reform proposal will embrace two simple values: work and responsibility. Those who can work should do so. And both parents must take responsibility for their children, because governments don't raise children, parents do.

In 1993, I met a lot of Americans who made a vivid impression on me and whose impression caused me to redouble my determination to face the problems which our country has too long ignored. I met a young man in California who changed schools to go to a safer school but whose brother was shot standing in front of him in the safer school as they tried to register. I met a widow in Detroit who supports herself and her children, enrolled in a training program to become a machinist, to prove again that most Americans want to work and don't want to be on welfare. I met a businessman in Florida who poured his heart into his small furniture store, only to be told by his insurance company that he had to drop coverage of his own parents whose age made them a high risk. All these folks strengthened my commitment to work for better education and better job training, universal health coverage that can never be taken away, safer streets, and a stronger America.

The stories of real people inspire the struggles and the efforts that drive my administration. We've got to keep working to rebuild the American economy, to revive middle class life and middle class values in America, and to restore our sense of community. We have to recognize that all these problems are interrelated. You can't just solve one without the other. We have to remember that these problems developed over a long period of time; they can't be solved overnight. We have to remember that Government can't do everything alone, everyone must play his or her part. But we must remember, too, that we can make a difference and we can do better.

In that spirit, let us all make New Year's resolutions today. Let's resolve among other things that in 1994 every American will have health care that's always there and can never be taken away, that in 1994 we will take back our streets and make them safer for our children, that in 1994 we will improve our schools and hold ourselves to world-class standards of excellence and that we will give our workers throughout their lifetimes the skills they need to compete and win in a tough global economy, that in 1994 we will continue to work to favor work over welfare, and that we will continue to rebuild our economy and, with it, the American dream.

If we'll stay together and work together, we can do these things. Have a happy and healthy New Year's. And thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3:15 p.m. on December 31, 1993, in Hilton Head, SC, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on January 1, 1994.

Remarks on Health Care Reform and an Exchange With Reporters

January 3, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this first meeting of 1994 for our administration, a meeting devoted to charting our course this year on health care. We all look back now in American history at—remember 1935 is the year that the American people adopted Social Security; 1965 is the year the American people adopted Medicare. I believe

that 1994 will go down in history as the year when, after decades and decades of false starts and lame excuses and being overcome by special interests, the American people finally, finally had health care security for all.

This will be a year when we attempt to fix what's broken with our health care system, keep what's right, to emphasize the program that we outlined of guaranteed private insurance for every American, comprehensive benefits that can never be taken away, and a system that gives people who presently don't have insurance and small businesses greater power to choose affordable quality health insurance.

In the days and weeks ahead, I will be asking the American people and the Congress to go beyond rhetoric to fact and to ask and answer some simple questions: Of all the available alternatives, which ones guarantee health security to all Americans? Of all the available alternatives, which ones carry the greatest promise of reducing bureaucracy, paperwork, and absolutely wasted billions of dollars? Of all the available alternatives, which ones guarantee more choices of health care, not only to the patients who really matter but also to the doctors and the health care providers? Of all the available alternatives, which ones guarantee the least second-guessing of the doctor-patient relationship? If we can have these simple questions asked and answered, I believe that, together, we can solve this great riddle which has bedeviled our country for too many years now, strengthen our economy, and restore a great sense of security to the American people.

We will do this in connection with our efforts to also dramatically alter the education and job training systems of the country to provide greater economic security and our efforts to pass a comprehensive crime bill to provide greater personal and family and community security.

I am looking very much forward to this year. I want to thank the First Lady and Secretary Shalala and Ira Magaziner for the work they have done on health care. I want to welcome Pat Griffin and Harold Ickes to our team. I'm glad that George Stephanopoulos will be taking a more active role in working on the health care debate in Congress.

Let me just say one last thing in closing. I suppose every Christmas and New Year's gives us the opportunity to reflect on the time we've just spent and the time that lies ahead. But I think it is so easy for us to forget here that what we do affects the lives of real people and that what is at stake here is not some great looming political battle. What is at stake here is the actual living conditions of the American people, whether families who work hard and do their very best to do what they're supposed to do are going to be able to know that their children will always have health care, whether we are going to be able to maintain a health care system and still have the money that we need to invest in a growing and highly competitive global economy so that America will be strong. And if we can keep that in mind, if we can move beyond the rhetoric and the smoke and the process to keep in mind every day that real people's interests are at stake here and that America must not go into the 21st century without health security for all, without a dramatically improved system of education and training, without a new commitment to the security of our families and our children, I think we're going to be in good shape.

And lastly, let me say I very, very much hope that this will be a bipartisan effort, that Democrats and Republicans will be working together and that we will resolve in the new year not to further a partisan interest but to further the interest of the people who sent us all here.

Thank you very much.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, how much are you willing to compromise on this plan itself, in view of the strong opposition in many quarters and, of course, on the Hill?

The President. Well, I think, first of all, we are going to see a fleshing out of all the alternatives, something that hasn't happened yet. The burden has been borne almost entirely by our plan, which is something I was willing to do. But now we need to look at the cost of the status quo and the cost and the consequences of the other plans and do what is best.

I have said all along what my bottom line is, that we have to have comprehensive benefits that can never be taken away, that we cannot go on being the only country in the world with an advanced economy that cannot figure out how to guarantee health care security to all our people. Now, that leaves a whole lot of room for working out the details. We should emphasize preventive and primary care, we ought to emphasize efficiencies, we ought to reduce the bureaucracy, and we ought to do it in a way

that will lower the rate in which these costs have been going up. But the main thing we have to do is to finally solve the riddle of providing health care security to all Americans.

Whitewater Development Corp.

Q. Mr. President, do you support the idea of naming a special prosecutor to investigate the Whitewater affair?

The President. I have nothing to say about that. I've said we'd turn the records over. There is nothing else for me to say about that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Loan Guarantees to Israel

January 3, 1994

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

Enclosed is an unclassified report on the Loan Guarantees to Israel Program as required by section 226(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (Public Law 87–195).

I hope this report will be useful to you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks to Central Intelligence Agency Employees in Langley, Virginia

January 4, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Woolsey. Tony Lake and I are glad to be here—and always seemed to me I ought to visit the CIA on a snowy day. [*Laughter*] Thank you for that warm welcome.

I wanted to come here today for two reasons, first, to meet you and to thank you, those of you who work for the Central Intelligence Agency who devote your lives and your skills to the service of our country. The second thing I wanted to do is to commemorate those who have given their lives in the service of the country through the Central Intelligence Agency.

Intelligence is a unique mission. Nobody knows that better than those of us who have the honor to serve in the Oval Office. When President Truman autographed the photo of himself that hangs in this building, he wrote, "To the CIA, a necessity to the President of the United States from one who knows." Every morning the President begins the day asking, "What happened overnight? What do we know? How do we know it?" Like my predecessors, I have to look to the intelligence community for the answers to those questions. I look to you to warn me and, through me, our Nation of the threats, to spotlight the important trends in the world, to describe dynamics that could affect our interests around the world.

Those activities are particularly important now. The end of the cold war increases our security in many ways. You helped to win that cold war, and it is fitting that a piece of the Berlin Wall stands here on these grounds. But even now, this new world remains dangerous and, in many ways, more complex and more difficult to fathom. We need to understand more than we do about the challenges of ethnic conflict, militant nationalism, terrorism, and the proliferation of all kinds of weapons. Accurate, reliable intelligence is the key to understanding each of these challenges. And without it, it is difficult to make good decisions in a crisis or in the long-term.

I know that working in the intelligence community places special demands on each and

every one of you. It means you can't talk freely about much of your work with your family and your friends. For some, it means spending a lot of time far away from home. For others, it's meant serving in situations of significant personal danger. While much of your work is sensitive and cannot be discussed publicly, I know what you do. I value it, and I respect you for doing it. And I wanted to come here to say thank you.

The 56 stars carved into the wall here in this lobby remind each who passes by this place of the ultimate risks of intelligence work. Each star memorializes a vibrant life given in the service of our Nation. Each star reminds us of freedom's high price and how the high share some must bear that all the rest of us must respect. My heart goes out to the families and to the friends of each of those whose sacrifices are represented here.

Two of the stars added just this year commemorate two devoted agency professionals who were slain last January entering this compound, Dr. Lansing Bennett and Frank Darling. All of us were shocked and saddened when they were killed and others were seriously injured. The First Lady represented me here at the memorial service, but I want to say again personally how much I admire the service that they gave, the sorrow and anger we all felt and continue to feel about this outrageous act.

The CIA was established over 45 years ago to help confront the challenges to democracy. These stars remind us that the battle lines of freedom need not be thousands of miles away, but can be right here in the midst of our communities with our families and friends. Jim Woolsey and I know that all of you here today are called to a very special kind of public service.

I celebrate your commitment. I appreciate your contributions. As President, I will do my best to learn from you, to help you to do your work, and to stand by you. And on behalf of the American people, let me say again, I thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:12 a.m. in the lobby of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers of The Netherlands

January 4, 1994

The President. It's a great honor for me to welcome Prime Minister Lubbers here today. As I'm sure all of you know, he is one of the senior statesmen in Europe, and he has been a great ally of the United States. We've worked together very closely on issues of international security, issues of European security, trade, and economic issues. His nation is one of our larger trading partners, has had a very constructive attitude about that, and of course, I think, the third biggest investor in the United States. So, our relationship with The Netherlands is very, very important. And I'm glad to have him here today, and I look forward to the visit we're about to start.

Eastern Europe and NATO

Q. Mr. President, why do you seem to be having trouble generating enthusiasm for the Partnership For Peace among Eastern European nations?

The President. As you remember, when they all came here, all the leaders of the Eastern European countries came here for the dedication of the Holocaust Museum, they were looking for ways to become more identified economically and militarily or at least in terms of security issues with the West, and NATO seemed to be an easy way or a clear way to do it. But we're not closing the door on that. What we're trying to do is to open the door to a developing relationship and to do it in a way that is consistent with what all the European nations have indicated they were willing to do at this time and also to do it in a way that doesn't divide Europe.

I think General Shalikashvili, who, as you know, was a child in Poland, spoke about that today. We're trying to promote security and sta-

bility in Europe. We don't want to do anything that increases tensions. I think that what we have decided to do will work if the Eastern European nations will make the most of it, and I hope they will.

Q. Do you think they just don't understand the concept well enough? I'm referring specifically to the President of Poland today.

The President. Yes, President Walesa. Well, you know what he said today in his interview. I think that that's why I'm going to see him. I'm going to Prague to see them, and we're going to talk about it. And Ambassador Albright and General Shalikashvili are both going to Eastern Europe ahead of me, and we're going to work hard to try to make everybody feel good about this approach. I think it's what our NATO partners want to do, and I think that it's a good beginning.

Q. How long does the evolutionary approach take?

The President. We don't know. We'll just have to see how it goes.

Q. Do you have a hope that all the nations of Europe eventually will be a part of NATO, including Russia?

The President. Well, I have a hope that all the nations of Europe will eventually be clearly and unambiguously committed to a peaceful and stable, secure Europe where the nations respect each other's borders. And I think we're working toward that.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Visit of Prime Minister Lubbers

Q. Mr. President, did you invite Mr. Lubbers to come to the White House because you expect him to be the next President of the European Community and successor of Jacques Delors?

The President. No, I invited him to come to the White House because he is already one of the leading statesmen in Europe and because our two nations have had a very strong relationship. We've worked together on matters of European and international security, on matters of trade and economic growth. There is a very large investment in this Nation from The Netherlands. We feel very good about our relationship. We met a couple of years ago, but we've not had a chance to visit since I've been President. So, that's why I asked him.

Europe

Q. Mr. President, Dutch politicians are afraid your administration is losing its interest in Europe. Is that a correct observation?

The President. No. I'm going to Europe three times this year to try to allay that. I asked for this NATO summit so that we could get together and talk about the future of NATO, our common security future. I intend to make it very clear that as long as I am President, we will maintain a strong military position in Europe and a strong support for NATO. One of the reasons that I asked General Shalikashvili to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is that he had just come from being the Supreme Commander in Europe and the commander of our forces there. And of course, I worked very hard to get the GATT round completed, along with Prime Minister Lubbers. So, we've done this together.

I think our economic and our security ties to Europe are as critical as they've ever been. And I hope that the opportunities that I'll have on this trip and again at the G–7 meeting with Naples and in-between, when I go back to commemorate the—and at least three different nations—the 50th anniversary of the events that brought an end to World War II, that all those things will reassure the people of your nation and of Europe about the United States intentions.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—to expand the NATO, you seem to have another opinion, right?

The President. No, I'm not against expanding NATO. I just think that if you look at the consensus of the NATO members at this time, there's not a consensus to expand NATO at this time, and we don't want to give the impression that we're creating another dividing line in Europe after we've worked for decades to get rid of the one that existed before. What we want is a secure Europe and a stable Europe. And I think that the proposal that I put forward would permit the expansion of NATO, and I fully expect that it will lead to that at some point.

Q. A part of the feeling of neglect in Europe is that there is not really a response of the State Department, from the European Bureau, to discussions with the diplomats here. They feel that inadequate. Are you aware of that, and what's your comment on that?

The President. No, I'm not, so I can't have a comment.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I'm going to go see them next week and try to convince them that—[*inaudible*]—and I hope that I can. I have a very high regard for them. I'm going to see them next week. Ambassador Albright and General Shalikashvili are going ahead of me just in the next few days. So we're going to work very hard with them and see what we can do.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Nomination for Ambassador to New Zealand and Western Samoa

January 5, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Josiah Beeman to be the U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand and to Western Samoa.

"Josiah Beeman's career has been marked by both accomplishment and concern," said the President. "He will serve our country well as Ambassador."

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

Nomination for Director of the United States Geological Survey

January 5, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Gordon P. Eaton to be the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

"Gordon Eaton is a highly respected earth scientist with a strong understanding of the workings of the USGS," said the President. "I believe he will do a fine job as Director."

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

Statement on the Death of Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

January 6, 1994

The Nation mourns the loss of our beloved former Speaker of the House, Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Jr.

As U.S. House Speaker, Tip O'Neill was the Nation's most prominent, powerful, and loyal champion of working people. He loved politics and government because he saw how politics and government could make a difference in people's lives. And he loved people most of all—his neighbors, his constituents, and his family.

Last fall, Tip was generous to me with his advice and his stature when he joined our effort to win approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement. His stand moved me, because working people had been the cause of his long and colorful career, and in his heart he knew that more open trade would mean a better quality of life for working Americans.

On a day of sadness for my family and Tip's, Hillary and I wish his wife, Millie, and their family our deepest sympathies for a husband and a father now gone and for a beautiful life well lived.

NOTE: The related proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene of Belgium in Brussels
January 9, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you think that Bosnia should be at the top of the agenda for the NATO consideration?

The President. Well, we'll discuss that and a number of other things. We have a lot of issues to discuss. But the Prime Minister and I will discuss that and several other issues. As you know, he's just ended a tour of 6 months in the presidency of the EU, and in my judgment, he and Belgium did a superb job. They were very instrumental in the successes we had last summer in the G–7 meeting, which laid the foundation for the adoption of the GATT round. So we're going to talk a little about that, too.

Death of President's Mother

Q. Mr. President, are you finding it difficult to engage in diplomacy after your personal loss?

The President. No, I'm glad to be here. My family and my friends and my mother's friends, we had a wonderful day yesterday, and I'm doing what I should be doing. I'm glad to have the opportunity to be here and go back to work.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:55 p.m. at the Conrad Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to Future Leaders of Europe in Brussels
January 9, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Mayor, distinguished leaders. I'm delighted to be here with the Prime Minister and with many of Europe's future leaders in this great hall of history.

I first came to Brussels as a young man in a very different but a difficult time, when the future for us was uncertain. It is fitting that my first trip to Europe as President be about building a better future for the young people of Europe and the United States today and that it begin here in Belgium. As a great capital and as the headquarters of NATO and the European Union, Brussels and Belgium have long been at the center of Europe's steady progress toward greater security and greater prosperity. For those of you who know anything about me personally, I also have a great personal debt of nearly 40 years standing to this country because it was a Belgian, Adolphe Sax, who invented the saxophone. [*Laughter*]

I have come here at this time because I believe that it is time for us together to revitalize our partnership and to define a new security at a time of historic change. It is a new day for our transatlantic partnership: The cold war is over. Germany is united. The Soviet Union is gone, and a constitutional democracy governs Russia. The specter that haunted our citizens for decades, of tanks rolling in through Fulda Gap or nuclear annihilation raining from the sky, that specter, thank God, has largely vanished. Your generation is the beneficiary of those miraculous transformations.

In the end, the Iron Curtain rusted from within and was brought crashing down by the determination of brave men and women to live free, by the Poles and the Czechs, by the Russians, the Ukrainians, the people of the Baltics, by all those who understood that neither economics nor consciences can be ordered from above. Equally important, however, their heroic efforts succeeded because our resolve never failed, because the weapons of deterrence never disappeared and the message of democracy never disappeared.

As the East enjoys a new birth of freedom, one of freedom's great victories lives here in Europe's West: the peaceful cleaving together of nations which clashed for centuries. The transformation was wrought by visionary leaders such as Monnet, Schumann, Spaak, and Mar-

shall, who understood that modern nations can enrich their futures more through cooperation than conquest. My administration supports European union and Europe's development of stronger institutions of common purpose and common action. We recognize we will benefit more from a strong and equal partner than from a weak one.

The fall of the Soviet empire and Western Europe's integration are the two greatest advances for peace in the last half of the 20th century. All of us are reaping their blessings. In particular, with the cold war over and in spite of the present global recession which clouds your future, all our nations now have the opportunity to take long, deferred steps toward economic and social renewal. My own Nation has made a beginning in putting our economic house in order, reducing our deficits, investing in our people, creating jobs, and sparking an economic recovery that we hope will help not only the United States but also will lift all nations. We're also facing up to some of the social problems in our country we have ignored for too long, from the challenge to provide universal health care to reducing crime in our streets to dealing with the needs of our poor children. We have a truly multicultural society. In one of our counties there are people from over 150 different national and ethnic groups. But we are working to build an American community for the 21st century.

And with the European Union, we have recently led the world to a new GATT agreement that will create millions of new jobs in all our countries. In many ways, it would be easy to offer you only a message of simple celebration, to trumpet our common heritage, to rejoice that our labors for peace have been rewarded, to cheer on the economic progress that is occurring. But this is not a time for self-congratulation. And certainly we have enough challenges that we should act as true partners. That is, we should share one another's burdens rather than only talking of triumphs. And we should speak honestly about what we feel about where we are and where we should go.

This is the truth as I see it. We served history well during the cold war, but now history calls on us again to help consolidate freedom's new gains into a larger and a more lasting peace. We must build a new security for Europe. The old security was based on the defense of our bloc against another bloc. The new security must be found in Europe's integration, an integration of security forces, of market economies, of national democracies. The purpose of my trip to Europe is to help lead the movement to that integration and to assure you that America will be a strong partner in it.

For the peoples who broke communism's chains, we now see a race between rejuvenation and despair. And the outcome will—bound to shape the security of every nation in the transatlantic alliance. Today that race is being played out from the Balkans to central Asia. In one lane are the heirs of the enlightenment who seek to consolidate freedom's gains by building free economies, open democracies, and tolerant civic cultures. Pitted against them are the grim pretenders to tyranny's dark throne, the militant nationalists and demagogues who fan suspicions that are ancient and parade the pain of renewal in order to obscure the promise of reform.

We, none of us, can afford to be bystanders of that race. Too much is at stake. Consider this: The coming months and years may decide whether the Russian people continue to develop a peaceful market democracy or whether, in frustration, they elect leaders who incline back toward authoritarianism and empire. This period may determine whether the nations neighboring Russia thrive in freedom and join the ranks of nonnuclear states or founder under the strain of reform and cling to weapons that increase the risk of nuclear accident or diversion. This period may decide whether the states of the former Soviet bloc are woven into the fabric of transatlantic prosperity and security or are simply left hanging in isolation as they face the same daunting changes gripping so many others in Europe.

These pivotal decisions ultimately rest with the people who threw off communism's yoke. They must make their own decisions about their own future. But we in the West can clearly help to shape their choices, and we must summon the political will to do so.

The task requires a steady and patient effort, guided by a strategic star that points us toward the integration of a broader Europe. It also requires a fair amount of humility, understanding that we cannot control every event in every country on every day. But if we are willing to assume the central challenge, we can revitalize not only the nations of the East but also our own transatlantic relationship.

Over the past half-century, the transatlantic community only realized half the promise of World War II's triumph over fascism. The other half lay captive behind Europe's walls of division. Now we have the chance to realize the full promise of Europe's victories without its great disappointment: Normandy without Yalta, the liberation of the Low Countries without the Berlin blockade.

During this past half-century, transatlantic security depended primarily on the deterrents provided by our military forces. Now the immediate threat to our East is not of advancing armies but of creeping instability. Countering that threat requires not only military security but also the promotion of democratic and economic renewal. Combined, these forces are the strongest bulwark against Europe's current dangers, against ethnic conflict, the abuse of human rights, the destabilizing refugee flows, the rise of aggressive regimes, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The integration of the former Communist bloc with the rest of Europe will be gradual and often difficult, as Germany's bold efforts demonstrate. And like all great opportunities, we must remember that this one could be fleeting. We must not now let the Iron Curtain be replaced with a veil of indifference. For history will judge us as it judged with scorn those who preached isolationism between the World Wars and as it has judged with praise the bold architects of the transatlantic community after World War II.

With the cold war over, some in America with short memories have called for us to pack up and go home. I am asked often, "Why do you maintain a presence in Europe? How can you justify the expense when we have so many problems here at home?" We tried that, right after World War I. The American people this year proved their resistance to the siren song of global withdrawal. We did so when the Congress voted for the North American Free Trade Agreement, voted for America to compete in a global economy, not to retreat. And we did so when we reached out to Europe and to others and, in working with the European Union, led the world to accept a new GATT agreement on world trade. I have come here today to declare and to demonstrate that Europe remains central to the interests of the United States and that we will help to work with our partners in seizing the opportunities before us all.

Without question, Europe is not the only focus of our engagement. We must reach out to Latin America and to Asia, areas that are increasingly important both to the United States and to Europe. And our bonds with Europe will be different than they were in the past, but make no mistake about it, the bonds that tie the United States and Europe are unique. We share a passionate faith that God has endowed us as individuals with inalienable rights and a belief that the state exists by our consent solely to advance freedom and security and prosperity for all of us as individuals. That is still a radical idea in the world in which we live. Developed by Locke and Montesquieu, put into practice in my country by Jefferson and Madison, it has toppled tyrants, it has drawn millions to our country's shores. Over three centuries, the ties of kinship between the United States and Europe have fostered bonds of commerce, and you remain our most valued partner, not just in the cause of democracy and freedom but also in the economics of trade and investment.

But above all, the core of our security remains with Europe. That is why America's commitment to Europe's safety and stability remains as strong as ever. That is why I urged NATO to convene this week's summit. It is why I am committed to keeping roughly 100,000 American troops stationed in Europe, consistent with the expressed desires of our allies here. It is not habit but security and partnership that justifies this continuing commitment by the United States. Just as we have worked in partnership with Europe on every major security challenge in this century, it is now time for us to join in building the new security for the 21st century, the century in which most of you in this room will live most of your lives. The new security must seek to bind a broader Europe together with a strong fabric woven of military cooperation, prosperous market economies, and vital democracies.

Let me speak briefly about each of these. The first and most important element of the security must be military strength and cooperation. The cold war is over, but war itself is not over. As we know, it rages today not only in distant lands but right here in Europe and the former Yugoslavia. That murderous conflict reminds us that even after the cold war, military forces remain relevant. It also reveals the difficulties of applying military force to conflicts

within as well as among states. And it teaches us that it is best to act early to prevent conflicts that we may later not be able to control.

As we work to resolve that tragedy and ease the suffering of its victims, we also need to change our security institutions so they can better address such conflicts and advance Europe's integration. Many institutions will play a role, including the European Union, the Western European Union, the Council of Europe, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the United Nations. But NATO, history's greatest military alliance, must be central to that process.

Only NATO has the military forces, the integrated command, the broad legitimacy, and the habits of cooperation that are essential to draw in new participants and respond to new challenges. One of the deepest transformations within the transatlantic community over the past half-century occurred because the armed forces of our respected nations trained, studied, and marched through their careers together. It is not only the compatibility of our weapons but the camaraderie of our warriors that provide the sinews behind our mutual security guarantees and our best hope for peace.

Two years ago, our nations began to adapt NATO to this new era by creating the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. It includes all the states of the former Soviet bloc as well as the 16 of NATO. Now it is time to move beyond that dialog and create an operating partnership. That is why I have proposed that we create the Partnership For Peace.

This Partnership will advance a process of evolution for NATO's formal enlargement. It looks to the day when NATO will take on new members who assume the alliance's full responsibilities. It will create a framework in which former Communist states and others not now members of NATO can participate with NATO members in joint military planning, training, exercises, and other efforts. This partnership will build new bonds of cooperation among the militaries of the East and the West. It will reinforce the development of democracies and democratic practices, such as respect for human rights and civilian control over military forces. It can give NATO new tools for responding to ethnic instability and other dangers of our era. The use of NATO forces in such missions will always be considered, and must be, on a case-by-case basis. But tomorrow's summit will put us in a stronger position to make those decisions and to make them early and wisely.

The Partnership For Peace will not alter NATO's fundamental mission of defending NATO territory from attack. We cannot afford to abandon that mission while the dream of empire still burns in the minds of some who look longingly toward a brutal past. But neither can we afford to draw a new line between East and West that could create a self-fulfilling prophecy of future confrontation.

This partnership opens the door to cooperation with all of NATO's former adversaries, including Russia, Ukraine, and the other newly independent states, based on a belief that freedom's boundaries must now be defined by new behavior, not old history.

I say to all those in Europe and the United States who would simply have us draw a new line in Europe further east that we should not foreclose the possibility of the best possible future for Europe, which is a democracy everywhere, a market economy everywhere, people cooperating everywhere for mutual security. We can guard against a lesser future, but we should strive for the best future for you and your generation.

NATO can also help to meet Europe's new security challenges by doing more to counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. I tell you, frankly, it is one of our most difficult and challenging tasks. Countering those weapons and the missiles that deliver them will require close cooperation, honesty, and discipline, and a willingness of some not now willing to do it to forgo immediate financial gain.

The danger is clear and present. Growing missile capabilities are bringing more of Europe into the range of rogue states such as Iran and Libya. There are disturbing reports of efforts to smuggle nuclear materials into and out of Eastern Europe. And this eastward-looking summit will give us the chance to begin to address the threat on our own territory.

The second element of the new security we are building must be greater economic vitality, the issue which I would imagine is of most immediate concern to most of you. We must build it on vibrant and open market economies, the engines that have given us the greatest prosperity in human history over the last several decades in Europe and in the United States.

Our combined success in leading the world to a new GATT agreement capped 7 years of

effort to expand prosperity to all trading nations. Now we must define a successor agenda to GATT that focuses on the renewal of advanced economies and the enlargement of prosperities to the nations of our East that are making the difficult transitions to market economics.

First, the renewal of our own economies is critical. Unless we are creating jobs and unless we are raising incomes in Europe and in the United States and Japan, in the advanced countries of the world, it will be difficult for the people of those nations, all our nations, to continue to support of policy of involvement with the rest of the world.

The nations of the European Union face particular severe economic challenges with nearly 20 million people unemployed and, in Germany's case, the extraordinarily high costs of unification. All our nations have had to struggle against the restless forces of this new global economy, against the competition that comes from countries with lower wages or that is generated when technology enables us to do more with fewer workers but there is not new technology to provide new jobs for those who are displaced. This is a problem not just for Europe but also for the United States and now for Japan as well.

Among the Atlantic nations, economic stagnation has clearly eroded public support and finances for outward-looking foreign policies and for greater integration. Our respective efforts to revive our own economies are therefore important not only for our own living standards but also for our collective strength. And both of them will shape the future you and your children will have.

We must proceed quickly to implement the GATT agreement. But we also must learn together and from each other on making a broader and bolder series of adjustments to this new global economy.

We Americans have a lot to learn from Europe in matters of job training and apprenticeship, of moving our people from school to work, into good paying jobs with the capacity to continue to learn new skills as the economy forces them to do so. But we also may have something to teach in the area of the flexibility of our job structure and our capacity to generate work and new employment opportunities. This is an area in which we can usefully draw lessons from each other. And that is why I am pleased that in March our leading ministers will hold a jobs conference that I proposed last July. We simply must figure out how to create more jobs and how to reward people who work both harder and smarter in the workplace. It is the basis of all the other attitudes that we want to foster to remain engaged with one another and with the rest of the world.

But as we work to strengthen our own economies, we must know that we serve our own prosperity and our security by helping the new market economies of Europe's eastern half to thrive. Successful market reforms in those states will help to deflate the region's demagogs. It will help to ease ethnic tensions. It will help new democracies to take root. It is also in your long-term interest because one of the things that we have learned is that wealthy nations cannot grow richer unless they have customers beyond their borders for their goods and their services. So the short-term difficulties of taking Eastern Europe into our economic alliance will be more than rewarded if they succeed and if they are customers for Western Europe's goods and services tomorrow. That is why early on in our administration we committed to increase support substantially for market reforms in the new states of the former Soviet Union and why we have continued our support for economic transition in Central and Eastern Europe.

Ultimately, the success of market reforms to the East will depend more on trade than aid. None of us have enough money to markedly change the future of those countries as they move to free market systems in the government coffers. We cannot give them enough aid to make them full partners. They must grow and trade their way into full partnership with us.

One of our priorities, therefore, should be to reduce trade barriers to the former Communist states. It will make little sense for us to applaud their market reforms on the one hand while offering only selective access to our markets on the other. That's like inviting someone to a castle and refusing to let down the drawbridge. The United States has already eliminated many of our cold war barriers to products from these countries. And all our nations must find more ways to do the same thing. The economic success of these states simply cannot be separated from our own renewal and security.

In 1931, a remarkable British political cartoon portrayed the United States and Europe in a rowboat. At the back end of the boat, where Europe's more Eastern powers sat, there was

a terrible leak, and it was sinking fast. The front end, where the United States and Western Europe were, was still afloat. The boat was sinking from the back end. And one of the figures in our end of the boat was saying, "Thank goodness, the leak's not at our end of the boat." In the end, the whole boat sank. That will happen again unless we work together. Europe's Western half clearly, as history shows, cannot long be secure if the Eastern half remains in turmoil.

The third and final imperative of this new security is to support the growth of democracy and individual freedoms that has begun throughout Europe's former Communist states. The success of these democratic reforms make us all more secure because democracies tend not to wage war on one another and they tend not to break their word to one another. Democratic governments nurture civil society, respect for human rights, and habits of simple tolerance. The democratic values at the heart of the Western community are also our best answer to the aggressive nationalism and ethnic hatreds unleashed by the end of the cold war.

We in the transatlantic community must commit ourselves to helping democracy succeed in all the former Communist states that are Western Europe's immediate neighbors, because their security matters to our security. Nowhere is democracy's success more important to us all than there, and then in Russia. I will say again: In Russia, if the nation continues to evolve as a market democracy, satisfied within her borders and at peace with her neighbors, defining her greatness in terms of the ability to enable all of the children of Russia to live to the fullest of their potential, then our road toward Europe's full integration will be wider and smoother and safer. As one Ukrainian legislator recently stated, "If Russia is democratic, Europe will be calm."

The results of the recent elections in Russia and the statements of some Russian political figures have given us all genuine cause for concern. We must consistently condemn expression of intolerance and threats of aggression. But we should also keep those concerns in some historical perspective. It was only 2 years ago, after all, that the Soviet Union dissolved. Just 2 months ago, Russia appeared to be on the brink of a civil war. But since then Russia has held a free and fair national election, its people have ratified a genuinely democratic constitution, and they have elected their first-ever post-Soviet legislature. And the government continues to pursue democratic and economic reform.

The transformation Russia is undertaking is absolutely staggering. If you just think about what the country has been like since 1917, if you go back to the 18th century and imagine the history of the nation from that point to this, the idea that the nation could seriously be involved by democratic vote in undertaking these transformations is absolutely staggering. We cannot expect them to correct overnight three-quarters of a century of repressive leadership, three-quarters of a century of totalitarian policy, or a whole national history in which there was no democracy.

As in the other Communist nations, this will be the work of generations. We in the United States have been at it for 200 years now, and we're still working to try to get it right. All of us have to recognize that there will be wrong turns and even reversals, as there have been in all of our own countries throughout our histories. But as long as these states continue their progress toward democracy and respect the rights of their own and other people, they understand the rights of their minorities and their neighbors, then we should support their progress with a steady patience.

In order to support these new democracies, we are supporting grassroots efforts to build the institutions of civil society, from community organizers in the Czech Republic to election volunteers in Bulgaria. We also will take steps to encourage cooperation among the new democracies. As with Western Europe after World War II, we must get regional neighbors working together rather than looking at each other with suspicion.

The broader integration in peace we are building is not only a European concern, I say again, it is distinctly in the interests of the United States. My Nation has thrilled at the progress of freedom on this continent over the past 5 years. And we understand well the toll that European discord ultimately takes on our own people.

Only a few hours from this place lie the graves of thousands of Americans who died in Europe's two great wars. History records where they fell, at Flanders Field, on the shores of Normandy, and in the Battle of the Bulge. But let us remember as well why they came here, why they left the safety of their homes to fight in a distant land. They came because our secu-

rity depends more on things that go far beyond geographical divides. Our security depends on more than the ocean that divides us. It depends on the existence of a strong and free and democratic Europe.

Today we can honor the sacrifice of those Americans buried here on your soil by expanding the reach of the freedoms they fought and gave their lives to preserve. The fight for your generation across a broader Europe will be joined and won not on this continent's beaches or across its plains but rather in its new parliaments and city councils, in the offices and factories of its new market economies, in the hearts and minds of the young people like many of you here. You have the most to gain from a Europe that is integrated in terms of security, in terms of economics, in terms of democracies.

Ultimately, you will have to decide what sort of Europe you want and how hard you are willing to work for it. But I want you to know that the United States stands by you in that battle, as we have in the other battles of the 20th century.

I believe that our freedom is indivisible. I believe our destinies are joined. I believe that the 21st century can be the most exciting period that Europe and the United States have ever known and that your future can be the richest and brightest of any generation. But we will have to work to make it so.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6 p.m. in the Gothic Room at the Hotel de Ville. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene of Belgium and Mayor Jose Desmaret of Brussels.

Remarks to Citizens in Brussels
January 9, 1994

Thank you all for coming out tonight. Thank you for waving the flags. I'm sorry we didn't have more room inside, but I'm glad we could show the speech on the screen.

Let me say that I have been in this place many times. I've been here as a student. I've been here as the Governor of my State. I never imagined I would actually be here as President and you would be here to say hello. You have already heard my speech; I have really nothing else to say except I'm delighted to be here. We are here to build a new and stronger future for Europe and a better partnership between Europe and the United States, and I hope all of you will support that.

Happy New Year, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:47 p.m. in the Grand Place, upon his departure from the Hotel de Ville.

Remarks to the American Diplomatic Community in Brussels
January 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you for coming. Thank you for playing. And thank you for waiting a little as I had the chance to stop downtown and talk to some citizens after I gave my speech.

I want to tell you how very much I appreciate the work that all of you are doing for your country a long way from home, but at the center of the future we have to make together. I think in a way you're all fortunate to be serving in Brussels at such a pivotal point in the history of Europe and the history of the world. This is a remarkable city, the headquarters of the Commission on European Unity and Union and NATO. And I want to thank all of our three Ambassadors behind us for the work that they have done.

The importance of our bilateral relationship with Belgium can hardly be overstated. Alan Blinken, I think, will represent us very well,

particularly if all of you at the Embassy do what everybody tries to do at the White House every day and make sure I'm not my own worst enemy. [*Laughter*] I want to thank Bob Hunter for the work he's doing at NATO and say that this Partnership For Peace, contrary to what some have suggested, is not a weak limitation on the future of European security, it is a strong first step that opens the possibility of the best possible future for Europe in which everyone will have an opportunity to be a democracy and to be part of our shared security. And I want to say a special word of thanks to my longtime friend Stu Eizenstat for coming here to serve. We've worked hard to get this GATT agreement. The European Union is now a reality. We have to see it through; there's still a lot to do.

I stopped at a little coffee shop and restaurant on the way out here tonight, just talked to some citizens, and I met this incredible Belgian lady who said, "You're right, we've got to compete. We can't run away from the world." And she said, "I know how hard it is economically, but 2 years ago I didn't have a job, and now I have my own business and I'm doing very well, and I'm excited about the European Union. I'm going to do business in other countries now." We've got to somehow communicate that spirit, that belief that we can bring this economy back, this whole global economy back to people here so they can believe in themselves. I can tell you that, back home, that is beginning to happen. We do have more control over our economic destiny. The deficit is coming down after going up for 12 years. Jobs are being created, and movement is there in the economy. And there is a sense that we're beginning to confront problems that we have ignored for way, way too long.

So I think we're coming here at a very important time and an appropriate time. And I guess I ought to end by apologizing to those of you who have had to do so much extra work because of this trip and the headaches I may have caused you. But believe me, it is in a worthy cause, and we are going to make a new future for the people of Europe and the people of the world so that we don't repeat the mistakes of the 20th century in the 21st and so that we give all these children a better future than any generation has ever known.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, Antoene Tixhon, Bourgmestre of Dinant, presented the President with a saxophone.*]

The President. In case you didn't understand it, Dinant, Belgium, is the home of Adolphe Sax, the man who invented the saxophone. And this says, "Adolphe Sax, 1814 to 1894. To Bill Clinton, President of the United States." And it says something else, but my glasses are not here. [*Laughter*] "Dinant, Belgium" and——

Bourgmestre Tixhon. "International Year of the Saxophone."

The President. Yes, the international year of Adolphe Sax. And it points out that this wonderful horn was made in Paris by Selmer.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:03 p.m. at the Conrad Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Alan Blinken, U.S. Ambassador to Belgium; Robert Hunter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO; and Stuart Eizenstat, U.S. Ambassador to the European Union. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters in Brussels, Belgium

January 9, 1994

Future Leaders of Europe

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

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

cally things they agreed with. I was very encouraged——

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

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

Ukraine

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

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

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

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

Partnership For Peace

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

The President. I hope so.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—giving Russia veto?

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

Bosnia

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

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

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

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

The President. Good night, everybody.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 8:30 p.m. at the Au Vieux Saint Martin Restaurant. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Memorandum on Assistance to the States of the Former Soviet Union
January 8, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Transfer of Funds for Assistance for the New Independent States (NIS) of the Former Soviet Union

Pursuant to the Supplemental Appropriations for the NIS of the Former Soviet Union Act, 1993 (Title VI of Public Law 103–87) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that programs described in Section 560 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1994 (Titles I–V of Public Law 103–87) and programs described in Section 498 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (Public Law 87–195), will increase the national security of the United States.

The political and economic transformation of the NIS of the former Soviet Union into peaceful market-oriented democracies will directly reduce the security threat to the United States and lead to substantial savings in the cost of the defense of the United States. The abovementioned programs facilitate this transformation, thereby making a critical contribution to increasing the national security of the United States.

Accordingly, unless I instruct otherwise in the interim, on the thirtieth day following submission to the appropriate Committees of the Congress of the memorandum regarding notification under 10 U.S.C. 2215 for the NIS of the former Soviet Union, you are authorized and directed to exercise your authority under the first two provisos under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies" in the Act to transfer funds in the amounts and to the accounts detailed in the attachment to this memorandum. Any funds transferred to the Agency for International Development may thereafter, at the direction of the Secretary of State or the Coordinator designated under Section 102 of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511), be allocated or transferred pursuant to the authority of Section 632 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. In the event of such transfer, the implementing agency shall be the agency responsible and accountable for the management, audit and use of such funds.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 10. The related memorandum of January 8 on notification is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Peacekeeping Operations in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
January 8, 1994

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

Six months ago I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of a U.S. peacekeeping contingent as part of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I am now providing this followup report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to ensure that the Congress is kept informed about this important U.S. contribution in support of multilateral efforts in the region.

As a significant part of U.N. efforts to prevent the Balkan conflict from spreading and to contribute to stability in the region, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 795 (1992) authorizing the presence of UNPROFOR for peacekeeping purposes in Macedonia. In early 1993, a Nordic battalion was deployed to Macedonia with the mission of monitoring and reporting developments along the northern border that could signify a threat to the territory of Macedonia. Consistent with U.N. Security Council Resolution 842 (1993), the United States augmented the UNPROFOR Macedonia peacekeeping force with a combat-equipped U.S. Army contingent. The U.N. Security Coun-

cil extended the UNPROFOR mandate in Resolution 871 (1993). Our U.S. Armed Forces personnel have served with distinction in Macedonia continuously since their arrival in early July 1993.

The peacekeeping operations in Macedonia have been conducted safely and effectively, and I am certain that you share my pride in and appreciation for the superb efforts of the Americans who are contributing so much to the UNPROFOR Macedonia mission. Unsurprisingly, the U.S. Army personnel received high praise from the U.N. Commander, Danish Brigadier General Thomsen, for their outstanding professionalism and capabilities, which enabled them quickly to assume an integral role in the force. Upon receiving orientation and training on the mission at UNPROFOR headquarters in Skopje, the U.S. unit began conducting observation and monitoring operations along the northeastern section of the Macedonian border with Serbia. The U.S. contribution has thus enhanced UNPROFOR's coverage and effectiveness in preventing a spillover of the conflict, and has underscored the U.S. commitment to the achievement of important multilateral goals in the region.

As always, the safety of U.S. personnel is of paramount concern. U.S. forces assigned to UNPROFOR Macedonia have encountered no hostilities, and there have been no U.S. casualties since the deployment began. The mission has the support of the government and the local population. Our forces will remain fully prepared not only to fulfill their peacekeeping mission but to defend themselves if necessary.

On December 14, 1993, elements of the U.S. Army Berlin Brigade's reinforced company team (RCT) assigned to UNPROFOR Macedonia began redeploying to Germany as part of the normal rotation of U.S. forces. Lead elements of a similarly equipped and sized RCT began arriving in Macedonia on December 27, 1993. The approximately 300-person replacement unit—Task Force 1–6, from 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 3d Infantry Division (Mechanized), Vilseck, Germany—assumed the mission on January 6, 1994.

The U.S. contribution to the UNPROFOR Macedonia peacekeeping mission is but one part of a much larger, continuing commitment towards resolution of the extremely difficult situation in the former Yugoslavia. I am not able to indicate at this time how long our deployment to Macedonia will be necessary. I have continued the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes in accordance with section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act and pursuant to my constitutional authority as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am grateful for the continuing support of the Congress for U.S. efforts, including the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to Macedonia, towards peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia. I remain committed to consulting closely with the Congress on our foreign policy, and I look forward to continued cooperation as we move forward toward attainment of our goals in the region.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 10.

Remarks to the North Atlantic Council in Brussels

January 10, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary General, and distinguished leaders. I am deeply honored to represent my Nation at the North Atlantic Council this morning, as eight previous Presidents have done before me. Each of us came here for the same compelling reason: The security of the North Atlantic region is vital to the security of the United States. The founders of this alliance created the greatest military alliance in history. It was a bold undertaking. I think all of us know that we have come together this week because history calls upon us to be equally bold once again in the aftermath of the cold war. Now we no longer fear attack from a com-

mon enemy. But if our common adversary has vanished, we know our common dangers have not.

With the cold war over, we must confront the destabilizing consequences of the unfreezing of history which the end of the cold war has wrought. The threat to us now is not of advancing armies so much as of creeping instability. The best strategy against this threat is to integrate the former Communist states into our fabric of liberal democracy, economic prosperity, and military cooperation. For our security in this generation will be shaped by whether reforms in these nations succeed in the face of their own very significant economic frustration, ethnic tensions, and intolerant nationalism.

The size of the reactionary vote in Russia's recent election reminds us again of the strength of democracy's opponents. The ongoing slaughter in Bosnia tallies the price when those opponents prevail. If we don't meet our new challenge, then most assuredly we will once again, someday down the road, face our old challenges again. If democracy in the East fails, then violence and disruption from the East will once again harm us and other democracies.

I believe our generation's stewardship of this grand alliance, therefore, will most critically be judged by whether we succeed in integrating the nations to our east within the compass of Western security and Western values. For we've been granted an opportunity without precedent: We really have the chance to recast European security on historic new principles, the pursuit of economic and political freedom. And I would argue to you that we must work hard to succeed now, for this opportunity may not come to us again.

In effect, the world wonders now whether we have the foresight and the courage our predecessors had to act on our long-term interests. I'm confident that the steel in this alliance has not rusted. Our nations have proved that by joining together in the common effort in the Gulf war. We proved it anew this past year by working together, after 7 long years of effort, in a spirit of compromise and harmony to reach a new GATT agreement. And now we must do it once again.

To seize the great opportunity before us, I have proposed that we forge what we have all decided to call the Partnership For Peace, open to all the former Communist states of the Warsaw Pact, along with other non-NATO states. The membership of the Partnership will plan and train and exercise together and work together on missions of common concern. They should be invited to work directly with NATO both here and in the coordination cell in Mons.

The Partnership will prepare the NATO alliance to undertake new tasks that the times impose upon us. The Combined Joint Task Force Headquarters we are creating will let us act both effectively and with dispatch in helping to make and keep the peace and in helping to head off some of the terrible problems we are now trying to solve today. We must also ready this alliance to meet new threats, notably from weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them.

Building on NATO's creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council 2 years ago, the Partnership For Peace sets in motion a process that leads to the enlargement of NATO. We began this alliance with 12 members. Today there are 16, and each one has strengthened the alliance. Indeed, our treaty always looked to the addition of new members who shared the alliance's purposes and who could enlarge its orbit of democratic security. Thus, in leading us toward the addition of these Eastern states, the Partnership For Peace does not change NATO's original vision, it realizes that vision.

So let us say here to the people in Europe's East, we share with you a common destiny, and we are committed to your success. The democratic community has grown, and now it is time to begin welcoming these newcomers to our neighborhood.

As President Mitterrand said so eloquently, some of the newcomers want to be members of NATO right away, and some have expressed reservations about this concept of the Partnership For Peace. Some have asked me in my own country, "Well, is this just the best you can do? Is this sort of splitting the difference between doing nothing and full membership at least for the Visegrad states?" And to that, let me answer at least for my part an emphatic no, for many of the same reasons President Mitterrand has already outlined.

Why should we now draw a new line through Europe just a little further east? Why should we now do something which could foreclose the best possible future for Europe? The best possible future would be a democratic Russia committed to the security of all of its European neighbors. The best possible future would be

a democratic Ukraine, a democratic government in every one of the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union, all committed to market cooperation, to common security, and to democratic ideals. We should not foreclose that possibility.

The Partnership For Peace, I would argue, gives us the best of both worlds. It enables us to prepare and to work toward the enlargement of NATO when other countries are capable of fulfilling their NATO responsibilities. It enables us to do it in a way that gives us the time to reach out to Russia and to these other nations of the former Soviet Union, which have been almost ignored through this entire debate by people around the world, in a way that leaves open the possibility of a future for Europe that totally breaks from the destructive past we have known.

So I say to you, I do not view this as some sort of half-hearted compromise. In substance, this is a good idea. It is the right thing to do at this moment in history. It leaves open the best possible future for Europe and leaves us the means to settle for a future that is not the best but is much better than the past. And I would argue that is the course that we all ought to pursue.

I think we have to be clear, in doing it, about certain assumptions and consequences. First, if we move forward in this manner, we must reaffirm the bonds of our own alliance. America pledges its efforts in that common purpose. I pledge to maintain roughly 100,000 troops in Europe, consistent with the expressed wishes of our allies. The people of Europe can count on America to maintain this commitment.

Second, we have to recognize that this new security challenge requires a range of responses different from the ones of the past. That is why our administration has broken with previous American administrations in going beyond what others have done to support European efforts to advance their own security and interests. All of you have received our support in moving in ways beyond NATO. We supported the Maastricht Treaty. We support the commitment of the European Union to a common foreign and security policy. We support your efforts to refurbish the Western European Union so that it will assume a more vigorous role in keeping Europe secure. Consistent with that goal, we have proposed making NATO assets available to WEU operations in which NATO itself is not involved. While NATO must remain the linchpin of our security, all these efforts will show our people and our legislatures a renewed purpose in European institutions and a better balance of responsibilities within the transatlantic community.

Finally, in developing the Partnership For Peace, each of us must willingly assume the burdens to make that succeed. This must not be a gesture. It is a forum. It is not just a forum. This Partnership For Peace is also a military and security initiative, consistent with what NATO was established to achieve. There must be a somber appreciation that expanding our membership will mean extending commitments that must be supported by military strategies and postures. Adding new members entails not only hard decisions but hard resources. Today those resources are not great, but nonetheless, as the Secretary General told me in the meeting this morning, they must be forthcoming in order for this to be taken seriously by our allies and our friends who will immediately subscribe to the Partnership.

Let me also—in response to something that President Mitterrand said and that is on all of our minds, the problem in Bosnia—say that when we talk about making hard decisions, we must be prepared to make them. And tonight I have been asked to talk a little bit about the work I have been doing with Russia and what I believe we all should be doing to support democracy and economic reform there. But I'd like to make two points about Bosnia.

First, I want to reaffirm that the United States remains ready to help NATO implement a viable settlement in Bosnia voluntarily reached by the parties. We would, of course, have to seek the support of our Congress in this, but let me say I think we can get it if such an operation would clearly be under NATO command, that the means of carrying out the mission be equivalent to its purposes, and that these purposes be clear in scope and in time.

Second, I welcome the reassertion by the alliance in this declaration of our warning against the strangulation of Sarajevo and the safe areas. But if we are going to reassert this warning, it cannot be seen as mere rhetoric. Those who attack Sarajevo must understand that we are serious. If we leave the sentence in the declaration, we have to mean it.

Those of us gathered here must understand that, therefore, if the situation does not improve,

the alliance must be prepared to act. What is at stake is not just the safety of the people in Sarajevo and any possibility of bringing this terrible conflict to an end but the credibility of the alliance itself. And that, make no mistake about it, will have great ramifications in the future in other contexts.

Therefore, in voting for this language, I expect the North Atlantic Council to take action when necessary. And I think if anyone here does not agree with that, you shouldn't vote for language. I think it is the appropriate language, but we have to be clear when we put something like this in the declaration.

Let me say finally that I ran across the following quotation by a distinguished and now deceased American political writer, Walter Lippmann. Three days after the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, Lippmann wrote this, prophetically: "The pact will be remembered long after the conditions that have provoked it are no longer the main business of mankind. For the treaty recognizes and proclaims a community of interest which is much older than the conflict with the Soviet Union and, come what may, will survive it."

Well, this meeting will prove him right. The Soviet Union is gone, but our community of interest endures. And now it is up to us to build a new security for a new future for the Atlantic people in the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:15 a.m. at NATO Headquarters. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference in Brussels
January 10, 1994

Initiatives in Europe

The President. Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, I came to Europe to help strengthen European integration, to create a new security for the United States and its Atlantic partners, based on the idea that we had a real chance to integrate rather than to divide Europe, both East and West, an integration based on shared democracies, market economies, and defense cooperation.

Today we have taken two giant steps toward greater security for the United States, for Europe, and the world. First, this afternoon I joined our NATO allies in signing the documents that create the Partnership For Peace. The United States proposed this Partnership to lay the foundation for intensive cooperation among the armed forces of our NATO members, all former Warsaw Pact states, and other non-NATO European states who wish to join the Partnership. By providing for the practical integration and cooperation of these diverse military forces, the Partnership For Peace will lead to the enlargement of NATO membership and will support our efforts to integrate Europe.

I'm also pleased to announce that on Friday the United States will sign with Ukraine and Russia an agreement which commits Ukraine to eliminate nuclear weapons from its territory. These include 176 intercontinental ballistic missiles and some 1,500 warheads targeted at the United States. This is a hopeful and historic breakthrough that enhances the security of all three parties and every other nation as well.

When I came into office, I said that one of my highest priorities was combating the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The issue of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union was the most important nonproliferation challenge facing the world. With the Soviet Union dissolved, four countries were left with nuclear weapons: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus. I have sought to ensure that the breakup of the Soviet Union does not result in the birth of new nuclear states which could raise the chances for nuclear accident, nuclear terrorism, or nuclear proliferation.

In just one year, after an intensive diplomatic effort by the United States, both Kazakhstan and Belarus agreed to accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to join the ranks of nonnuclear nations. Much credit for these actions goes to President Nazarbayev of

Kazakhstan, whom I will be welcoming to Washington in February, and Chairman Shushkevich of Belarus, whom I will meet in Minsk later this week, as well as to the people and Parliaments of those two countries.

My administration has been working with the Governments of Ukraine and Russia to address Ukraine's security concerns so that it could follow suit. The trilateral accord we will sign will lead to the complete removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine.

I want to congratulate both President Yeltsin and President Kravchuk of Ukraine for their statesmanship in negotiating this accord with us. I want to commend President Kravchuk and to thank him for his leadership. I look forward to consulting with him personally during the brief stop at Borispol Airport in Kiev on Wednesday evening. President Kravchuk will later join President Yeltsin and me in Moscow on Friday to finalize the agreement in a trilateral meeting.

This agreement opens a new era in our relationship with Ukraine, an important country at the center of Europe, a country, I might add, which was mentioned frequently during our meetings today. We expect to expand our cooperation with Ukraine, especially in the economic area. We look forward to Ukraine's playing an important role in efforts to move toward the integration of a broader Europe.

Today I spent the day at NATO Headquarters, one of the pillars of our security in the post-World War II era. Throughout that era, our security was defined by the stability of Europe's division. But with the two breakthroughs for peace announced today, we can begin to imagine as well as to define a new security for the post-cold-war era founded not on Europe's division but instead on its integration. Throughout the 20th century, now drawing to a close, Europe has seen far too much bloodshed based on these divisions. But with strong democracies, strong market economies, strong bonds of defense cooperation, and this strong step to combat nuclear weapons proliferation, we can make the next century far more secure for all of our people by building a united Europe.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News]?

Russia

Q. Mr. President, there are some who have suggested that even this Partnership For Peace is going to be too much of an exacerbation to the nationalist tendencies in Russia. And today Mr. Zhirinovsky said that if NATO troops are ever stationed near the borders of Russia, it's a mistake, it's finished for NATO and/or other forces who have supported this organization, it's the beginning of a third world war if the NATO or other forces are along those borders. How do you respond to that and to the concerns that there are people in Russia who will not even take this step kindly?

The President. My response to that is that his, thank goodness, is not the governing voice in Russia and that we have offered to the Russians, to all the states of the former Soviet Union, and to all the Eastern European countries which were in the Warsaw Pact the opportunity to participate in this Partnership For Peace.

The reason I wanted the Partnership For Peace rather than nothing, which perhaps Mr. Zhirinovsky would have preferred, or immediate membership, which others would have preferred, is that I thought it gave us the best chance, first, to develop substantive military and defense cooperation for these countries; second, to give nations who wish to be members, full members, of NATO the chance to develop the capacity to assume their responsibilities; and third, to give us the chance, most importantly of all, to create a Europe that really is integrated, that is based on unity and not some dividing line that at least is further east than the cold war dividing line was.

So I simply—I disagree with the position that he's taken, but that is not the position that governs Russia, thank goodness.

Q. Do you think, just to follow, that Russia would be joining the Partnership For Peace?

The President. They're certainly welcome to do so. We've issued——

Q. Could that happen in the next few days?

The President. I think that all the nations to whom the welcome mat has been put out may want to take some—some may want to take more time than others to think about it. But we certainly expect to have some sort of continuing defense cooperation with Russia, and they are certainly welcome to be a part of this.

Go ahead, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Bosnia

Q. On the subject of Bosnia, earlier today you said that NATO would be reasserting its warning against the strangulation of Sarajevo.

You said if we're going to reassert this warning, it cannot be seen as mere rhetoric. Yet, NATO has done nothing in Bosnia really. What changed today after your meeting?

The President. Well, let me point out, NATO has done everything that the United Nations has asked it to do. With our allies, we have conducted the longest airlift in history to bring supplies to the people of Bosnia. We have supported working with our allies' operations in the Adriatic and other operations designed to support the embargo. We have supported the no-fly zone. We have done everything the United Nations has asked us to do.

What we are going to discuss tonight in greater detail—let me say, I don't want to say any—I'll be glad to talk about my comment today, but I do want to tell you we're going to have more discussions about this tonight at dinner.

The point I was trying to make today that Secretary General Woerner also wanted to make was that if we were going to restate, in effect, the warning we adopted in August that if Sarajevo were subject to undue and continued shelling in a way that threatened it significantly—and there was more shelling today—that we would consider having air strikes, that we had to be prepared to do that. And I can tell you that on behalf of the United States that if the facts warrant that, we would certainly ask the North Atlantic Council to take it up. That is, we would ask all of our allies and NATO to consider an appropriate response. Now, there's still the U.N. to deal with and other things, but we believe we should go forward.

The question of what we can do to get a peace in Bosnia, however, I want to caution you, goes far beyond that. That is, it depends upon the willingness of all the parties to agree to a reasonable settlement. And what may be appropriate in dealing with relieving the siege of Sarajevo may or may not actually hasten an end to the war. So we'll be discussing that in greater detail.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Q. You're not ready for the air strikes yet, sir?

The President. Well, let me say, what I want to do at this meeting—this meeting is not about air strikes. This meeting is about whether we're going to reaffirm our position. I can just tell you that the United States would be prepared to ask the North Atlantic Council to consider that if the siege of Sarajevo continues and the facts warrant it.

Partnership For Peace

Q. You made one of the toughest statements you ever have made for an international group. What was the response of the allies? I mean, how did they take it? Did they say they would go along?

The President. Well, we're going to talk about it tonight. Some did; some have not commented yet. But let me say today the most important thing and the thing we talked about today was our agreement on the strategy for reaching out to the East. Over the long run, that will have a greater significance, in my judgment, for the future of Europe than whatever is or is not done with the tragedy in Bosnia at this late date. So we spent most of our time today fleshing out, dealing with, working through this whole concept of the Partnership For Peace. And I was, frankly, very gratified that so many of the leaders of the other countries believe that it is the right way to go and understand it's not just a compromise but it's a vibrant concept that gives us a chance to build the best possible future for Europe. That to me was the best thing we were doing.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press]?

Ukraine

Q. Mr. President, what assurances do you have from President Kravchuk that he can sell this arms deal to his Parliament this time? There have been difficulties in the past. And what are the costs, sir?

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, that—let me deal with the cost first. As you all know—and then I'll get to the other point—you all know how the Nunn-Lugar funds work. The only cost to the United States taxpayers in this agreement will be the continuation of the Nunn-Lugar program, that is, the funds that we provide to help people dismantle their nuclear weapons. What does Ukraine get out of this? They get security assurances that go with this sort of agreement. That is, once you become a nonnuclear state, the states that have nuclear weapons promise not to use them against you ever, under any circumstances. They get various kinds of technical assistance to carry out this. And they get paid for their highly enriched uranium. They are compensated. That is a commer-

cial transaction involving no cost to the American taxpayer. So there is no cost.

In terms of the assurances, let me say that President Kravchuk has continued to work on—progress on previous agreements he has made. He has shown, I think, great courage in the last few months in working through this very difficult and complex set of negotiations with us that has involved me, the Vice President, the State Department, and everybody else that's appropriate on our side. And we have no reason to doubt the ability of the President to keep the commitment that he is prepared to make.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, now that you have a deal with Ukraine, what can we anticipate Sunday when you meet with Syrian President Asad? Will there be some sort of dramatic announcement there, as well?

The President. I've already got—you know, we've already bunched too many stories in one day, haven't we? [*Laughter*] I really can't—I can't say any more at this point than you already know about that. We're going to try to keep the Middle East peace process going.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 39th news conference began at 6:42 p.m. at the Conrad Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Vladimir Zhirinovsky, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party in Russia.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Brussels
January 10, 1994

NATO Summit

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

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

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

Bosnia

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

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

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

Aid to Russia

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

The President. Well, what they talked about today was—first of all, we have quite a large plan. We've got to dislodge some of the money that we've committed that was tied up in the international institutions. They all believe that we needed a combination of two things: We

need to try to speed up the privatization, because in the end that was the real guarantor of reform—and Russia has done a phenomenal job of privatizing industries, thousands just in the last year—and secondly, that we needed some sort of social support network, an unemployment system, a retraining system, a system to train people to manage and operate businesses and banks that will enable people to deal with the dislocations that are coming. And that's basically what we talked about.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 p.m. in the Grand Place. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter on Withdrawal of the Nomination of Morton H. Halperin To Be an Assistant Secretary of Defense

January 10, 1994

Dear Mort:

I have received your letter asking that I not resubmit your nomination to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping. With deep appreciation for your willingness to serve our country and with real regret, I accept your request.

Yours is a superb record of service and accomplishment dating back over 30 years. Your qualifications speak for themselves, and I am pleased to hear that your willingness to serve my Administration continues unabated.

At the same time, I appreciate your understanding of the circumstances involved in a new Secretary of Defense coming on board and the tradition of Cabinet officers having the freedom to select subordinates.

I am confident that this Administration will continue to benefit from your talent and counsel and hope that you will be available for other suitable assignments.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: The Office of the Press Secretary also made available Mr. Halperin's letter requesting that his nomination to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping be withdrawn.

Remarks to the American Business Community in Brussels

January 11, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Jim, and good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I got here in time to hear the last several moments of the Secretary of State's remarks and all that stuff where he was bragging on me, and it reminded me of Clinton's fourth law of politics, which is whenever possible be preceded on the platform by someone you've appointed to an important position. [*Laughter*]

Nonetheless, we did have a good day yesterday, the United States did, and I think the Atlantic alliance did. I came here to Europe hoping that together we might begin to realize the full promise of the end of the cold war, recognizing clearly that this is a difficult economic time in Europe, there are still profound difficulties in the United States, and that is having an impact on the politics of Europe and of the United States and of what we might do.

Nonetheless, it seemed to me that the time had come to try to define, here on the verge of the 21st century, what the elements of a new security in Europe and in the United States should be in the aftermath of the cold war, one premised not on the division of Europe but on the possibility of its integration, its political integration around democracies, its economic integration around market economics, and its defense integration around mutual defense cooperation.

Yesterday when the NATO alliance adopted the concept of the Partnership For Peace, we did what I believe history will record as a very important thing. We opened up the possibility of expanded NATO membership to nations to our east, not only all the former Warsaw Pact countries but also other non-NATO members in Europe, all who wish to begin to work on joint planning and operations with us and to work toward being able to assume the full responsibilities of membership. But we did it in a way by opening up the possibility to everyone and making no decisions now. We did it in a way that did not have the United States and NATO prematurely drawing another line in Europe to divide it in a different way but instead gave us a chance to work for the best possible future for Europe, one that includes not only the countries of Eastern Europe but also countries that were part of the former Soviet Union and indeed Russia itself. So we have made, I think, a very good beginning in the right way.

We also are going to have today the first summit with the European Union after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, to begin to talk about what we can do together to rebuild the rate of economic growth and opportunity here and throughout the world.

Our firms, our American firms, are deeply woven into the fabric of Europe's economies. Over 60 percent of all the overseas profits of American companies come from Europe. We have 225 billion American dollars invested here, employing nearly 3 million Western Europeans alone. And back home, trade with Europe generated $120 billion worth of exports and about 2½ million jobs in 1993. We all know—you know better than I—that this continent favors, excuse me, faces high unemployment and very sluggish growth rates. We also see that in Japan. And even though in our country the unemployment rate is coming down, we see in every advanced economy great difficulty today in creating jobs and generating higher incomes even when people are working harder and working smarter.

The renewal of the Atlantic economies is critical to the future of America and, I would argue, critical to the future of our alliance. For in a democracy, as we have seen time and time again in votes at home, in votes in Europe, and in votes in Russia, when people feel that they are anchored and stable and secure, when they believe they will be rewarded for their work, when they believe that the future will be better than the past, they vote in a certain way. When they are in economic and emotional free fall, when they feel disoriented, when they don't know whether the future will be better than the past, they often vote in another way and in ways that, indeed, make their futures even more difficult and life for all peoples more difficult.

When I became President, it seemed to me that my first order of business ought to be to put our own economic house in order. And so we worked hard to reverse the exploding deficits of the last 12 years, to begin to invest in our own people, to try to do it in a way that would keep interest rates low and inflation low and turn the tide of private investment in the United States. We have begun to do that. Last year more new jobs came into our economy than in the previous 4 years. Millions of Americans refinanced their homes and businesses. Consumer confidence at the end of the year rose to its highest level in many years, and people began to believe that they could pay their debts and control their lives. In November, delinquencies on home mortgage payments in America reached a 19-year low. So we are beginning to believe that we have some discipline, some control of our own destiny.

We also had to make a tough decision in America last year as a people, and that is whether we could grow internally or whether we could continue to grow by reaching out to compete and win in a global economy and helping our friends and neighbors to grow. That debate was, I suppose, captured more clearly for the people of our Nation and the people of the world in the congressional debate over NAFTA than in any other thing.

But the issue was bigger and in some ways simpler than that. It seems to me clearly that there is no way in a global economy for a wealthy country to grow wealthier, to generate more jobs, and to raise incomes unless there are more customers for its goods and services and customers beyond its own national borders, and that the United States can ill afford to be in the vanguard of those running away from that idea and instead should be in the vanguard of those promoting it. That's really what the NAFTA vote was all about.

To be sure, those who voted against NAFTA were responding to very legitimate pressures and very real fears, for workers all over the world

believe now that they are too fungible, relatively unimportant to people who control their jobs and their lives, and that in the flash of an eye their jobs and their livelihoods could be taken away by someone who can move money, information across the globe in a millisecond and indeed who can move management and technology across the globe in a short amount of time.

And so it is going to be a continuing challenge for us to keep Americans outward looking, committed to open trade and more open markets and still, at the same time, to make our working people more secure in the sense not that they will be able to hold the job they have, because they won't—the average American will now change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime—but they must know that they are employable, that they will have their basic health care needs and the needs of their families taken care of, and that they will have a chance to make the changes that will dominate at least the foreseeable decades of the 21st century changes that are friendly, not hostile to them. And that is our challenge as we begin the next session of Congress in 1994.

But because of the NAFTA agreement and because of the meeting that we had in Washington State with the leaders of the Asian-Pacific region, there was a new energy given to the prospect of successfully concluding the GATT round. And after 7 years of frustration and progress, we were able to do that. I was not fully satisfied with the round. It was obviously not perfect from any nation's point of view, and there are clearly many things that still have to be done. But there is no doubt in my mind that it was in the interest of the United States to conclude the GATT round successfully, that it will lead to the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs in our Nation alone and millions worldwide by the end of the decade. [*Applause*] One person believed that. [*Laughter*]

And I think now we have to ask ourselves where we go beyond GATT. There are several issues, of course, that we need to take up with our European friends and with others around the globe. And we will take them up.

We also have to deal with the structural challenges facing our economies, the economies of the advanced nations. In March we're going to have a jobs conference in the United States. We have a lot to learn from some European countries about training and retraining of the work force. They have something to learn, perhaps, from us in flexibility of the work force and mobility of the work force and the creation of an entrepreneurial environment that will enable unemployment to be driven down to lower levels. But it is clear that together, along with our friends in Japan, we all have to learn something about how to make technological and other changes that are going on lead not only to higher productivity but the ability of working people to be rewarded for that productivity and the ability of nations to create more employment within their national borders.

Beyond that, let me emphasize that when I leave here today after the European Union summit, I am going on to Prague to meet with the leaders of the Visegrad countries. And it seems to me that it is folly to believe that we can integrate Europe through NATO or just on the basis of affinity for democracies, unless we are also committed to the economic integration of all of Europe and to reaching out to our east.

I will be urging the leaders of the European Union today to work with the United States to further reduce trade barriers and increase trade and investment to our east. Today I say to all of you, I hope that you are representing companies that as a result of the activities taking place in these few days will take another and harder look about your prospects in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond, because without private investment we cannot hope to have private economic development.

Oh, I know we have a lot to do in Russia. I know we have a lot to do in the other states of the former Soviet Union and still some work to do in Eastern Europe. And we are doing that. I am going on to Russia after I leave Prague. But in the end, private investment and the development of successful private sectors will determine the future of European integration economically. And without it, I don't believe we can hope to sustain the military and political ties that we are building up.

So I ask you to do that. The United States Government has worked hard to eliminate outdated export controls and to support American companies in Europe. We hope that in turn you will feel emboldened to make more investments further east and to do what you can to improve our prospects to generate higher levels of trade and investment across national borders in ways that benefit people everywhere. For in

the end, governments do not create wealth, people like you do.

Soon your efforts will be sending goods back and forth through the Chunnel. Your capital already is building bonds of commerce and culture across the Atlantic. You are in many ways the pioneers of the new Europe we are trying to ensure. Just by instinct, you will want the kind of integration that we have to work for around the political conference tables. Your determination to enter new markets is a hallmark of the American spirit and can help make the 21st century an American century as well.

I hope you will do that. I assure you that we will work hard to do our part.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:06 a.m. at the Conrad Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Jim Prouty, president, American Chamber of Commerce.

The President's News Conference in Brussels
January 11, 1994

The President. Good morning. As all of you know, this historic summit meeting of the North Atlantic Council was my first NATO meeting. I'm glad we were able to accomplish as much as we did here. I'm convinced that history will record this meeting as a major step in building a new security for the transatlantic community.

I'm very pleased that our NATO allies approved our proposal for the Partnership For Peace. I believe it will help our alliance to meet Europe's new challenges, and I'm pleased by the response the Partnership has already generated from nations who have contacted us and said they are interested in being a part of it.

Ultimately, the Partnership will lead to the enlargement of NATO and help us to build a security based not on Europe's divisions but on the potential of its integration. I look forward to working with NATO leaders in the coming months to prepare for exercises with the states that join the Partnership and to work on the next steps towards NATO's enlargement.

Today NATO also took dramatic steps to prepare for its new post-cold-war missions by calling for the creation of combined joint task forces. These task forces will make NATO's military structures more flexible and will prepare the alliance for nontraditional missions. They will also help us to put the Partnership For Peace into action by serving as the vehicle for Eastern militaries to operate with NATO forces, something that General Joulwan will begin to prepare for immediately.

I'm pleased that during this summit NATO began to address the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The agreement that the United States will sign with Ukraine and Russia this Friday will also make a major contribution to reducing that threat. With the end of the cold war, we no longer face the threat of confrontation between nuclear powers, but we do face continuing conflicts, including the reality of the murderous conflict in Bosnia. At this meeting we discussed candidly and at some length NATO's policy towards Bosnia. We reaffirmed our commitment to respond to the strangulation of Sarajevo and to help to implement an enforceable peace agreement if one is reached by all the parties.

I want to discuss this with some precision, if I might. The United States last evening in our discussions took a very strong position that we ought to reaffirm our air warning, that is, the possibility of the use of air power to relieve the strangulation or in retaliation for the strangulation of Sarajevo, but that the language ought to be left in our policy if, and only if, we were prepared to follow through. And I made it clear that for our part, we were prepared to follow through, and therefore, we supported leaving the language in. But along with the Secretary General, I urged our allies not to leave it in unless we were prepared to follow through, on the theory that we should not say things that we do not intend to do.

In addition to that, I supported the United Kingdom and France and their call for plans to ensure that we can complete the bloc rotation of troops to Srebrenica, so that that can take place, the exchange of the Canadians for the

Dutch forces, and to explore how Tuzla airstrip might be opened. Now, either of these activities could require the use of NATO, including United States air power. We also have a continuing commitment to and the opportunity to use air power to protect the United Nations troops there if that is needed for close air support.

Now, these are the actions which have been taken. In other words, we have reaffirmed our position of last August, which is an important thing to have done in light of the recent shelling of Sarajevo. We have instructed our military command to come up with plans to see what can be done to ensure the rotation of the troops in Srebrenica and the opening of the Tuzla airstrip. And those plans, as has been said by the Secretary General, can include the use of air power.

Let me just mention one or two other things. While the WEU and other European international bodies would play an important role in meeting the security challenges in Europe in the coming years, I still believe that NATO remains the linchpin of our mutual security. And so, as we finish this summit, I want to say a special word of thanks to Secretary General Woerner for his remarkable leadership. I have had the opportunity now to meet and work with many leaders around the world. He is a genuine statesman. He understands what is at stake here. He has a vision of the future, and he leads this alliance with great vision and discipline. And I thank him for that.

I also want to thank the other NATO leaders for their hospitality and especially the Prime Minister of Belgium and the people of Belgium and Brussels for their hospitality to us. I believe this was a very successful meeting. They had accomplished everything that I hoped, and I think as the years go by we will be glad that it occurred.

Bosnia

Q. Could you please tell us whether or not there was unanimous belief by the NATO allies that these air strikes could go forward, or is there something that still needs to be done before you can actually commit to movement?

The President. There was unanimous—and I want to be very clear on this—there was unanimous support for the policy as it is written. Everybody voted for it. In order to trigger the air strikes, what must happen? I want to emphasize two things. One is, whether they occur or not depends upon the behavior of the Bosnian Serbs from this moment forward. Secondly, based on that behavior, our military personnel will take this issue back to the NAC in our absence, and we will deal with it. And of course, we will consult with the U.N. if it is something that involves the use of air power other than to give support to the U.N. forces as already approved.

So that is what I think—at that point, we'll deal with the facts. Some of us, I think it's clear, were stronger than others about the appropriateness of it under the circumstances that we now know about or could imagine. But I think the accurate thing is there was unanimous support for the policy, which means everybody who voted for it recognized that air power might well be used. What happens now depends upon the behavior of the combatants, principally the Bosnian Serbs, and what the military commanders come back and recommend.

Partnership For Peace and NATO

Q. When you get to Prague, in light of this meeting and in light of your own feelings, will you be in a position to tell at least some of the Visegrad leaders that they are in fact on a fast track toward membership in NATO?

The President. I think I'll be in a position to tell them, number one, the purpose of the Partnership For Peace is to open the possibility of NATO's enlargement as well as to give all the former Warsaw Pact countries and other non-NATO nations in Europe the chance to cooperate with us militarily, that NATO is an alliance with mutual responsibilities as well as the security guarantee. And we are clearly serious about pursuing this, including ultimate membership, as evidenced by the fact that the Secretary General said in his closing remarks—I don't know what he said here in the press conference because I didn't hear it—he said in his closing remarks that General Joulwan would immediately contact the military leaders of these countries, including the Visegrad countries, to talk about how we could begin planning for mutual operations in training and exercise.

So I think that they will clearly understand that this is a very serious proposal that opens the possibility of membership, not one that limits it.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, the Secretary General said in his remarks that the instrument is there regarding Bosnia and other threats, but he's not sure that the will is there. Now, you just mentioned unanimity. It was a unanimous vote, as we understand it, last August for the same policy, yet many attacks have taken place in Sarajevo and have been unanswered by NATO. So first, do you think that there is a greater will now; do you sense a greater determination despite the misgivings of those peacekeepers on the ground? And secondly, is there a lower threshold, do you think, given this language that the British and the French, we understand, proposed on Tuzla and Srebrenica? Is there a lower threshold to use air power in those instances than for the wider air attacks regarding Sarajevo?

The President. I would make two points in response to your question. One is, I don't know that the threshold is lower, but there are more instances in which air power can be used now under the NATO policy. That is, clearly the policy asks our military command to explain how we can guarantee the troop rotation in Srebrenica and how we can open the airstrip at Tuzla, including the use of air power. So there are clearly more opportunities for it.

Secondly, is there still a difference of opinion about whether and how quickly we should use air power, especially to relieve a shelling of Sarajevo? I think on today's facts there are clearly some differences among the allies. And let me just mention one consideration. Those countries that have troops there are understandably concerned about the danger to their troops. If we use air power, are they more likely to be retaliated against? On the other hand, I think they're closer to being willing to use it than they were in August because a lot of them are very sensitive to the fact that their troops seem to be in more danger now than they were in August and that their casualties are increasing.

So do I think we are closer to real unanimity than we were in August? I do. Would they all vote the same in a given-fact situation? I don't know. That's why I think it depends largely on what the Bosnian Serbs do.

Q. Given the fact that there is still some difference of opinion, doesn't this come close to failing your own test from your intervention, that why threaten if you're not going to have the will to——

The President. But I believe, based on what several of them said to me privately, they are more prepared to deal with this than they were in August. That is, Secretary General Woerner and I both said, "Let us not put this language back in unless we mean it. Let us clearly understand that we must mean it if we put it in this time." And they voted unanimously to put it in. And afterward several of them came to me privately and said, "Of course, we have reservations about what happens to our troops, but we have reservations about what happens to our troops under the status quo, and we are prepared to go forward with this."

Q. Concerning Bosnia, can we say today that you and President Mitterrand are on the same wavelength; do you agree, no more bones of contention?

The President. Yes. I've been a little surprised by the press reports that indicate to the contrary. I strongly supported President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Major's amendment adding Tuzla and Srebrenica to the resolution. I did not support substituting Tuzla and Srebrenica for the general commitment to use air power to relieve the siege of Sarajevo, for a very important reason. I think that it will be very hard for the U.N. mission to succeed. That is, keep in mind what the U.N. mission is doing, by the way, folks. We have the longest airlift in history there. We are trying to enforce the embargo. We are trying to enforce the no-fly zone. In other words, we are trying to contain the combat and the loss and trying to keep open humanitarian aid, hoping that we can all do something to convince all three sides that they have a real interest in stopping killing each other and taking whatever agreement they can get now.

Now, I believe if Sarajevo is destroyed and cannot function as a center for all kinds of activities, it will be very difficult for the U.N. mission to succeed. The French and the British have troops on the ground there. They naturally have more reservation about the use of air power in response to the shelling of Sarajevo than nations that may not have troops on the ground there. I understand that. They agreed with my position, and I strongly agreed with theirs. I do not believe there is a difference of opinion between us on this policy now.

Ukraine

Q. The Ukrainian opposition is now saying that President Kravchuk does not have the authority to go ahead and sign an agreement, and there's also some sign from some Ukrainian officials who are saying that the terms of a final agreement are yet to be determined. How sure are you at this point that this deal will not fall apart?

The President. Well, I believe President Kravchuk will honor the deal. They've already started to dismantle the missiles. And I think that the other thing that's very important to emphasize here is that this agreement guarantees compensation for Ukraine for their highly enriched uranium, something they have wanted and demanded. And so I think, as the details of it become known in the Rada, there will be more support for it.

Let me just try to give you an American analogy here, if I might. It's not an exact analogy, but when President Bush signed the original NAFTA treaty—or when we approved the side agreements with the NAFTA, we didn't know at the time whether everybody in Congress would think it was a wonderful idea or ratify it or try to derail it. But we went through with it, and eventually the United States stood firm behind it. Executives often have to sell to their legislative branches what they know is in the national interest of their country.

This agreement reached by President Kravchuk, I think, was reached with the full understanding in his mind that he would have to sell it but that it contained advantages for Ukraine far more than had previously been recognized. And I think, as they know more about the details and the facts, that he will prevail there. And I expect the agreement to stand up, because it's clearly in the interest of the country. They get far more than they give up on this.

Russia

Q. Have you spoken with President Yeltsin about Bosnia, and does he agree with what you describe as a new resolve to deal with it?

The President. No, we have not had this discussion. But last August when all this came up, the Russians knew that what we were doing was taking a position with regard to the use of air power that was clearly tied to behavior by the Bosnian Serbs. And at the time, and I think still, no one considered that the United Nations mission could proceed and could function if Sarajevo were completely destroyed. No one believed that. So I don't believe that anything that happened today, once fully understood—I'm sure we'll have the chance to talk about it in some detail—I don't believe that anything that happened today will undermine the understandings that we have with the Russians.

Thank you very much.

Ukraine

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I don't want to say that. What I'm trying to tell you is that that's why I said it was not an exact analogy. What I'm saying is that any time an executive makes a deal in any country in the world with a legislative branch, there are going to be people in the legislative branch who don't agree with it or who just don't know if they can agree with it until they know what the facts of it are. That's the only point I'm trying to make. I am not making any judgment about how the Ukrainian Government works but simply that this always happens. This shouldn't surprise anybody. This always happens. Every decision any executive makes is going to be second-guessed by people of the legislature. It's almost the way the system's set up.

NOTE: The President's 40th news conference began at 10:50 a.m. in the Joseph Luns Theatre at NATO Headquarters. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. George A. Joulwan, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The President's News Conference With European Union Leaders in Brussels

January 11, 1994

President Clinton. Thank you very much. We have just had a very productive meeting, President Delors and Prime Minister Papandreou and I. As I have said many times in the last few days, I came to Brussels in the hope of working with the leaders of Europe to build a broader and more integrated Europe. At the heart of this new concept of security is the economic vitality of the relationship between the United States and the European Union. The EU remains America's most valued partner in trade and investment. A strong relationship between us is good for America. It can help to generate more jobs, more growth, more opportunities for workers and businesses at home as well as for those here in Europe.

That is one of the reasons that our administration strongly supported the Maastricht Treaty. We believe a strong and more unified Europe makes for a more effective economic and political partner. I think we proved that through our combined efforts to lead the world to a new GATT agreement in December.

One key to achieving that accord came last spring when President Delors agreed to join me in focusing on market access at last year's G–7 summit. I'm committed to deepening our relationship with the EU through regular meetings at all levels to continue to address other concerns as we address the market access concern and as we work together to get a new GATT agreement.

I have argued in my own country that to advance the global economy and to advance the interests of American workers as well, we must compete, not retreat. All advanced economies can only generate more jobs and higher incomes when they have more people beyond their borders to buy their goods and services. Therefore, we must continue our efforts to expand global growth and world markets. The GATT agreement will help in that regard. I am convinced it will create millions of jobs in the global economy between now and the end of the decade. But we also have responsibilities, the United States, the EU, and others, to continue our own efforts toward open trade and more global growth.

In today's meeting, we discussed four ways in which we can build on the momentum generated by the GATT agreement. First, we stressed the need to finalize and ratify the agreement. The agreement itself was an impressive breakthrough, but there are several areas in which we did not reach full agreement. I emphasized today our strong desire to resolve our outstanding differences. We also agreed that further market access offers from Japan and from other countries are also needed to meet the ambitious goals on which we agreed. The U.S. and the EU cannot alone create the open markets the world needs. We think it is clearly time for the other great economic power, Japan, to join us in this effort to open markets.

Second, we agreed on the importance of putting jobs at the center of our trade and economic agenda. Today, the nations of the European Union are facing high and persistent rates of unemployment and sluggish growth. In the United States, we have begun to generate more jobs, but our Nation still has a long way to go before our unemployment is at an acceptable level and before our workers begin to generate more income when they work harder. The renewal of each of our economies will benefit all of them. We discussed some of the innovative ideas contained in the Delors white paper. President Delors and Prime Minister Papandreou both make very thoughtful comments about the kinds of things we could do to generate more job growth both in Europe and the United States. And we look forward to pursuing those ideas at the jobs conference in Washington this spring and again at the G–7 summit this July.

Third, we agreed to explore the next generation of trade issues. I suggested that the successor agenda to the Uruguay round should include issues such as the impact of environmental policies on trade, antitrust and other competition policies, and labor standards, something that I think we must, frankly, address. While we continue to tear down anticompetitive practices and other barriers to trade, we simply have to assure that our economic policies also protect the environment and the well-being of workers. And as we bring others into the orbit of global trade,

people who can benefit from the investment and trading opportunities we offer, we must ensure that their policies benefit the interest of their workers and our common interest in enhancing environmental protection throughout the globe. That is exactly what we tried to do with the North American Free Trade Agreement. And in the coming months I look forward to continuing discussions on these issues with our EU partners.

Finally, we discussed the imperative of helping to integrate the new market democracies of Europe's eastern half into the transatlantic community. Yesterday, NATO took an historic step in this direction with the Partnership For Peace. We must match that effort by helping to ensure that our markets are open to the products of Eastern Europe. Ultimately, the further integration of Europe can be a future source of jobs and prosperity for both the United States and Western Europe as these nations become increasingly productive and, therefore, increasingly able to serve as consumers in the global economy.

We have already begun to open our markets to these new democracies. And I have urged that both the United States and the EU explore additional ways in which we can further open our markets to the nations to our east. Our trade relations are a source of strength, a source of jobs, a source of prosperity.

I look forward to continuing these discussions in the future. We had a lot of very good specific discussions this morning on the jobs issue in particular. And we intend to continue to work together and to make progress together.

Thank you very much.

President Andreas Papandreou. President Clinton, in this very brief presentation, has covered the issues that we discussed today. He has done so in a very complete way, so I will make two or three comments and not more.

To begin with, we have the revitalization of transatlantic relations, relations between Europe, the European Union, and the United States of America. It is very important for President Clinton that European integration, the great objective of a united Europe, is very important.

Now, the other important issue is an opening towards Eastern Europe. The walls separating the East from the West have been dismantled. We do not want any further divisions in Europe. But we should not ignore the dangers that may confront us on this road. Russia is involved in a very difficult economic, political, and social reform. And we would like to contribute in any way we can so that this road will lead to a modern economy, to a peaceful policy, and to a just society. We hope that that will be the final outcome of this process.

Now, the third point which is directly linked to what we have mentioned so far is a Partnership For Peace. We have to work together for peace. This is a great concept. We should consider ways of working together in the area of defense in connection with problems arising due to crises, due to nationalist fanaticism, due to conflicts in Europe or at the periphery. Crisis management is a very important objective. Military cooperation without Eastern European countries being members of NATO but cooperation between them and NATO is not a threat for Russia but rather an invitation to Russia to contribute constructively.

I will not embark on the problem of the European economy. Mr. Delors will speak about this problem. But the truth is that there are three regions in which we have both unemployment and recession: Europe, Japan, and the United States. Now, the United States have started an upswing.

We are faced with a very serious problem in connection with employment, and we will have to live with this problem for many years unless we manage to find a radical solution. It is not the right time to go into the details of these solutions. Now, this is what I wanted to say at the present juncture.

So, President Delors.

President Jacques Delors. Questions immediately, because this is more interesting than what I could add. President Papandreou has spoken on behalf of the Community.

Bosnia

Q. Helen Thomas, UPI, United Press International. Back to NATO, Mr. President. What makes you think that the Serbs will take the threat seriously now since NATO has been the boy crying wolf in the past? And what really has stiffened everybody's spine now after 2 years of shelling, bombing, slaughter?

President Clinton. Well, keep in mind now, the resolution was directed toward a specific set of circumstances. NATO reaffirmed the August position that if Sarajevo was subject to strangulation, defined as large-scale shelling, that air power from NATO could be used as a re-

sponse to that. And then today, there were added two conditions that we asked our military leadership to come up with, plans to ensure that the troop replacement in Srebrenica could proceed and to see whether the airstrip at Tuzla could be opened.

I can only tell you what happened in the meetings. The Secretary General of NATO and I both said that these steps should not be called for unless everyone voting in the affirmative was prepared to see them through. And there was an explicit discussion of that. So I think that the continued deterioration of conditions, the frustration of all of us that no peace agreement has been made, and that explicit debate should give this vote the credibility that I believe it deserves.

The Global Economy

Q. Listening to what you said about growth and jobs and also defense of the environment and social rights, I'm very struck by how similar your language is to the proposals which President Delors recently put to the European heads of government. Would you acknowledge that your thinking on these issues is very largely convergent? And what would you say to some people who responded in this Union by saying now is no time to be unduly concerned about workers' rights or the environment, that this can be no priority when we are tackling mass unemployment? It's a debate we've had here in the Union. I wonder how you would advise people in that respect here.

President Clinton. First of all, I think it is fair to say that President Delors and I share a lot of common ideas. Prime Minister Papandreou and I have shared some ideas. I've read some of his thoughts and interviews. I think any person who seriously studies this issue, who studies income trends in the United States, who studies job trends in Europe, who studies now what is happening in Japan, will reach the conclusion that every wealthy country in the world is having great difficulty creating jobs and raising incomes and that there are some common elements to this malady which have to be addressed.

Now, let me say in response to the two issues you've raised, first of all, with regard to the environment, I believe that dealing with the environment creates jobs, doesn't cost jobs if you do it in the right way. And I think we now have about 20 years of evidence that supports that, that if you have the right sort of sensible environmental policy and if you finance it in the right way, you will create jobs, not cost jobs. Much of the environmental cleanup that is sensible requires the development of technologies and the generation of high-wage jobs which will be virtually exclusively the province of the same countries that are having trouble creating jobs.

With regard to workers' rights, I would respond in two ways. First of all, if in order to create jobs we have to give up all the supports that we have worked hard for over decades for working families, then we may wind up paying the same political price and social price. That is, we do not want to see the collapse of the middle class in Europe or in the United States. What we want to do is to rebuild and strengthen the middle class.

If you look at the vote in Russia, if you look at the recent vote in Poland, you see what happens in democracies when middle class people feel that the future will be worse than the present. So if you're going to ask for changes in the system of support, those changes have to be done in a way that increase the sense of security that middle class, working class families have in all these countries.

Secondly, the issue of worker rights and the issue of the environment should be seen from our prospective as a global one. That is, if you look at what Ambassador Kantor negotiated with Mexico in the NAFTA treaty, the first trade agreement ever to explicitly deal with environmental and labor issues, we did it because we said, okay, if we're going to open our borders and trade more and invest more with developing nations, we want to know that their working people will receive some of the benefits and a fair share of the benefits of this trade and investment. Otherwise, they won't have increasing incomes, and they won't be able to buy our products and services.

So I see this whole worker rights issue as more a function of the global economy and one that will help us to build up ordinary citizens everywhere, which I think should be our ultimate objective.

Bosnia

Q. Terry Hunt, from Associated Press. Mr. President, back on Bosnia, you mentioned that this threat of military action is not a new threat. How long can NATO keep on making these

threats without carrying them out, without delivering? At what point does it become, as you warned about yesterday, an empty threat?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, we have two different issues here. The French and the British proposed the motion to ask our military planners to come up with a strategy to ensure the rotation of troops in Srebrenica and to see whether with the use of air power or some other device we might secure the opening of the airstrip at Tuzla to continue the U.N. mission, the humanitarian mission. So we'll await the plan and see what happens.

On the question of the use of air strikes in retaliation for the strangulation of Sarajevo, that is largely going to be a function of the behavior of the people who have been shelling Sarajevo, the Bosnian Serbs. When you say how long, it depends on what is their behavior. Is the shelling going to abate now, as it did after August when we adopted the resolution? And then it basically escalated dramatically only relatively recently. Or will they continue to do it? And then we'll see if our resolve is there. My resolve is there; that's all I can tell you. And I believe the people in that room knew what they were doing when they voted for this resolution. When you say how long, it depends in part on what will be the conduct from this day forward of those who have been responsible for shelling Sarajevo.

Integration of East and West

Q. I had a question on Partnership For Peace. And I'd be grateful if, Mr. President, you could answer and then perhaps President Delors, too. With hindsight, I wonder whether you don't think you missed a trick by making entry into NATO for the former Communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe work on the same track as entry into the European Union. Would this not have been a more credible approach for Partnership For Peace?

President Clinton. I'll be glad to answer that question, but I think perhaps I should defer to President Delors since he has a much better sense of how the membership track for the European Union works and let him answer the question that you specifically posed, and then I'll also respond. And perhaps Prime Minister Papandreou will respond.

President Delors. Back in 1989, already with the events that took place then, the summit of industrialized nations dealt at length with this question: How, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism, could we make it possible for the countries in question to get back onto the track of pluralist democracy and open economy? And then it seemed to us that immediate entry by the countries in question into the European Union would be more damaging for them than would be a period of preparation and adaptation. We were afraid then that there would be a clash between the strong and the weak, however much aid we could give them. So a period of transition was necessary. It was in the context of the mission that was entrusted to the European Community and to the Commission that we endeavored to help them in order to make it possible for them to progress in parallel along the two tracks that I have indicated today. After 4 years of experience and speaking in my personal name, I am ready to take stock of this aid to which the Community has contributed a lot.

May I recall that in 1989, the European Union only represented 25 percent of the external trade of the countries of Eastern Europe. Now we represent 60 percent. And so we have replaced COMECON, and that was absolutely necessary. We have doubled our imports over 3 years from these countries. We represent 60 percent of total aid, including the aid from the international financial organizations. But we cannot replace them. These countries are responsible countries. They have to learn the workings of an open economy and democracy. Of course, there are claims; in our countries there are also people that are recommending other solutions. But I still think that immediate entry to the European Union would have been very damaging to them, irrespective of what our leaders would have had to explain to our citizens who are taxpayers.

For today, we have to take stock of what's happened, but not do this having in mind the idea that we could substitute for them. They are responsible for the fates. Some of them have chosen the "big bang" approach in order to reform their economies. I deplore this, and I feel that this was one of the reasons for the return of the former Communists and others. Others have taken a more gradualist approach. But each country was different. Czechoslovakia was traditionally an industrial country. Hungary, even out of communism, had begun experiments in decentralization way back in 1970. So we cannot act in their stead. Today, they have to face a

growing problem of security. The Partnership For Peace is there to deal with this, but there is also a need for economic security.

But I'm a pragmatist. I'm open to any solution. But when I hear some leaders within Europe saying that we should have acted otherwise, I remain convinced that we did opt for the right solution. Now, have we always supplied it with the desirable efficacy? That's another question. It remains open. But again, with the commissioners responsible, we shall take stock of all of this.

But we have to be careful. All of the miracle solutions that have been proposed would not have resolved the problems, and anyway, we can see this with German unification. It is not this that in any way has diminished the frustration of the populations concerned or filled the psychological gap or even made it possible to get onto the ideal road towards modernization. There are all sorts of problems. Besides, I'm very respectful of what is happening in Germany. But it is an experience contrary to the other one. You can see what problems remain to be resolved.

President Papandreou. Just a few words, because I think President Delors has stated very clearly our stand. There is a very delicate relationship between deepening of the European Union and enlargement of the Union. They must go together in a careful relationship. Otherwise, the Union itself may not be able to achieve its fundamental goals. So some delays are necessary, both from the point of view of the countries petitioning the entry and also from the Union itself. But I think I've said enough, in view of what President Delors has already said in such detail.

President Clinton. I'd like to go back to your original question. What you asked, I think, was, since there is sort of a phased-in possibility for additional membership in the European Union and a phased-in possibility for membership in NATO, should the criteria and timetables have been reconciled? I think that's the question you're asking.

I can't give you a yes or no, except to say that I think it would have been difficult to do that for a couple of reasons. First of all, NATO and the European Union are fundamentally different organizations. Membership in NATO means that each member has a solemn obligation to defend the security of each other—any other member from attack. And membership in NATO includes a guarantee, therefore, coming from the United States and from Canada, something that is not the same with the European Union.

On the other hand, membership in the European Union now involves a commitment to a level of economic and political integration that some who may want to be a part of NATO may or may not want to commit to. So I think, as a practical matter, it would have been very difficult to reconcile these two timetables since the organizations are different. Some may be more interested in being in the European Union. I can conceive of some countries who want to be in the Union who may not want to be in NATO. Some may wish to be in NATO before they're able to meet the responsibilities of the European Union.

President Delors. I would just like to add one sentence. In my humble opinion, the generation that I belong to and which holds responsibility at present has two obligations, and to reconcile these is not easy. On the one hand, we want to create a political union with the European countries that desire this, because we think that none of our countries is capable of coping with these problems and with world responsibilities. And secondly, given the events that have occurred in the East, we have another obligation which is equally important; that is, to extend our values of peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding to the wider Europe.

Believe me, to combine the two is no easy task. And again, I criticize those who put forth simplistic solutions in this area. Life is difficult. No one can prevent such events being conflictual. A little modesty on the part of those proposing miracle solutions will be necessary.

Greece

Q. Mr. President, Germany recently requested that the famous Article 5 of the NATO Pact should apply for the security for the Czech Republic, not a NATO member, in order to face a threat not been defined yet. Since Greece, a NATO member, according to reports, many of them, is facing a real threat in her northern border from an expected movement of Albanian refugees from Kosovo via Skopje—[*inaudible*]—if the same article could apply on that case, keeping also into account that European Union and Western European Union are not guaranteeing the Greek borders. And I'm taking this opportunity, Mr. President, to ask

you directly if America will be in the position to guarantee the security of Greece from such a threat on a bilateral basis?

President Clinton. Frankly, that's a conversation I think I ought to have with Prime Minister Papandreou before I have it in public, in some ways. But let me respond in two ways. First of all, the United States has taken two strong steps to try to make sure that the dire situation you described does not occur. We have sent 300 troops to be located in Macedonia, or Skopje as the Prime Minister describes it, as a part of a NATO effort or a U.N. effort to contain the conflict in Bosnia.

In addition to that, shortly before I became President but after I was elected President, the previous administration with my strong support sent a very strong and firm warning about involving Kosovo in the conflagration in Bosnia. And we made it very clear that we would have very strong views about that and a strong reaction to it.

So I think the real issue is, are we trying to protect the interests of Greece and other nations from being embroiled in the conflict now in the Balkans? And the answer is yes, and I think we've taken two strong steps to do that. I believe we will be successful in doing that.

NOTE: The President's 41st news conference began at 12:49 p.m. in the News Conference Theatre at the headquarters of the Commission of the European Union, where he met with Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou in his capacity as President, European Council, and Jacques Delors, President, European Commission. The European Presidents' remarks were translated by interpreters.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic in Prague

January 11, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. First, I want to express my thanks to President Havel for his warm welcome. I'm coming back to Prague only for the second time in my life. I was here 24 years ago in this same week, in a very different role in life.

I have been deeply impressed by the progress made by the Czech Republic and was deeply impressed by the meeting I had today with the President and the Prime Minister and with other leaders of the government. I reaffirmed the fact that the security of this Republic and of the nations of Central and Eastern Europe are important to the security of the United States and to Europe and to the Atlantic alliance, that the Partnership For Peace is the beginning of a genuine security relationship which can lead to full membership in NATO, and that we must also be mindful of the economic dimension of security. For it is difficult for nations to pursue good policies and to reflect democratic values unless they can also offer the hope of success to the people within their borders who work hard, obey the law, and try to contribute to the welfare of society.

So we talked about these things, and I look forward to talking tomorrow with all the leaders, who will be here together, in perhaps somewhat more specific terms about what we can do to further both these objectives. But I am very encouraged by this meeting tonight, and I thank President Havel for his support for the Partnership For Peace.

Partnership For Peace and NATO

[*At this point, a question was asked in Czech, and a translation was not provided.*]

The President. That issue has not been resolved, so since it was not discussed one way or the other, I suppose it is theoretically possible. NATO is a security alliance in which all the members undertake to assume certain responsibilities for the welfare of the entire group. One of the things I want to emphasize about the Partnership For Peace is a security relationship that will permit immediately the military commanders of NATO to begin to work with the military leaders of each country involved in the Partnership, to look at joint training, to look at joint exercises, to deal with the whole

range of issues which will help to move toward membership.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:50 p.m. in the First Courtyard at Prague Castle. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Appointment for Director of Presidential Personnel

January 11, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of J. Veronica Biggins to be Director of Presidential Personnel.

"I am very pleased that Veronica Biggins, a highly regarded executive and recognized leader of both her corporation and her community, will be joining our team," the President said.

"Her experience in human resources management, community relations, and business, as well as her commitment to improving the lives of all Americans, will enable her to make a significant contribution to this administration."

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

Nomination for the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy

January 11, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Lewis Manilow, Charles H. Dolan, Jr., and Harold C. Pachios as members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. Upon Mr. Manilow's confirmation by the Senate, the President intends to designate him Commission Chair.

"The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy plays an important role in directing the USIA as it works to promote democracy abroad," the President said. "I am pleased to announce the addition of these three accomplished professionals to our team."

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

Nomination for the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada

January 11, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Thomas L. Baldini and Susan B. Bayh as members of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada. Upon Mr. Baldini's confirmation by the Senate, the President intends to designate him Chair.

"I am pleased today to name these two hardworking individuals to the International Joint Commission," the President said.

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

Exchange With Reporters Prior To Discussions With President Michal Kovac of the Slovak Republic in Prague
January 12, 1994

Partnership For Peace

Q. President Clinton, what's been the reception so far to what you have brought to these nations?

The President. So far, so good.

Q. No objections, sir?

The President. We've had three different conversations, of course, and this will be the fourth. And each of them—although leaders can characterize them for themselves—but I have been very pleased so far.

Q. Have they raised security issues with you, that they are worried that if there should be some kind of resurgence in Russia that they feel protected, or are they still worried about this?

The President. No one has said that they expect something like that in the near future. What no one knows is whether the future of Europe will be like its past or if it will be different.

Q. Are you saying that all have accepted the Partnership so far?

The President. You'll have to ask them when we do the press conference.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:06 a.m. in the library at the U.S. Ambassador's Residence. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Visegrad Leaders in Prague
January 12, 1994

President Clinton. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the very beautiful American Embassy.

I have just finished a very productive and enjoyable working lunch with the leaders of the Visegrad states: President Vaclav Havel and Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic; President Arpad Goncz and Prime Minister Peter Boross of Hungary; President Lech Walesa and Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak of Poland; and President Michal Kovac and Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar of Slovakia.

I want to at the outset stress my appreciation to President Havel, Premier Klaus, and the Czech people for their hospitality and contributions to our meeting, and I thank again all the Visegrad leaders for joining here today.

This region, where the great democratic rebirth of Europe began 5 years ago, holds a special place in my own affections. I first came to this city 24 years ago this week. And two of my senior national security advisers were born in this region: the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, who spent most of his early years in Poland, was born there; and my U.N. Ambassador, Madeleine Albright, who was born here in Prague. I told President Havel yesterday that the Czech Republic is the only nation in the world that has two Ambassadors in the United Nations.

I have come to Europe to help build a new security for the transatlantic community for the 21st century. During the cold war the security of the Western alliance was defined by the division of Europe. Our new security must be defined by Europe's integration, the integration of a broader Europe based on military cooperation, robust democracies, and market economies. That was my message in Brussels, where I met with our NATO and European Community allies. And it will be my message as I travel to Moscow.

I am mindful of an old Polish saying, which I have, I hope, learned to pronounce properly: *Nic o nas bez nas*, nothing about us without us. And so I have come to this region to share my thoughts directly with your leaders and your people. I believe the United States must make clear to all of you first that we are committed to helping you continue your work of reform

and renewal in peace. That commitment derives from more than our shared values and our admiration for your efforts. It also derives from our own security concerns. Let me be absolutely clear: The security of your states is important to the security of the United States.

At today's lunch I discussed three ways in which my nation is prepared to advance Europe's democratic integration by supporting your region's continued renewal and security. First, we discussed the Partnership For Peace, the American proposal NATO has just adopted. The Partnership invites all former Warsaw Pact and former Soviet states plus other non-NATO members in Europe to join in military cooperation with NATO in training exercise and operations jointly.

While the Partnership is not NATO membership, neither is it a permanent holding room. It changes the entire NATO dialog so that now the question is no longer whether NATO will take on new members but when and how. It leaves the door open to the best possible outcome for our region, democracy, markets, and security all across a broader Europe, while providing time and preparation to deal with a lesser outcome.

Second, we discussed ways in which the United States can help to solidify your democratic and market reforms. I stressed that I have ordered our programs to give greater emphasis to helping this region tend to reform's impacts on your workers and your communities. I talked about the ways we are working to expand trade and investment between your region, the rest of Europe, and the United States. I also discussed the steps we are taking to help the Visegrad region and other parts of Central and Eastern Europe bolster their new democracies.

We're supporting the development of a thriving civil society. And in our meeting I announced the creation of the democracy network, an initiative to bring new resources to grassroots and independent groups throughout the region. I stressed our interest in fostering regional cooperation among your countries, practical things that can advance your integration into a broader Europe.

Finally, I salute all those leaders here in Prague today who have worked to build practical regional cooperation and consensus in Central Europe at this pivotal moment in history. I congratulate them on having this regional meeting. And I suggested several ways we can help to support regional integration, including support for regional infrastructure projects like highways and communications networks and air traffic systems.

I have greatly enjoyed my discussions today here. I assure you I will follow up on them. The United States will have a special conference this year on trade and investment in the countries represented here on what we can do to increase American investment and to increase the purchase of the products made by the people who are working hard in all of these thriving democracies.

I come away convinced that together we can place Central and Eastern Europe at the heart of a new Europe, an integrated Europe, democratic, prosperous, secure, and free. That is my commitment; I believe it is our joint commitment.

Thank you very much, and I'd like now to turn the microphone over to President Havel.

President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic. Distinguished President, ladies and gentlemen, we are living in a time of a dramatic searching for a new order, an order in which no one would be subjugated or endangered and which would make it possible for all European peoples and states to live in an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation.

Our today's meeting in Prague bears witness to the great importance which the United States and the North Atlantic alliance attach to stability, security, and peace in Central Europe, in relation to peace in all of Europe as well as to the security of the United States.

We welcome the Partnership For Peace project as a good point of departure in NATO's quest for a new identity of the alliance as a true stabilizing core of European security. We appreciate that it allows individual approaches from the various countries. At the same time, however, it depends on how energetically and how quickly the different countries will move to instill in Partnership For Peace contents meeting their interests and their possibilities. For our part, we want to do everything in our power in order that our partnership results in our full membership in the alliance. As we do not regard Partnership For Peace as a substitute for that but rather as a first step toward NATO, the reason why we want to join the alliance is that we share the values of civilization which it protects and that we want to take part in protecting them.

We realize that it is neither possible nor desirable to isolate Russia. However, we are independent states, and we decide ourselves about our affiliations and our policies.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we agreed to in our conversations with the representatives of the Central European nations that are represented at this meeting in Prague, our countries have very similar views on this subject. This is certainly a gratifying circumstance, and it is to the benefit of us all.

Let me therefore conclude by expressing my firm conviction that this meeting has become an important landmark on the road toward a new democratic and truly peaceful Europe, sharing firm and natural ties with the North American Continent. At one time, the city of Yalta went down in history as a symbol of the division of Europe. I would be happy if today the city of Prague emerged as a symbol of Europe's standing in alliance.

Thank you.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, there are nationalists in Russia who look at these four countries and other nations that were under the grip of Moscow, and they dream of rebuilding the Soviet empire. What will you tell Russian President Boris Yeltsin about the security needs of these countries and how far it should go in guaranteeing their territorial integrity and their borders?

President Clinton. First of all, I would say that based on their past statements, he's right, and they're wrong. That is, I think that the Russian position, the position of the present administration there, that they will respect the territorial boundaries of their neighbors is the proper position.

You know, each nation at critical periods has to imagine again what its future is going to be, and it has to define itself—how it will define itself as a nation and how it will define a standard of greatness. The United States, in very different ways, is going through such a period today. And Russia must do that.

In the 21st century can anyone seriously believe that we will define greatness by whether one country can physically occupy another, since we all know that wealth and opportunity will be determined by things other than physical possession of land mass? I don't think so.

And my urgent task will be to try to continue to press the path of democracy and reform and America's support for it in Russia. They are a great people with a great history and a great future. But the future must be different from the past, and the way greatness is defined must be different. And that, I think, is a struggle plainly going on there now that will play itself out over the next few years. And I'm hoping and will be working for the best possible impact.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Security of Visegrad States

Q. Mr. President, it's obvious that the leaders have accepted something short of what they really wanted. And in a way they're being treated as second cousins. They really wanted security guarantees, and you and all the NATO allies have told them that that's not in the package. In view of——

President Clinton. Let me just—I disagree that they're being treated as second cousins. This is something NATO has never done before. We will have people out in the next few days talking about how we're going to begin all kinds of joint security operations. To say that 16 nations of NATO made a mistake not to immediately issue security guarantees to some nations of Europe and not others, without knowing in any way, shape, or form whether the reciprocal obligations of NATO could be met by new members, I think is an unfair characterization of the NATO alliance.

Q. My question is, in view of the lessons of World War II, is it conceivable if any of these nations were invaded or aggressed against that NATO would not come to their help?

President Clinton. I think it is doubtful; that's right. I think our reading of history is right. But frankly, I think none of us believe that—I can't speak for the other Presidents except based on our conversations—that that is imminent. I think—what I was impressed by from these leaders is that they very much want to be a part of Europe, of the Western alliance in an economic and social and political as well as a military way and that the broad definition of security is in that.

Of course, there are always concerns that in the future, the darker past might be recreated, that there could be an expansionism again. But what we need to do is—again, what I'm trying to do is to reach out and enhance the security of these nations in ways that also permit other nations to enhance their security and partnership

with us and that does not now draw a new line of division across Europe. Maybe there will be a new line drawn some day, and if so, we want to do what we can to support the security of these nations. But we hope that we are giving Europe the possibility for the best possible future.

Mr. Blitzer [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network] I think had a question for President Walesa, and then I'd like a question from the foreign press next. But Wolf, go ahead.

Poland

Q. President Walesa, I'm sorry I can't ask you this question in Polish. But Poland seems to be the least enthusiastic among the Visegrad countries for the Partnership For Peace proposals. Is that accurate? And can you describe exactly how you feel about this proposal and whether Poland will seek membership in the Partnership For Peace proposal?

President Lech Walesa of Poland. I can answer in two words: Sometimes small is beautiful. And we do believe that this is a step in the right direction. It's been decided by the powers of the world, and we shall try to make good use of this.

Prague Visit

Q. What about your next part of your unofficial program in Prague with President Havel? Did public radio give you a tape of your saxophone concert? It was excellent. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. I think the best part of my unofficial time in Prague was becoming reacquainted with the city, walking across the bridge again after 24 years and seeing the family I stayed with 24 years ago and just meeting the people. I was very pleased by the large number of people who came out yesterday to see me and say hello. And seeing the changes here, it was very rewarding, and it stiffened my determination to continue to support these kinds of changes.

Now, I had a lot of fun playing the saxophone. And the President gave me a saxophone, you know, with his name inscribed on it, so it's a gift I will always treasure. The nice thing about the little music we played last night was that the Czech musicians with whom I played were so good that they covered up all my shortcomings.

Is there another question from the foreign press?

Bosnia

Q. What is the next American step in the Bosnia war?

President Clinton. Well, the next thing that we are doing now is what we are doing with NATO. NATO adopted a new resolution and our military commanders in Europe now are looking into the instruction they got from the NATO commanders, which is to examine what plans can be developed to ensure the rotation of the troops at Srebrenica and to ensure that the airstrip at Tuzla is open.

Now, in addition to that, I have been actively consulting with all the people with whom I have met. I have asked all the leaders here what further steps that they thought ought to be taken. Everyone recognizes that the peace prospects have been diminished now because, for the first time in a good while, all three parties seem to believe they have something to gain by fighting. And as long as that circumstance continues, it's going to be difficult for us to convince them through a political process to stop. But there are some ideas floating around, and I'm going to solicit some more.

Yes, sir, go ahead. Well, I'll take two more. Go ahead—three more.

Ukraine

Q. Mr. President, already there are voices in Ukraine's Parliament suggesting that President Kravchuk went beyond his authority in negotiating the agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. And even a Foreign Ministry spokesman there today said there may not be an agreement ready for you and President Yeltsin and President Kravchuk to sign in Moscow on Friday. Is that your understanding, and is this causing concern about this agreement that you reached this week?

President Clinton. Well, let's see what happens in Kiev. I think, you know, we have to let President Kravchuk make his own judgments about what he can and cannot do with his government. I expect that we will have an agreement, and I expect that it will be honored. And I think, frankly, the more the people in the Ukrainian Parliament know about it, the better they will feel about it. I think as the details get out, they'll feel better about it.

Yes, I'll take you, too. Go ahead.

Q. There appears to be some difference of opinion even within your own staff about Presi-

dent Kravchuk's ability to order these changes, whether he can do it by executive order, whether the Rada or Parliament has to vote on it. What is your understanding of that, sir?

President Clinton. We'll talk about it in Kiev and beyond. Let's watch it unfold and see.

We've got to go.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, I had planned to ask the question that Mark [Mark Knoller, CBS Radio] asked. But let me ask you, the reformers in Russia seem to have had trouble building coalitions to offset the rise of the nationalist forces. What kind of advice will you be giving Mr. Yeltsin and other reform leaders about how to go about offsetting the threat of Mr. Zhirinovsky?

President Clinton. Well, I think first of all, perhaps in the last election they learned a good lesson, which is that the forces of reform need to find ways to work together and to speak if not with one voice, at least with a common message.

I expect there to be some rough spots along the way. I mean, after all, this is a rather new experience for them, and they'll have to figure out exactly how the forces are going to be organized within the new Parliament, and then they'll have to work out their relationship with the President. But even those of us that have been at it for 200 years still have difficulties from time to time. But I'm looking forward to meeting with a number of those leaders in the reform effort and getting to know them and getting some feel for where they are and where they're going. But I'm still basically quite hopeful.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 42d news conference began at 1:55 p.m. at the U.S. Ambassador's residence. The Visegrad leaders spoke in their native languages, and their remarks were translated by interpreters.

The President's News Conference With President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine in Kiev

January 12, 1994

President Kravchuk. Ladies and gentlemen, let me open this news conference and give the word to the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton.

President Clinton. Thank you very much. I have just completed my first meeting with President Kravchuk, and I am delighted that we have met under such promising and historic circumstances. I was also delighted to be able to wish the President a happy 60th birthday on this auspicious occasion.

President Kravchuk, President Yeltsin, and I are ready to sign on Friday an agreement committing Ukraine to eliminate 176 intercontinental ballistic missiles and some 1,500 nuclear warheads targeted at the United States. This breakthrough will enhance the security of Ukraine, the United States, Russia, and the entire world.

Ukraine is a nation with a rich heritage, enormous economic potential, and a very important position in European security. The ties between our two nations have deep roots. From America's birth to the present day, Ukrainian immigrants have helped to shape my nation's history.

Our meeting this evening begins a new era in our relations. The agreement President Kravchuk and I will sign with President Yeltsin opens the door to new forms of economic, political, and security cooperation. Our meeting tonight centered on three important issues.

First, we discussed the strategic importance, for this region and the world, of the nuclear agreement. I commend President Kravchuk for his courage and his vision in negotiating this agreement.

Second, I was able to issue a personal invitation to Ukraine to participate fully in the Partnership For Peace launched at this week's NATO summit. By providing for specific and practical cooperation between NATO and Ukrainian states and their forces, this Partnership can foster an integration of a broader Europe and increase the security of all nations.

I'm very pleased by the expression of interest in participating that came from President Kravchuk and his Government today.

Third, President Kravchuk and I agreed today to expand and enhance the economic ties between our nations. This is a difficult time of transition for Ukraine, but Ukraine is blessed with abundant natural resources and human talent. Because so many of its neighbors are moving toward market economies and democracy as well, I believe Ukraine's most promising future lies with reform and with integration with those burgeoning economies.

To assist in the reform effort, I am today announcing the establishment of an enterprise fund for Ukraine, as well as Belarus and Moldova, a fund which will help to capitalize new small businesses and provide assistance to existing firms that seek to privatize.

Over the last year, the United States has also provided $155 million in assistance to Ukraine. We are prepared to increase our support substantially as Ukraine moves toward economic reform. Under such circumstances, I also believe the international community would be able to provide significant support and investment to Ukraine, and I am prepared to work hard to see that that support and investment comes to pass.

To begin this work, we will be pleased to welcome to Washington later this month a senior Ukrainian economic delegation. I believe that Ukraine can play a major role in the future of Europe, a Europe whose security is not based on divisions but on the possibility of integration based on democracy, market economics, and mutual respect for the existing borders of nations.

I'm looking forward to seeing President Kravchuk in Moscow on Friday and to welcoming him to Washington for an official visit in March. I want to thank the people of Ukraine for having me here and treating me so warmly, if only briefly. And I would like to close by asking the President permission to come back and actually see the beautiful city of Kiev at some other time. I have sampled its wonderful food, and I'm now ready for the sights.

Thank you very much.

President Kravchuk. Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to greet the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, and his accompanying persons in Ukraine. I'm sorry that this visit is quite short, but I hope and I'm confident that Mr. President will be able to visit Ukraine once again, so to say, in a full-scale and will be able to show him the Ukraine as it is. And I invite you, Mr. President, to visit Ukraine whenever it is convenient for you.

This is a short visit, a few hours only, but to my mind it is worth several days of negotiations if it's taken into consideration the wide range of issues which have been discussed. And we would be glad to inform the world that those problems were worth its attention.

I think the most urgent problem and the most important problem for the whole world now is the problem of nuclear weapons. And we have approached its solution. And I'm sure that this day and the forthcoming days open the way for the world for disarmament and for the elimination of nuclear weapons. And Ukraine will be committed to its obligations, and Ukraine will be the state which will not stand in the way to disarmament.

A lot of time was devoted to discussing the bilateral relations between the Ukraine and the United States. And I'm glad that the President of the United States and the United States support our country in this time of our hardships. And I'm sure that this sort of cooperation and support is real support of all independent states which have emerged on the basis of the former Soviet Union.

I'm sure that the charter for cooperation and friendship between our states, which is now being finished up by our experts, will be a new stage in the development of our relations. For us, it is very important that there is an understanding from the part of the President of the United States of urgency of the support to Ukraine in carrying out its economic reform and support its reforming processes. I am happy that the President of the United States will support our country in such international financial structures as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, European Bank for the Reconstruction and Development.

We understand that we have to be decisive in carrying out reforms, and we are ready for that. And we are happy with the development of our trade relations and that new prospects are opening up.

We support the initiative of the United States, its program which is called the Partnership For Peace, which we consider to be the universal formula which enables the participation of all countries. We understand that this program does

not solve all the problems of security, but anyhow, it gives the possibility of all states to participate.

I'd like to greet once again Mr. President here in the Ukraine, and I would like to point out that in all issues we have discussed we have found joint, common viewpoints. This meeting was short, but it was very important and fruitful and it opened a new stage in the development of Ukrainian-American relations, which I am confident will be long-term and reliable.

Thank you for your attention.

If you don't mind, Mr. President, I'll have the office now of the press secretary. [*Laughter*] I give the possibility to ask questions of our guests, American journalists.

Denuclearization Agreement

Q. Wolf Blitzer, of CNN. What exactly must your Parliament now do to ratify this agreement? And exactly how long will it take for Ukraine to become a nonnuclear nation?

President Kravchuk. You know, the philosophers say that everything changes in the world, even you cannot step in the same river twice. So I hope that our Parliament becomes cleverer in the course of its life and it sees the reality of the present days, and it will understand the essence of these relations and the wish of the three states. And when they will understand it, they will support the implementation of these agreements.

Q. Ukraine sympathizes with you and your wife, Hillary, but anyhow, there's a question here. There is a decision of the Parliament, the Ukrainian Parliament, on disarmament. According to mass media, you told that there will be a financial technological assistance. But your words were that you will render technical assistance. Is that true?

President Clinton. Well, I will attempt to answer the question as I understand it. First of all, Ukraine is already due some compensation for the tactical nuclear weapons it has already dismantled. And I have discussed with the President the quickest way of reaching an agreement on how much is due and how it can be delivered.

Secondly, under the so-called Nunn-Lugar bill, Ukraine is entitled to a substantial amount of money to help to dismantle the offensive strategic nuclear weapons, which can be used for not only dismantling the weapons but for some of the defense conversion needs of Ukraine as well.

But over and above that, the United States is committed to rendering economic assistance to Ukraine to help start new enterprises, to help fund privatization, and to help make this painful transition to a new economy. And we are further committed to helping convince other nations and the international financial institutions to help as well.

Finally, as part of our agreement, of course, Ukraine will be compensated for the highly enriched uranium that is a part of nuclear weapons. And that is a strictly commercial arrangement because that uranium can be turned into fuel rods for commercial purposes and electric power plants.

Whitewater Development Corp.

Q. Thank you, and happy birthday, President Kravchuk. President Clinton, as President of the United States you do not have the luxury at home to ignore events overseas, and perhaps the reverse is true. Former President Carter was one today who came out and suggested the time had come for an independent counsel to take a look at the Morgan Guaranty savings and loan situation. He and many other Democrats are looking to you for an indication of whether that's appropriate. Is it?

President Clinton. I have nothing to say about that on this trip except that most of them have been denied the facts that are already in the public record before they made their comment, largely as a result of the way this thing has been discussed. But I have nothing else to say about that.

President Kravchuk. Thank you for your greetings, and I'd like to note that there is a gentleman sitting over here who mentioned the wife of Mr. President, Hillary. So once again, I would like to give the words to a woman. And I hope I'll receive another portion of greetings.

Denuclearization Agreement

Q. Sometimes there are financial programs, but they lack implementors. Where's the guarantee that these programs will be implemented?

President Kravchuk. If this is a question to me, I would answer that the guarantees are inside the Ukraine, the way we work, the way they will have the attitude to us. So these are the guarantees.

President Clinton. If I might add just one point. Sometimes in discussions with nations, financial guarantees do not materialize because they are dependent on decisions made by other parties, usually the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund. In this case, every part of our agreement depends only upon the three Presidents and their Governments to keep their word. The first thing I said to President Kravchuk tonight is that I would do everything I could to make sure that all three of us did exactly what was in the agreement. And I am confident that we will.

President Kravchuk. I'm sorry, as a press secretary I would ask for some more questions, but here is a protocol, so the last question, please.

Russia and NATO

Q. Mr. President, Mr. President Clinton, you mentioned the PFP, the Partnership For Peace. And there are some people who say that Russia has been using a type of passive imperialism in order to keep countries of Eastern Europe and Central Europe out of NATO for the time being. Do you—by threatening destabilization. Do you agree with that? And I would be very interested in what President Kravchuk has to say.

President Clinton. No, I don't. The short answer to the question is, I do not agree with that, although President Yeltsin himself has expressed reservations about NATO membership for other countries if Russia is excluded. You know, he has expressed an interest in being a member himself.

The leaders of NATO concluded that they should not offer membership at this time to any country because they weren't sure any country was ready to assume the responsibilities of membership and because they didn't want to exclude anyone else.

The Partnership For Peace offers a genuine concrete military security cooperation, joint planning, joint training, joint operations to all the states of the former Soviet Union and to all of the members of what was the Warsaw Pact. And we are genuinely interested in reaching out to all these nations.

I can assure you that no one has a veto over NATO membership. It is anticipated that the Partnership For Peace will lead to NATO membership for many of those who participate in the Partnership who want to go through and assume the responsibilities of membership, ultimately.

That's how I see it. President Yeltsin only said that he didn't, at this time, want another line drawn across Europe. He wanted to have a chance to be part of an integrated European security network in which every nation would have to respect the territorial boundaries of every other state.

President Kravchuk. Mr. President Clinton, and I'll give one more question to the Ukrainian side.

Denuclearization Agreement

Q. The question to President Clinton: What assurances of security will the United States give and Russia give to Ukraine after it will have the nonnuclear status?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, what goes with the Non-Proliferation Treaty adherence is the absolute security that no one who has nuclear weapons will ever use them against any nation that is part of the NPT. That is the first security.

But let me make two other points, which I think are more important, at least as a practical matter, to Ukraine's security. Number one, the Partnership For Peace gives Ukraine the opportunity to work with the military forces of the United States and all of NATO in planning and working together and in establishing patterns of conduct which clearly will increase the security of this nation.

Second, and perhaps even more important, Ukraine's decision to become a nonnuclear state opens the possibility of receiving significant economic assistance, not just from the United States but from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the G–7 nations, and other nations who understand the greatness of this nation, its strategic importance and its economic potential. And I believe that in the 21st century, it will be difficult for any nation to be secure unless it is economically strong.

So perhaps that is the most important thing of all, the whole range of possibilities that are now open to Ukraine because of this courageous decision by the President.

President Kravchuk. Ladies and gentlemen, we would compensate what we haven't time to do, when we'll be implementing our program. And you will be compensated with an objective description of the role and the processes in

Ukraine. And now the best thing for us to do is to wish Mr. President Clinton bon voyage.

President Clinton. Let me say this in closing: If he did not have such a very important job, I would invite President Kravchuk to the United States to run my press conferences. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President's 43d news conference began at 9:50 p.m. at Boryspil Airport. President Kravchuk spoke in Ukrainian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks at a Welcoming Ceremony in Moscow, Russia
January 13, 1994

Thank you. Well, Mr. President, I am delighted to see you again and deeply honored to be in this magnificent hall which is a great testimony to the rich history, the leadership, and the greatness of your nation, the greatness that has been demonstrated again by the remarkable changes over which you have presided in the last 2 years.

I have just come from a set of historic meetings that we'll have a chance to talk about, meetings which make it clear that Russia and the United States must work together to build a new future for Europe on which a new future for our entire world depends.

I believe that together we can work to lead a new security for Europe based on democratic values, free economies, the respect for nations for one another. We will be discussing the specific things we can do to keep the economic reform going in Russia and to help the Russian people to realize the benefits of the courageous changes that have been going on; to use the Partnership For Peace to develop mutual security all across Europe and for the first time in all of history to have a Europe that is not divided by an artificial line between peoples; and to work toward the historic agreement that you and I will sign with President Kravchuk on Friday to make the world a safer place with fewer nuclear weapons.

These are the ways in which, under your leadership, your nation is defining its greatness. And I am very pleased to be here to work on these things with you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:16 a.m. in St. George's Hall at the Kremlin.

Nomination for Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs Director
January 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Shirley J. Wilcher as Director of the Labor Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP).

"Throughout her career, Shirley Wilcher has dedicated her efforts to preventing discrimination in America's workplace and educational institutions," the President said. "I am pleased she has agreed to accept this important position."

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

Nomination for Department of Education Regional Posts
January 13, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Regional and Deputy Regional Representatives for the U.S. Department of Education in San Francisco, Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, and Kansas City.

"I am pleased to name these hardworking individuals to serve as Regional and Deputy Regional Representatives for the Department of Education," said the President. "Each has demonstrated their commitment to improving education and will serve our country's schools and students well."

NOTE: Biographies of the following nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary: Janet L. Paschal, Deputy Regional Representative, Region I; Stan Williams, Regional Representative, Region IV; Judy W. Harwood, Deputy Regional Representative, Region IV; Stephanie J. Jones, Regional Representative, Region V; Sandra V. Walker, Regional Representative, Region VIII; and Loni Hancock, Regional Representative, Region IX.

Nomination for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce
January 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate William W. Ginsberg as Assistant Secretary for Economic Development at the Department of Commerce.

"William Ginsberg's experience and commitment to economic development will serve him well in this new post. I am pleased to name him to our team," the President said.

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

Remarks at a Reception in Moscow
January 13, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to begin by thanking Ambassador and Mrs. Pickering for having us here tonight and for giving us all a chance to meet and to visit in what I imagine is an extraordinary and unprecedented gathering not only of Americans but of Russians who come from different political perspectives. I am told that 60 years ago at a Christmas Eve party here, three trained seals went crazy in the ballroom. Now, in the United States, when people from different political parties get together, they sometimes behave the same way. [*Laughter*] So I'm glad to see you all getting along so well tonight.

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

Over the years, over the centuries, the Russian people have shown their greatness in many ways: in culture, on the battlefield, in govern-

ment, in space. And now on the brink of the 21st century, this great nation is being called upon to redefine its greatness again in terms that will enable your nation to be strong and vital and alive for hundreds of years into the future.

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:28 p.m. at Spaso House.

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

January 14, 1994

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

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

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

President Clinton. Well, of course, in the end this is a question that Ukraine has to answer for itself, but I can only tell you what my opinion is. My opinion is that Ukraine will increase its authority among nations for doing this. After all, Ukraine has enhanced the security of the

United States today by agreeing to remove 1,500 nuclear warheads aimed at our Nation. Ukraine has enhanced the security of Ukraine and Russia by agreeing to dismantle these warheads, which means that there is less chance of nuclear accident, nuclear espionage, nuclear terrorism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

January 14, 1994

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

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

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

During the free democratic elections, the Russians approved the new constitution, and for the first time, with no coercion, they elected their own Parliament. I don't agree with those who believe that the first pancake did not turn out right. If you take a better look at individual

names and popular slogans, you will see that the people chose a better way of life, legality and predictability.

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

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

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

Specifically, along with the Tokyo package and the Clinton package and Vancouver, the most tangible support for Russia would be the opening of the American market for our exports, whether raw materials or equipment. And I'm very much satisfied that today we finally, after 2 years of discussions, we signed an agreement on uranium. All the cold war restrictions should be lifted, like the Jackson-Vanik amendment. We need to remove purist barriers that were put up under the excuse of Russian dumping crisis. As regards uranium, I think it is rather a fear of competition with more advanced technologies and cheaper materials.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Clinton.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

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

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

The President gave me strong assurances of his intention to continue the reform process. He and I discussed a number of ways in which the United States and the international community can assist in the promotion of reform and at the same time assist Russia in cushioning the social hardships which reform has brought to many Russians.

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

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

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

We took several historic steps to ensure that the fear of nuclear confrontation will remain a relic of the past. As you know, Presidents Yeltsin and Kravchuk and I signed an agreement that commits Ukraine to eliminate over 1,500 nuclear warheads. All the most modern and

deadly missiles in Ukraine, the SS–24's, will have their warheads removed within 10 months. Second, President Yeltsin and I agreed that as of May 30th, the nuclear missiles of Russia and the United States will no longer be targeted against any country. And third, we signed an agreement to work closely together in regions where proliferation risks are greatest, including the Korean Peninsula and the Middle East.

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

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

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

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

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

President Yeltsin. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Russian Reform

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

President Yeltsin. I believe that we have very stable and steady relations with the United States that are well checked and based on partnership. But of course, some adjustments will be made, especially with respect to the social sphere. We believe that in contrast with the Vancouver meeting, we will not count on humanitarian aid and direct social aid. This is our business to attend to.

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

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

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

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

economy into the global economic system based on markets is a very sound thing.

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

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

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

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

Denuclearization Agreement

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

President Yeltsin. Our expectations came perfectly true, promptly. We've signed an agreement with Ukraine to eliminate all of Ukraine's nuclear weapons. Their nuclear weapons will be shipped to Russia for destruction. And of course, with respect to uranium, we need to provide some compensation. Instead of weapons-grade uranium, we need to provide them with fuel-grade uranium. And we are in agreement.

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

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

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

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

Russian Reform

Q. A question for both Presidents. President Yeltsin, you have made a commitment today and President Clinton has agreed and has urged you to continue the commitment to the economic reforms. It will take a while, though, to create

the institutions that can cushion the effects. The recent elections have shown that only 15 percent of the people elected support that policy. How can that be sustained politically given the opposition you're going to face in the Parliament?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Russian Parliament

Q. Given the composition of the new Parliament in Russia, do you believe that you will have some problem having the Parliament to ratify our agreement with some Western partners—maybe foreign policies will get tougher as approved by the Parliament? Do you believe that you as the President of this country are in some difficulty in dealing with your foreign partners?

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

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

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

President Clinton. Well, those who are in the Parliament are, after all, the product of democracy. And I think that there are two separate things here. I think we have to respect the democratic process. And in every democratic process, no one is satisfied with the outcome of all elections. I can testify to that. So in that sense, I don't think they present a threat to the democratic process.

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

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

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

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

Partnership For Peace and NATO

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

President Yeltsin. I believe that the initiative displayed by U.S. President Bill Clinton and by some European politicians, I mean in terms of

not admitting one country by one to NATO, but rather to declare them Partners For Peace and security, provides a very good formula. Because we need to draw up one more line here because if you divide us in the black and the white, it is no good.

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

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

But this Partnership For Peace is a real thing now. It is real now. We invited all the republics of the former Soviet Union, all the Warsaw Pact nations, and the other non-NATO members of Europe to be part of the Partnership For Peace. All were invited. All were told that this can also lead to eventual membership in NATO, but that our objective is to create an undivided and united Europe, united around political freedom, economic freedom, military cooperation, and respect for one another's borders, for the first time in the history of the nation state. It has never happened before.

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

Press Secretary Myers. This will be the last question.

Bosnia

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

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

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

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

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

We reached no conclusive results, but we had a pretty honest conversation, and a few things were said that I think we might be able to follow up on. Anything I were to say—excuse me—anything I might say with greater specificity would probably only confuse things and raise false hopes. This is a real thicket. But we had

what I thought was an honest, good conversation about the larger issue, which is, is there anything else anybody from outside can do to help make peace?

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

NOTE: The President's 44th news conference began at 11:41 a.m. in the Kremlin Press Center. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks in a Town Meeting With Russian Citizens in Moscow
January 14, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the midst of these conflicts between the faces and forces of tomorrow and the forces of yesterday, I believe that the greatness of nations in the 21st century will be defined not

by whether they can dictate to millions and millions of people within and beyond their borders but instead by whether they can provide their citizens, without regard to their race or their gender, the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their ability, to take full advantage of the incredible things that are in the world of today and tomorrow.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To be sure, the system you had produced a very literate society, made some of you the best educated people in the world, developed a high-tech base and developed a strong industrial base tied quite closely to your military might. But it is inadequate to a dramatically changing, highly competitive, increasingly flexible global economy in which all decisions simply

cannot be made by a handful of people from the top down and in which no country is immune from the forces without.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have reached an agreement, an unprecedented agreement, for cooperation in space. Next month, Russian cosmonauts will serve on our space shuttle. We will share our resources,

share our knowledge, share our training. And we will uncover things in space and in our venture which will have direct economic benefits to the people of Russia and the people of the United States. We both have different but very significant environmental problems which require high levels of skill and technology but which generate enormous economic opportunities and large numbers of jobs. These things will come.

Secondly, last April when I met with President Yeltsin, I pledged $1.6 billion in United States aid. We have now committed all that aid, and 70 percent of the money has been spent. And I provided a map the other day which showed that it had been spent all over the country in all kinds of different ways, mostly to help you to develop a private economy. You will begin to see the benefits of that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We are committed to fostering this kind of democratic ferment, and we are prepared to provide whatever kind of technical assistance we can to help it do well here. I say that because

some people are concerned at the wide variety of views and the loud expression of those views we see in the Duma here after the last election. That can be a healthy thing if, but only if, everybody else's views are respected and protected too. For once democracy becomes an instrument of crushing the views of the minorities, of those who disagree, of those who don't have the muscle, then democracy itself soon disappears.

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

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

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

There are still questions, you know, in the world about how you will define your greatness. When I was at the NATO conference and afterward, there are nations that live between Western Europe and the border of Russia who still wonder what the future holds, nations who said, "Put me in NATO now just in case. Oh, I believe this President of Russia when he says he respects the territorial borders of other nations, but look at the history of Russia. Think of the national impulse. Draw another line across Europe now, while you have a chance." There are people who are in the Baltic nations now who hear some of the debate in your politics, who hear the threats to take them over again. One of your political leaders even suggested you might like to have Alaska back. I don't think I can go along with that. [*Laughter*]

I say that because all those definitions, I would argue to you, are looking to yesterday. What in the world would you do with an army of occupation to the east? How would you pay for it? And what would it give you? How would you be more powerful than some small nation, one of the industrial tigers of Asia, for example, producing and selling goods and services at such a rate that their people's incomes are going up by 10 percent a year, and they are giving the people who live there the opportunity to do things that would have been undreamed of by their parents or grandparents? This is a very serious thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

Q. Do I need to speak Russian or English?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q. I'd like to thank you for what you think about our future in economics and in democracy. But I'd like to remind you that—how I see tomorrow of our country is the spiritual power. Some astrologists say that Russia will soon become the center of everything because

we have this spiritual energy here. What do you think of that? You didn't mention anything about our cultural future. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, what I have done is—the reason that you say that we have supported the Muslims in Yugoslavia, we supported the multiethnic government in Bosnia because it was recognized by the United Nations. So the United States supported it because it was recognized by the United Nations. However, we also support a peace process which would give some territory to the Muslim-dominated government, to the Serbs and to the Croats. So what we're doing in Bosnia is to try to support the U.N. mission in trying to urge the parties to stop killing each other.

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

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

and take care of our problems within our borders.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

her. So I thought I would introduce her, and I thank you for that.

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

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

The President. Which country?

Q. Baltics.

The President. First of all——

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So what we wish to do—yesterday evening, Ambassador Pickering, our American Ambassador, and Mrs. Pickering, who are both here, held a reception for me at the American Ambas-

sador's residence, Spaso House, and we had a lot of the leaders of Parliament, a lot of the leaders of the regional political groups, a lot of people from the private sector, some of whom are from different political groups, there to meet me. Because now democracy is three things, it's the elected President, the constitution, and the Parliament, plus people who have been elected in various ways throughout the country, plus people who are in free associations, like labor movements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q. I'm 13 years old.

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

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

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

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

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

ready, and perhaps my chance will come." I say that to you.

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

Q. Thank you.

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

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

I perfectly agree with that. I think you could have a system, a democratic system like the British, like the French, like the Italians, like—you name it, but they all have certain things in common. They all have opportunities for the people to vote and a system for them to have elected representatives who themselves get to vote on which laws govern the people and some system for the protection of individual rights and the rights of minority groups. But how you do that is perfectly up to you. There are many different ways you can do it. Yes, the British system is different from the French system, and both of them are different from our system.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The second thing I would say, however, is that no country can have more than one President at a time. Every nation needs someone who's the leader, who then works with the leaders of other nations. And I'm the President of

the United States. If I want to work with you and help you, I should be open to meeting with and listening to all the democratic voices in Russia. But in the end, I still have to work with your President.

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

The President. Well, I can tell you this: I came from a family that had no money, no influence, and no particular interest in politics. My mother got interested in politics after I started running, but not before. My advice to you would be two things: One, get the best education you can; and two, involve yourself in politics and figure out what you believe, which party and group you want to be identified with; work in the elections; work on some problem that the people have.

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

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

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

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

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. at the Ostankino television station.

Statement by the Presidents of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine
January 14, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

The Presidents recognize the importance of compensation to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus for the value of the highly-enriched ura-

nium in nuclear warheads located on their territories. Arrangements have been worked out to provide fair and timely compensation to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus as the nuclear warheads on their territory are transferred to Russia for dismantling.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique.

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

January 14, 1994

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

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

—Considering the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the basis for efforts to ensure the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, they called for its indefinite and unconditional extension at conference of its participants in 1995, and they urged that all states that have not yet done so accede to this treaty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—The Presidents also tasked their experts to study options for the long-term disposition of fissile materials, particularly of plutonium, taking into account the issues of non-

proliferation, environmental protection, safety, and technical and economic factors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Presidents of the two countries agreed that, in addition to strengthening global norms of nonproliferation and working out agreements to this effect, close cooperation is essential in order to develop policies on nonproliferation applicable to specific regions posing the greatest

risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

—They agreed that nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula would represent a grave threat to regional and international security, and decided that their countries would consult with each other on ways to eliminate this danger. They called upon the DPRK to honor fully its obligation under the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its safeguards agreement with the IAEA in connection with the Treaty, and to resolve the problems of safeguards implementation, inter alia, through dialogue between IAEA and DPRK. They also urged full and speedy implementation of the Joint Declaration of the ROK and the DPRK on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

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

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

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

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique.

Joint American-Russian Statement on Human Rights
January 14, 1994

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

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

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

right and underscore its importance for a free and open society.

The United States reaffirms its support for democratic reforms in Russia. Among these reforms are the establishment of an independent judiciary as a fundamental part of a state based on the rule of law, the strengthening of other foundations of a civil society and full realization of personal rights and liberties. The Presidents agree that the continued success of the democratic transformation in Russia is of great importance for the promotion of the principles of democracy and human rights all over the world and for the maintenance of international stability and security.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique.

Moscow Declaration
January 14, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

With the approval by the U.S. Congress of NAFTA and the successful completion of the Uruguay Round of global trade negotiations, President Clinton and President Yeltsin wel-

comed the accelerating progress toward creation of an open and prosperous world economy and trading system. President Yeltsin informed President Clinton of recent steps among the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States toward increased economic coordination and cooperation. The two Presidents agreed that such initiatives, pursued in an open and voluntary manner consistent with GATT rules and procedures, should be conducive to the rapid inclusion of all the participating states into the global economy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Death of Foreign Minister Johan Jurgen Holst of Norway
January 14, 1994

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

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

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

The President's Radio Address
January 15, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

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

One key to our new security is helping Europe's former Communist states succeed themselves in building democratic governments, market economies, and peaceful militaries. Our best

security investment today is to support these practices of freedom in Europe's Eastern half in places such as Poland, Ukraine, and Russia. That was my top goal on this trip.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:01 p.m. on January 14 at the Kremlin in Moscow for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on January 15.

Remarks to Future Leaders of Belarus in Minsk

January 15, 1994

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

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

I wanted to come to Belarus because I am impressed with much of what you have done and because I believe you can and will do even more. Your generation has been given an opportunity to build a strong and free nation. While you face hard times today, you have much with which to build a better future. You stand at the crossroads of continents. You have a highly educated people and great institutions of higher learning. You have good, strong high-technology industries. Above all, you have reclaimed your freedom, and your destiny is now in your own hands. And so now you must decide what to do with your nation and your future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

obeying the law and trying to make their contribution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Seventy-six nuclear weapons were here when the Soviet Union dissolved. As a new nation, one of your first decisions was to do away with them. It would have been easier to look backward and say, "Well, these 76 weapons somehow make us a great nation. They make us stronger. We will keep them; we will use them and rattle them around as threats if people don't help us or do what we want them to do." But you made a braver and a better choice, to live nuclear-free.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

January 16, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

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

January 16, 1994

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

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

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

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

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

This meeting has also provided us with the opportunity to exchange views over a number of issues including those related to bilateral relations between our countries. We have agreed that the noble objective toward which we are working requires a qualitative move in these relations. We have also discussed questions related to the regional situation, as well as all matters that might constructively contribute to the achievements of security and stability in the Middle East.

Syria seeks a just and comprehensive peace with Israel as a strategic choice that secures

Arab rights, ends the Israeli occupation, and enables all peoples in the region to live in peace, security, and dignity. In honor we fought, in honor we negotiate, and in honor we shall make peace. We want an honorable peace for our people and for the hundreds of thousands who paid their lives in defense of the countries and the rights.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

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

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

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

a clear expression that there will be a possibility of that sort of relationship.

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

Thank you, sir.

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

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

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

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

Could you repeat the question in Arabic, please?

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

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

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

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

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

Q. Mr. Clinton, despite the peace negotiations, ever since the Madrid Conference, Israel continues with its policy of settlements in the occupied Arab countries. Although Syria has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has been asking for years for the denuclearization of the Middle East as a region, Israel refuses, in fact, to sign and ratify this Non-Proliferation Treaty and is still accumulating and amassing weapons. Don't you think, sir, that such practices go counter to the concept of peace for which you are striving? Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

Syria-U.S. Relations

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

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

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

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

Press Secretary Myers. We'll take one more from each side.

Middle East Peace Process

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

President Clinton. We did not have any discussions today about the details of any phase of the Middle East peace process because the other parties are not here present, and it would not have been an appropriate thing to do.

Q. [*Inaudible*]——

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

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

Q. In my view, on the 13th of September at the White House, you called for a bigger Syrian role in the peace process and you called personally on His Excellency President Asad to play a personal role in forging ahead a breakthrough in the peace process. Now that you've met President Asad face to face for the first time, what is your impression about President Asad, and how do you view his personal role in achieving that breakthrough?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I had heard a lot about President Asad's legendary

stamina in these meetings. [*Laughter*] And when we called a break 4 hours and 20 minutes into our meeting, I can tell you that his reputation does not exceed the reality; he deserves every bit of it.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 45th news conference began at 4:15 p.m. at the Intercontinental Hotel. President Asad spoke in Arabic, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Interview With Reporters Aboard Air Force One
January 16, 1994

President's Trip

The President. Are you all exhausted?

Q. Yes.

Q. Aren't you?

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

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

Q. What?

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

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

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

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

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

For all the criticism of the pace of reform in Russia, one of the little-known facts about it is that in terms of privatizing companies, Russia's actually running ahead of the pace of the other former Communist economies. There's some other problems they have to deal with, their inflation problems and just having a legal framework that will attract more investment, but I feel quite good about that. Just from my experience in Moscow, I really think that while there are, as you would imagine, uncertainties among the people there because of all the hardships and the difficulty of sort of visualizing the future, I think there's a lot of emotion to the idea that the people ought to rule the country. I didn't get much sense in anybody that they wanted a more authoritarian government. I think they like the fact that the voters are in the driver's seat, even though they're still trying to come to grips with exactly what that means and how to translate it into policies.

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

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

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

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

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

Pan Am 103 Bombing

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

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

Russia

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

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

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

Q. What are your impressions of Asad?

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

Gaydar left the government once before, and the reforms didn't stop. So the only thing I encouraged him to do was, I said, "You proved you're committed to democracy. You've stayed with this reform. You've still got some tough decisions to make." I told him, I said, "I contacted the G–7 before I came up here. We want to help cushion the impact of reform, and

we want to help make sure the people of Russia know what you're doing to help the economy. And if you're going to keep on the reform path, it'll be easier for us to do that, because then we'll be able to make sure that the IMF and the World Bank support you as well as these individual countries."

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

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

So the one thing that I think we need to focus on is now that they've got a constitutional democracy, and all of them, even the ones who want to slow down reform, want more investment, which is interesting—they all want more investment, even the ones that think, "Well, reform has gone too fast"—they might be for the first time in a real position now to write some of the laws in such a way that will attract a lot more investment. For example, if you want to make an energy investment in Russia, you may not care what the rate of privatization of small companies is, but you do want to know if you put the money in there and who you're investing with, is your investment good, what do you do in case of breach of contract, what are your tax obligations if you make money? Just clear, simple, straightforward stuff that we take for granted, that I think they now have to do a little more work on.

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

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

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

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

Russia and the change in a person. And by his actions he did that.

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

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

The President. Oh, no, I think he's deeply emotional enough. But in the last election, keep in mind, he put all of his prestige and effort into passing the Constitution. And he prevailed. So a lot of people voted for Boris Yeltsin and his constitution and also voted for the Communist candidate, the agrarian candidate, Zhirinovsky and his crowd. That's the point I'm trying to make. And he needs to win the overlap. He can't let them win the overlap if he's going to govern the country and move it forward.

President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria

Q. How about Asad, what are your impressions?

The President. Smart. Very tough.

Q. What is that?

The President. He's very smart and very tough and has a very clear view of what he thinks has happened in the Middle East in the last 25 years and what he thinks ought to happen. On the other hand, I think that he has reached the conclusion that it is in the interest of his people, his administration, and his legacy to make a meaningful and lasting peace. I believe that.

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

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

Q. Did he ask you, if there was peace between Israel and Syria, we would follow through on our commitment to commit U.S. troops to the Golan Heights in order to keep the peace?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trip Highlights

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

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

Q. Any disappointments?

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

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

Partnership For Peace

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

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

Tony would have to answer the other question in terms of the label and all that, but it was an American idea. We started by consulting all the allies; we realized that there were a whole range of reasons for reservations for immediately expanding membership. And then there were some who had some question about whether NATO had any role at all. And we talked

through what our objectives were independent of NATO: What would you like to have happen in Europe in 10 years? What is it we're trying to get done? And then all of our folks went back together and came back with that idea. I have no idea who thought of it, who labeled it or who—I got it through the NSC and State and Defense. We all talked it through before I got there, because it was essentially a military training and planning concept. And I'm sure somebody knows the answer to your question, but I don't.

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

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

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

Remarks on Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities

January 17, 1994

I want to thank Arland for reminding us all that we can make a difference in people's lives and that there are a lot of good people out there who are dying to make more of their lives if given the opportunity. It's so easy for us here to come here and talk in Government language about Government programs that never seem to reach to the human level and to the reality of what is actually at stake among the young people of this country. And he did that better than I think that I will be able to in following up. But for all of you who are here to talk about this today, if there was ever an argument for why we needed to find ways to give people and communities the capacity to develop themselves, I think Arland Smith made a better argument than any of the rest of us ever could. I thought when he said, "I couldn't believe I was here in Washington; I used to be a knucklehead," I thought he was going to say there were a lot of knuckleheads here, but he was delicate enough not to say that. [*Laughter*]

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

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

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

On this Martin Luther King Day, we honor our Nation's challenging and most eloquent voice for human rights and human potential, a person who gave his life to guarantee better

opportunities for people like Arland Smith. When Martin Luther King died in April of 1968, I was living here as a senior at Georgetown, and I remember so clearly putting a big red cross on my car and driving it down into the burning areas of town to deliver supplies to people who had lost a lot of hope. It was a very troubling time for our country and, indeed, for the whole world.

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

But I couldn't help thinking as I was going across the world trying to help other nations deal with their problems, that I was coming home to Martin Luther King Day, and the honest hard assessment that a lot of things that were obsessing and burdening this country 25 years ago when Martin Luther King died are just as bad today as they were then. A lot of things are better. A lot of things are better. There is more individual opportunity for people who are educated and who developed it. There is less overt prejudice. But there is more violence, less opportunity, and more destruction of family and community for the places that are really hard hit than there even was 25 years ago. And I think the only way we can honor Martin Luther King's memory is to be honest about that and to ask ourselves what we can do to rebuild the communities and families of this country and to give more young people like Arland Smith a chance to be what he is becoming.

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

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

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

We also know that we can't do it without help from the business community. So I say to you here on this Martin Luther King Day, America needs your help. The real reason Arland Smith's got a good story is that after he paid the price to go through the educational system and to change his own habits and the way he presented himself and his own aspira-

tions for his own life, the only real reason he's got a story to tell is that he also has two jobs. And if there were no job at the end of the rainbow, then this man would be standing up here giving a very different speech: "Why did you all hold out false hopes? Why did you tell me to be a good student, to be a good citizen, to be a good father, to do all these things, and then there was nothing at the end of the effort for me?"

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

In Martin Luther King's last book, "Where Do We Go From Here," he said that community-based businesses, no matter how small, are vital because they are a strength among the weak though they are weak among the mighty. If we want people to live by the work ethic, we've got to give them work. It's as simple as that. We have advanced, from the beginning of this administration, a new approach, coordinated in partnership here in Washington between the private and public sector and also coordinated at the grassroots level, to focus on a community investment strategy which would empower people to determine their own future. That's what the empowerment zones and enterprise communities are all about, and that's what our efforts to strengthen the community investment act and to develop community development banks are all about. And that's what our effort to pass a crime bill that would put another 100,000 police officers on the streets in grassroots communities are all about.

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

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

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

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

Now, I have given a lot of thought, having been a Governor and having tried to do this on a State level with mixed results, to what works and what doesn't. When I became Governor of my State for the second time in 1983, we had an unemployment rate 3 percent higher

than the national average. And the Mississippi Delta was then and unfortunately still is the poorest part of America. But I could take you through towns in the eastern part of my State—Mr. Nash, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and I went week after week, month after month, year after year into town after town after town. And we would go into a county and see 2 towns 10 miles from one another, the same income makeup, the same racial makeup, the same educational makeup, and one would have an unemployment rate 4 points lower than the other. One would have a school in which there was no white flight but instead coordinated, integrated, high-quality education. And it was always because of the leadership and the vision and the discipline and a common concern for the people who lived at the local level. They created empowerment zones without even knowing what the idea was or what it meant. So what we have really argued over and over and over again now for a year in Washington is what we could do to set up a system that would accelerate the creation of those success stories, so there can be millions more Arland Smiths.

I asked the Vice President to head a new Community Enterprise Board to try to come up with that sort of system, to change the Federal relationship with America's communities but also to set in motion a process for American communities which would require them to undertake the discipline of examining where they are, what they're doing right and wrong, and how to come up with strategies to succeed. I am very proud of the work that they've done so far.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

Remarks on the Observance of the Birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.
January 17, 1994

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

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

I want to say a special word, too, if I might at the outset, of appreciation for the fact that Howard provided the moment for me to remember again that in all great debates there should be some discord. When the president

of the student body got up here, I thought to myself, well, we do have a responsibility to seek justice as we see it. And I was glad she was here doing that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For decades our security depended upon protecting a divided Europe. Europe was the center of two world wars which took more lives from the face of the Earth in less time than any

two events in history. After the Second World War, Europe was divided, but war did not come again, in part because we protected the people on our side of the dividing line. But then the Berlin Wall came crashing down. People rose up and demanded their own freedom.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But as I come home on this Martin Luther King Day from a trip that fought for democracy and economic progress and security, I have to ask myself: How are we doing on these things here at home? How are we doing on these

things at home? If democracy is the involvement of all of our people and if it is making strength out of our diversity, if we want to say to the people in the troubled areas of Europe, "Put your ethnic hatreds behind you; take the differences, the religious differences, the racial differences, the ethnic differences of your people, and make them a strength in a global economy," surely we must do the same here.

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

In the last year, our economy has created more jobs in the private sector than in the previous 4 years combined. Unemployment is down; interest rates are down; investment is up. Millions of middle class Americans have refinanced their homes and started new businesses. All this is helping us to move in the right direction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We know right now that 100 percent of the people need not only to graduate from high school but to have at least 2 years of education after high school in the global economy. We know it, but we're not organized for it. And so under the leadership of the Education Secretary and the Labor Secretary, our administration is working to set up a system to move all young people from high school to 2 years of further training while they're in the workplace, in the service, or in school. And we're doing our dead level best to make sure that the cost of a college education is never a deterrent to seizing it, by reorganizing the whole student loan program. Last year the Congress adopted our plan to reorganize the college loan program, to lower the interest rates, string out the repayments, require people to pay back as

a percentage of the income they are earning when they get out, not just based on how much they borrow when they're in school. No one should ever refuse to go to college because of its cost.

And earlier today, to give one more example of what we mean by the presence of opportunity, on this Martin Luther King Day I met with a group of business leaders and urged them to become active partners in communities where the need is greatest. We have learned time and again now, ever since Martin Luther King lived and died, that even when we have times of great economic growth there are areas in the inner cities and in rural America that are totally left out of the economic progress that occurs. We have learned that unless we can rebuild our communities from the grassroots up, unless we can rebuild the institutions of a community in ways that support work and family and children, that millions and millions of Americans will be left out of the American dream.

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

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

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

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

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

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

But Martin Luther King reminded us, too, that laws can regulate behavior but not the heart. And so I say to you, we must also seek what Abraham Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature." And we all have a responsibility there. When he spoke here at Howard, Martin Luther King said the following things, and I

thought about it today when I was looking at Mr. DeBose up here introducing me, expressing the pride in the service he rendered and how it changed the minds and the hearts of the people with whom and for whom he worked. Dr. King said, "Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless effort and persistent work of dedicated individuals who are willing to be coworkers with God. And without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the primitive forces of stagnation. And so we must help time, and we must realize that the time is always right for one to do right." "Time is neutral," he said. "Time can either be used constructively or destructively." All he asked from each of the rest of us was to put in a tiny, little minute.

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

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

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. in Cramton Auditorium at Howard University. In his remarks, he referred to Charles DeBose, Jr., national service intern, and university officials Franklyn Jenifer, president, and Joyce Ladner, vice president for academic affairs. The Executive order and memorandum on fair housing are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on the Los Angeles Earthquake
January 17, 1994

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

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

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

At my direction, the Director of FEMA, James Lee Witt, is now on his way to California, along with Secretary of Transportation Pena and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Cisneros. In addition, I have directed some senior White House staff to the scene as well. Our

hearts and prayers go out to the people of southern California. I spoke early this morning with Mayor Riordan and then with Governor Wilson and wished them well and pledged to them that the United States Government would do all that we possibly can to be helpful. They were obviously appreciative and were glad that James Lee Witt, as well as our Cabinet Secretaries, were on their way to the scene.

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

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

Again, let me say I wish the Mayor, the Governor, the people of California well. We are looking forward to working with them. I have had the opportunity to speak with both Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein today, and I am confident that everybody is doing everything they can. I am going to be here basically waiting for reports today and tomorrow as we assess what our next steps should be. Let me sign the document for disaster declaration, and then I will answer a few questions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The President. If we need to do it, we can. We are organized to do it. But again, I want to wait until I get a report back from Mr. Witt after he talks to the Mayor and the Governor and others involved out there. We've had a pretty good record of—you know, we've had experi-

ence working with the folks in that area. Ironically, you know, we've got some sites that were made available for emergency aid during the fires that could still be activated rather quickly. I mean, our folks are in place there and the contingencies that they need to think through, I think, have pretty well been thought through. So, we should be able to give you a much better report tomorrow sometime.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:07 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

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

January 17, 1994

Dear Mr. Witt:

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

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

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

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

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

Letter on Withdrawal of the Nomination of Admiral Bobby R. Inman To Be Secretary of Defense

January 18, 1994

Dear Admiral Inman:

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

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

Very truly yours,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: The White House also made available Admiral Inman's letter requesting that his nomination be withdrawn.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on the Los Angeles Earthquake in Burbank, California

January 19, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mayor.

Ladies and gentlemen, first let me say that I always learn something when I come to southern California. Very often in the last 2 years I have come here when things were difficult for people, and I always walk away utterly astonished.

I would like to say two things by way of introduction. First, on behalf of all the people on our Federal team, we want to thank the mayor and the members of the city council and city government, the Governor and the State legislators, Senator Boxer, Senator Feinstein, the Members of the United States Congress, the members of the county government, people I have already met with here today. The sense of teamwork here has been truly extraordinary. And I appreciate all of you doing that so much.

When I became President, one of the things I most wanted to do was to give the American people a high level of confidence that their Government at least would work in basic ways and that they could trust us at least to do the basic human things right without regard to party, philosophy, whatever fights we were having over economic policy or anything else in the world, that when the chips were down, the basic things that people were entitled to have that done by their National Government, they would feel that. And I suppose there's no more important area than in an emergency for people to have that kind of feeling.

The second thing I want to say is, I never cease to be amazed by the energy and the optimism, the courage and the constant good humor of so many millions of people in this State against all odds. And I walked the crowds today, through these crowds. I saw public workers that haven't slept more than 2 or 3 hours in 3 days, working on the roads, the water lines, the gas lines. We saw countless numbers of people who had lost their homes, who didn't know when they were going to be able to go back to work. We saw children asking us to help get their schools fixed so they could go back to school. I met a man who had saved three homes in his neighborhood, along with a team of firemen. I met a woman who had lost her home—this is unbelievable—lost her home, who said to me, "You know, I lost my home, and I'm really grateful you folks are coming here to help, but when you go to that meeting this afternoon, I hope you'll just ask everybody to do the right thing." She said, "Ask people not to overcharge us for water. But ask all the people who are hurt not to take advantage of FEMA." She said, "You know, somebody in the rest of this country might get in trouble later this year. And I lost my home, but we're going to do some of this ourselves. And I heard some people who were asking for reimbursement for things that were already broken in their homes." And she said, "We just all ought to do the right thing, and we'll come out okay." And so I say to all of you who are elected, you've got a lot to be proud of just in the people that you represent.

The mayor has already mentioned all the people in the Federal team who came out here, but I would like to thank them. FEMA Director James Lee Witt and Secretary Cisneros, Secretary Pena, the Federal Highway Administrator Rodney Slater, the Deputy Secretary of Commerce David Barram, John Emerson, from my staff, came out here early. All told, we've had about 1,500 Federal personnel in California, Washington, and at the teleregistration center in Denton, Texas, working on this. And as I said, it's really been a joy to work with the local and the State officials. I think we're all about to get the hang of working with each other, but we hope we don't have another chance to do it very soon.

As you know, I was asked to declare a disaster declaration on the day that the earthquake occurred, and I did that. And we'll be talking later in this meeting about the whole range of Federal services that are available and about the disaster assistance centers that FEMA will set up and how people can access them. I ask all of you who are Federal officials and State officials and county officials and local officials to help us with this.

I looked at those people today, and a lot of those folks are not used to fooling with the Government for anything. They're not used to

asking for help, they're not—they can't be charged with the knowledge of what is in a FEMA program or in an SBA program or some other agency program. We're going to do our very best to make it easy and accessible for them. And they'll talk more about that in a minute. But you can help us a lot, Mayor, all of you can help us a lot by simply telling us if it's reaching people. And when this is all over, Leon Panetta and I have to go back to Washington and figure out how to pay for it—[*laughter*]—and that's our job. But it won't work unless it actually works.

When I was walking up and down those lines today looking at those folks, I thought most of these people are just good hard-working people trying to do the right thing. And it never occurred to them that they would ever have to figure out how to work their way through a maze of any sort of Federal program, whatever. So one of the things that all of you can do to help us is to be good intermediaries, and if it's not working to let us know. If we need to be some place we're not, let us know. And that's, I think, very, very important.

The other point I want to make is that we'll be talking a lot about emergency aid today, but we recognize that it's going to take a good while to finish this work. When I was out at the place where the highway broke down, one of many, I asked how long it would take to fix it. And the highway engineer said, "Oh, probably about a year." And I said, "Well, what do you have to do to fix it in less time?" It's not just a question of money, it's also a question of organization. We'll talk more about that today.

I want to make three specific announcements today, but to make this point: This is a national problem, and we have a national responsibility and we will be in it for the long run. This is not something where all of us from the Federal Government just showed up while this is an issue in the headlines, gripping the hearts and emotions of all your countrymen and women who feel for you all the way to the tip of northern Maine and the tip of southern Florida. This is something we intend to stay with until the job is over.

And in that connection, I have been authorized to say that today the Small Business Administration will be releasing enough money to support about $240 million in new low-interest loans to people who qualify for them. We will release $45 million in new funds from the Department of Transportation to support the beginning of all the cleanup and the beginning of the repair movement. You know there's a lot of, unfortunately, a lot of destruction now that has to be done on those roads before the construction can start. So that will accelerate that process.

And the third thing I want to say is that as soon as we get good cost estimates, and the Governor and the mayor have given us some today, but as soon as we get good cost estimates on what the losses are and what kinds of things fall within the responsibility of the Federal Government, we will then see how much money we now have already appropriated for disasters. And then, along with your congressional delegation, I expect to ask the Congress for an emergency supplemental appropriation for California as soon as the Congress returns on January 25th. And I believe the Congress will do the right thing. And I want to tell you that this is something I think the California delegation will be absolutely united on. And we've already had the conversations with them. I'm grateful that so many members of the delegation are here today.

Let me just say one final thing. I have been asked also by several people, by the mayor, the Governor, the Senators among others today, about the matching requirement. Generally, in any emergency there's a 25-percent match requirement which the Federal Government can waive—can be waived so that the match requirement goes down to 10 percent for State and local contribution to disaster assistance. I wish I could just come here today and tell you that I could waive that. We waived it in the Midwest flood, when we had the floods earlier this year. We had a 500-year flood, the worst flood that we hope it only comes along every 500 years. I think you have a very strong case for waiver, but before we can approve it, under the law we have to have a realistic assessment of what the costs are, because the criteria established by Congress for waiver is that the burdens on the State and local resources will be too great to reasonably bear, given the other problems. Now, if you look at the economic problems that California and southern California have had alone in the last 4 years, I don't think it will be too difficult for you to make that case. But it is not legally possible for me to say until I see the numbers and the arguments. So you have to make the case; we will work with you to help you make that case. But that's a commit-

ment I can't make today until we see the evidence under the law.

We will proceed with the emergency supplemental. And I'd like to spend the rest of the meeting just sort of listening to what's going on, what the problems are, because when I leave here today, I want to have a clear sense that we have our act together and that when we go back to Washington we'll be able to do our part there while you're doing your part here.

And the last point I want to make, again, is that we have no intention, none, of letting this be a short-term thing. We will stay with you until this job is finished. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, Gov. Pete Wilson, Senator Dianne Feinstein, and Senator Barbara Boxer thanked the administration and discussed efforts to assist victims and repair damage. Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan outlined areas of concern, and Dick Andrews, director of the office of State emergency services, discussed the response efforts of Federal, State, and local governments. James Lee Witt, Director of FEMA, explained how disaster assistance centers provide temporary housing and financial assistance to victims. Mayor Riordan then invited the President to comment.*]

The President. Well, I would like to ask just—I think the audience would like to know, and I know Dick's going to announce later where they are, because the local folks have decided where the disaster assistance centers should be sited, but how many will there be? And we talked earlier about whether there will be a mobile center, too, to go to the people who may have lost their cars, for example, in the earthquake. And how long will it take people to get checks for their personal needs, those that lost all sources of income and have to have some money just to live, how long will it take before those checks will actually be in their hands after they apply?

[*Mr. Andrews discussed the opening of additional disaster assistance centers to handle the large volume of applicants, as well as mobile centers that would travel around the area to assist in the application process. Director Witt stated that applicants would receive assistance checks more quickly than in previous years, due to improvements in the process.*]

The President. Maybe I should wait on this, but I don't know when the appropriate time is. When I was working the crowds today, a lot of children asked me about the schools. Apparently there are a whole lot of schools that are affected, and the kids are out of school. How long will it take to get any assistance to them, and how does that work?

[*Sidney Thompson, superintendent of schools, Los Angeles Unified School District, discussed conditions in southern California schools and efforts to reopen them. Shirley Mattingly, head of emergency services for Los Angeles, stated that Federal, State, and local governments will continue to work together. Dan Waters, head of the department of water and power, discussed efforts to restore water and power. Los Angeles County Supervisor Mike Antonovich detailed the damage in the Santa Clara Valley, and Representative Elton Gallegly addressed the damage in Ventura County and requested that the area be declared a disaster. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros discussed solutions for providing temporary and permanent housing to victims. Representative Esteban Edward Torres asked about fact sheets in languages other than English. Mayor Judy Abdo of Santa Monica expressed concern that her heavily damaged city would not receive adequate funding, and Secretary Cisneros assured her that funds would be distributed based on the extent of damage.*]

The President. I just want to echo that, if I might. I just asked Mr. Panetta to come down here to talk about it. Right now, all we can do is put out this emergency relief and programs that already exist; that is, until Congress acts, that's all we can do. So you'll get something now, and if it turns out to be inadequate, then when we put the supplemental appropriation together, it will be based on a showing of need by community. It will be irrespective of size or allocation or anything else. So when that program goes through, all you have to do is make sure that we got the right evidence, and then we'll be able to proceed on that basis.

[*Councilwoman Jackie Goldberg of Hollywood discussed the lack of storage facilities and housing in her district. Jackie Tatum, president, recreation and parks commission of Los Angeles, and Gary Squires, general manager, Los Angeles housing department, offered their cooperation in*

providing temporary and permanent housing to victims. Yvonne Burke, head of the county board of supervisors, commented on mutual aid and the coordinated efforts of various government agencies. Vicki Howard, chair of the Ventura County board of supervisors, requested two disaster assistance centers in her county. OMB Director Leon Panetta assured participants that the Government has sufficient funds to provide immediate assistance. Chief of Police Willie Williams and Sheriff Sherman Block addressed public safety concerns. Kathleen Brown, State treasurer, discussed the damage to public buildings and offered her cooperation in financing the repair of buildings and bridges. Secretary of Transportation Federico Pena commented on efforts to repair the transportation system, and State Senator Diane Watson requested that helicopters be supplied to transport patients to less crowded hospitals. Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles discussed programs to provide loans to victims. John Garamendi, State insurance commissioner, requested the Federal Government's help in rebuilding homes and businesses and suggested a national disaster insurance program. Mayor Riordan then invited the President to respond.]

The President. Well first, Mayor, let me thank you for hosting the meeting and for inviting me out. I was sitting—I actually got quite a number of good ideas today. I'm not sure the best idea didn't come from Art Torres when he said we needed to give every elected official a fact sheet on all these programs in all the appropriate languages, because then all of you can go out and strengthen your own position by making sure that it works. And I think that's important; that's a great idea.

The second thing I'd like to do is just thank you for the kind words you said about all the people that are here that came from the Federal Government. As I was looking there, from my Federal Highway Administrator Mr. Slater to my Budget Director Mr. Panetta to James Lee Witt to Secretary Pena, Secretary Cisneros, Mr. Bowles, and down to David on the end, starting with David Barram and looking around the other table, these people have something very unusual in Federal officials, they actually had years of experience in the fields in which they're working before I appointed them to the jobs that they hold. It makes a huge difference, and I hope it turns out to be a precedent in the future.

Let me just say one other thing. Every month when the economic reports come in at the White House and I see that interest rates are down, investments up, home mortgage delinquencies were at a 19-year low the month before last, and all these jobs have been created in the country, I ask everybody the same question: When is this going to start affecting California? And the thing that worried me most about the earthquake, beyond the terrible human tragedies involved, was the prospect that this might delay what we were beginning to see, which is the economic recovery beginning to take hold in California.

Now, one of three things can happen now: This earthquake can make your situation worse, it can have no impact, or it can actually make it better. And you're going to have to decide. We have a couple of responsibilities in that regard at the national level. The first thing we've got to do is to get this money out in a hurry.

We'll work with you on that, both the emergency money and that which comes in the supplemental. That will have a positive economic impact which at least will partially offset the negative things which have occurred in the short run.

The second thing we have to do is to make sure that structurally nothing happens. For example, I thought what Senator Watson said about looking at the different road routes was an interesting thing. You have got to figure out how to make sure you don't lose a single job on this. And as Rodney Slater pointed out to me earlier, you also ship a lot of produce and other products out of California on the highways. And we can't help that. And you can't do that by mass transit. They're still going to have to get on a truck and go. So you have to figure that out. And whatever we're supposed to do to help you do that, we've got to do.

The third thing I want to say is we will do whatever we can that is legally possible, working with Chairman Panetta here, to accelerate the funds and to reduce the bureaucratic burdens of moving on this highway construction. But I would urge you, as we talked at the site today, to consider things like 7-day work weeks, 24-hour-a-day construction where the neighbors will permit it, things that will actually put more people from southern California to work. If you build these roads quicker than you normally

would, you will by definition have to hire more people than you normally would in a short period of time, which could actually give you a little bit of economic boost when you desperately need it. So we will try to help you, but I want you to come up with a plan to tell us how you want to do it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. at the Hollywood-Burbank Airport.

Interview With Larry King
January 20, 1994

First Year in Office

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

What a year. Biggest surprise?

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

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

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

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

The President. Yes.

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

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

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

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

Mr. King. You were in Ocala.

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

Mr. King. And you said, "Where are you?"

The President. My mother called me from Vegas.

Mr. King. Vegas, where else?

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

Mr. King. I saw some people who were with her the night before she died. You would have never known she was ill. She was all right.

That had to be the worst; what was the best day of this year? And then we'll discuss a whole bunch of things and take calls. What was your best day?

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

Mr. King. Best political day?

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

Los Angeles Earthquake

Mr. King. Let's run down some things real current. You're just back from L.A. Apparently

it's going to rain there this weekend. Are they going to have tents outside for those people?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Administration Nominations

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

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

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

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

Mr. King. Because?

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

Mr. King. Are there days you think that?

The President. Not for me, no.

Mr. King. You like it too much?

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

Mr. King. Goes with the territory?

The President. Yes. And so I always say, if you want to get into this business, you need

to know who are, what you believe in, and where you stand with what you believe because you can't let yourself be defined by what happens outside.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civil Rights

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

The President. Well, I certainly expect one soon. The civil rights bar basically was heavily involved in the nomination of the last candidate who withdrew. And the Attorney General is working hard on it. And basically I've given her my proxy on the thing, "Just work with them. Work with people who are committed to having a strong civil rights enforcement."

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

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

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

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

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

Attorney General Janet Reno

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

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

Mr. King. So she's staying?

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

Secretary of State Warren Christopher

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

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

Mr. King. And he's the right man in——

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

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

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

The President. I think he's got a strong grip because he's got a 4-year term and a constitution which gives him more power, for example, than I have here, just pure legal power. I think that in the last election, a lot of people who are not friendly to some of his policies did very well, partly because the reformers didn't campaign as one group and didn't do a very good job in the mass media and all that sort of stuff, partly because the average Russian's having a tough time now. One of the things that I did when I was in Russia, and you know, through that town meeting—kind of like we do—and let people ask me questions, and I tried to establish some link between them and these processes of reform that are sweeping the world. Because times are tough for them now. And I think anytime times are tough—and keep in mind, they've just been a democracy a little while. We've been at this 200 years. And we kind of feel haywire from time to time, and we've been working at it for two centuries. They just got started. And so they elected some pretty extremist people and some people that are calling them to a past that is romanticized. And I think he's going to have a challenging time. But I think if they—he's a very tough guy. He believes in democracy. He's on the right side of history. And I think he will continue to listen and learn and work, and I think he'll do——

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

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

Natural Disasters

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

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

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

The President. That's right. It's a 100-year cold in a lot of these places. We have, first of all, tried to cut down on the Federal Government's power usage. We shut it down yesterday, shut it down today, and we're going to open

late tomorrow and try to keep our power usage down so that we can give the power to people in their homes. Secondly, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Cisneros anticipating this, gave out all of our homeless money early, so that all the State and local governments all around here have got as much money as we can possibly give them to take care of homelessness and to try——

Mr. King. Anticipating a tough winter?

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

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

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

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

The President. I think so.

Mr. King. And there's a symbolic——

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

Whitewater Development Corp.

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

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

Mr. King. Do you know Mr. Fiske?

The President. No.

Mr. King. Going to cooperate fully?

The President. Absolutely. Whatever they want to do, we'll be glad to do it.

Mr. King. He says he's going to probably take testimony from you and Hillary.

The President. Whatever he wants to do. The main thing I want to do is just have that turned over to him so we can go back to work. I just want to do my job. I don't want to be distracted by this anymore. I didn't do anything wrong. Nobody's ever even suggested that I did. Everybody who's talked about it has suggested, as a matter of fact, to the contrary, that I didn't. But still, let them look into it. I just want to go back to work.

Mr. King. Was it unfair, the press, or was it fair? Was it a story? Is it a story?

The President. Well, let's wait until it's all over, and then maybe I'll have something to say then. The main thing is, it's important that I not be distracted from the job of being President. That's what I owe the American people. I've got to get up every day, no matter what else is going on, and try to give everything I have to moving this country forward to changing this country for the better. And this will take the onus, if you will, off of that. People will know it's being handled in that way, and then I can just go back to work, which is what I want to happen.

Mr. King. In all candidness, a Special Counsel should have been appointed sooner, do you think?

The President. Well——

Mr. King. I mean, it would have certainly taken the story down.

The President. It would have. I was concerned in the beginning about agreeing to it when—for the first time ever, no one ever—people were saying, "We know you didn't do anything wrong, so appoint a Special Counsel." It wasn't, "There's this evidence of wrongdoing. Were you involved in it?" or something like that. But it was a much bigger story here and then eventually around the country, I think, than I had anticipated. So the important thing for me, again, was for people to feel comfortable about the way it's handled so I can go back to work. And I think now people will feel comfortable about the way it's handled, and I can go to work.

Mr. King. The one thing most people are asking is—they'll learn more about this, because it is involved, obviously—is why you took a loss and didn't take a deduction since everybody who has a loss takes a deduction.

The President. Well, that will come out in the—I think we took some interest deductions along, which were part of our losses, but at the end I did basically what we thought was the bend-over-backwards right thing to do and what was appropriate at the time. But let's wait

until the investigation is over. That'll all come out, and then if there are questions about it, when the report's made to the American people, I can answer questions about it then.

Gore-Perot NAFTA Debate

Mr. King. The night of the NAFTA debate and the passage of NAFTA, were you at all surprised at how well Al Gore did?

The President. Oh, no.

Mr. King. Because he had, you know, this wooden image and——

The President. Yes, but I knew——

Mr. King. ——people were predicting that Perot would beat him——

The President. I thought he would be great here if he had a fair chance and an honest debate. You know, he's like all the rest of us, sometimes we pick up images that are on occasion right but not fully accurate. And this image of him as sort of wooden and stiff, anybody who really knows him will tell you he is very funny, he has a terrific sense of humor, he's got an incredibly flexible mind. And the reason I like this debate format that you provided is that no one could shout anyone else down. I mean, they were all sitting here real close, you know. You were sitting here. Everybody got to talk. Everybody got to answer questions. And I knew two things: I knew he knew a lot about it; I knew he believed very deeply in the position that we had taken. It wasn't just something he was saying—"Well, I'm the Vice President, and Bill Clinton is for NAFTA, and I've got to be"—he believed it deep down in his bones. And I knew that he would feel comfortable and confident. So I liked it. You know, he and I were—we might have been in the minority in our administration when this whole thing was first—[*laughter*]——

Mr. King. To do that was his idea, and he asked you to okay——

The President. He said, "What do you think about it?" And I immediately said, "I think it's a terrific idea." And so we were sort of like salesmen in our own house.

Mr. King. But the handlers said no.

The President. Well, no, some of them did, not all of them but some of them. But we were beginning to make progress, you know; we were beginning to pick up votes already. But we were doing it by basically saying to Members of Congress, "You know this is right, and you know it's in the national interest, and you ought to do it even if it's unpopular in the short run." We felt, he and I both did, that this debate here, this discussion on your program, would be the only chance we'd ever have to kind of break through to ordinary Americans who watch you and listen to you and just want to know. And that's really what—that's what you did. You gave us a chance to talk to everyday Americans. And he was really—and I was so proud of him. I mean, he was really wonderful.

Mr. King. Do you think we might see someday a President debate?

The President. Well, it could be. Certainly if I run for reelection I'll expect——

Mr. King. No, I don't mean that. I mean major issues coming up for a vote—health care——

The President. It could be.

Mr. King. ——you and Senator Dole, or someone, someone of the leadership, where a President would sit down and say, "Let's discuss it with the opposition." I don't think that's ever happened in this country.

The President. It might not—I wouldn't be afraid of doing it. I wouldn't want to commit in advance just because I would want to make sure it was the right thing to do at the time. But you know, I run a remarkably open Presidency. I ran for this job because I wanted to get the economy going, I wanted to get the country back together again, and I wanted people to believe that their Government belonged to them again and that we could be more open and accessible to them. And I've tried to do that. The day after I was inaugurated, we opened the White House to just folks to come in. And tonight in another way we're opening the White House again.

Mr. King. And we're going to do that right away. When we come back you can call in and talk to the President of the United States on this special edition of "Larry King Live." Don't go away.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

President's Health

Mr. King. Welcome back to "Larry King Live." By the way, the President was fully prepared to go 90 minutes tonight, but he is very tired. As you might imagine, this has been a back-breaking schedule with the death of his mother, the funeral, overseas, back home, full physical, and we mean full physical, right?—

you had what they call top-to-toe—and then out to L.A. So we understand fully, and we'll get to as many calls as we can.

How was the physical, okay?

The President. Great.

Mr. King. Okay, Chevy Chase, Maryland, with President Clinton. Hello.

Somalia

Q. Yes, Mr. President, what do you say to those who say that you and your administration have not done a good job about Somalia? And given the fact that the Somalis don't trust the UNISOM, Somalia is bound to go back to where it was before the U.S. intervention.

Thank you.

Mr. King. Thank you.

The President. Well, I think we have done a good job in Somalia. We've saved a lot of lives there. But when we went there, it was primarily for a humanitarian purpose, to try to save the lives. I was told when I became President that we might be able to withdraw the American troops as early as one month, 2 months into my term. We've now been a full year, and as you know, we've got a few more months to go before we withdraw our troops. But the thing that caused the starvation in Somalia in the beginning was that a lot of people identified with their clans more than the country as a whole, and they were fighting each other. What we have done is to set in motion a process in which the clans can agree to a peaceable way of governing the country among themselves. And if they don't do that, we'd have to stay forever. And we can't do that. So in the end, the people of Somalia are going to have to take responsibility for themselves and their future. And in the meanwhile, we'll keep working to try to keep as many of them alive as we can.

Mr. King. To Plantation, Florida, with President Clinton. Hello.

Trade

Q. Good evening, President Clinton. How would you like to lower the country's trade deficit and balance the payments by giving all Americans and all businesses tax deductions for buying American products, by definition 90 percent made in America with 90 percent parts made in America and 90 percent profits going to American companies?

Mr. King. Would that work?

The President. I wonder whether it would even be——

Mr. King. Legal?

The President. Yes. It would certainly, I think, violate some of our international trade agreements, and it might cause others to retaliate against us. I would like to lower our trade deficit, at least that which is structural and permanent. Our biggest problems are with Japan and now with China.

Mr. King. Are you going over there?

The President. Yes, we're working on both of them. I understand what he's saying, and we do have certain "buy America" preferences in our law, but we have to be very careful how far we go without violating the treaties and agreements we made with other countries who take our products freely.

Deputy Counsel Vincent Foster, Jr.

Mr. King. By the way, something just hit me, and it occurred in the last year. The last time we were here was the night Vince Foster died. It was 6 months——

The President. Six months ago, tonight.

Mr. King. Six months ago, tonight. Do we know a lot more than we did before?

The President. I don't think we know any more than we did in the beginning because I just really don't believe there is any more to know. You know, he left a note; he was profoundly depressed.

Mr. King. You didn't know it?

The President. No. And I talked to him——

Mr. King. The night before, right?

The President. No, I think 2 nights before, and told him to come see me. Or maybe it was the night before, and I told him to come see me on Wednesday, which was the day after he shot himself. It broke my heart. We'd been friends for more than 40 years. We lived next to each other when we were little bitty kids. He was a remarkable man. And I miss him.

Mr. King. This Special Counsel says he's going to look into that, too. Is that fair game?

The President. Well, I think because he had some files that were relevant to—I think he has to look into what was there, and he'll just—whatever he wants to do, you know, let him do that. That's not my business to comment on.

Mr. King. Detroit, Michigan, for President Clinton. Hello.

Q. Hello, President Clinton. Congratulations on your one year in office, and many more.

The President. Thank you.

Crime

Q. I live in Detroit where we have had 629 murders in our State, and I would like to know, what can you do or help us about this issue? And I would just like to congratulate you. You've been a President that has said what you're going to do, and you have done it. And regardless of what the media bashing, I thank you for all that you have done.

The President. Thank you, ma'am.

First of all, let me say that you call from Detroit, which has had a lot of murders. And the Children's Defense Fund said today that a child is killed with a gun every other hour in this country now.

Mr. King. Unbelievable.

The President. Unbelievable, but it's true. But this lady could have called from many other cities in the country and small towns, too.

Let me tell you what I think we can do together. First of all, we've got to strengthen our law enforcement forces. You've got a great new mayor in Detroit in Dennis Archer. He's a longtime friend of mine. I read his inaugural address the other day. It was a brilliant way of getting Detroit together and getting started. But we have to put more police officers on the street, well-trained and working with people in the communities, walking the blocks, working with the kids, preventing crime as well as catching criminals. Our crime bill will put 100,000 more police officers on the street. It's the first priority for Congress when they come back.

Secondly, we passed the Brady bill, but we need to do more on guns. Specifically, we need to limit these automatic, semiautomatic assault weapons that have no purpose other than to kill. And I hope we can reach an accord with the sportsmen and quit arguing about things that are false issues and get an agreement on what the problem is and how to attack it.

Thirdly, people who are repeated serious violent offenders shouldn't be paroled.

And fourthly, you've got to give these kids something to say "yes" to. That is, we have got to go into these really distressed areas and rebuild the bonds of family, community, and work. There's got to be education opportunities. There's got to be job opportunities. There's got to be alternatives to imprisonment, like boot camps. There needs to be drug treatment and drug education programs. We can't have it all on the punishment. These children have to have something to say yes to. If you look at a lot of these high crime areas where the gangs and the drugs and the guns are, they fill the vacuum when family collapses, when work collapses. Most of us organize our lives around work, family, community. And a lot of these young people that are in real trouble today and really vulnerable are living in places where there's not enough community, enough family, or enough work. So I think we have to do both things. And then next year or this year now, I'm going to ask the Congress to work with me and then work with the mayors, the Governors, and others to really get serious about this. We've got to do something about it, and we've got a program that will make a difference.

Mr. King. To Auckland, New Zealand, with President Clinton. Hello.

Q. Greetings from New Zealand, Mr. President.

The President. How are you, sir?

Lebanon

Q. I'm good; how are you? In your Geneva meeting with President Asad of Syria, did you ask him for a withdrawal of the Syrian forces from Lebanon, or a least at time schedule, or Lebanon's going to be the price for peace with Israel? Thank you.

The President. No, no. Lebanon was not the price for peace. He agreed that as part of a comprehensive peace agreement, we should implement the Taif accord which, as you know, calls for an independent Lebanon, free of all foreign forces. And President Asad clearly said that if he could be satisfied from his point of view in having a comprehensive peace agreement with Israel, Israel would also have to have an agreement with Lebanon, an agreement with Jordan, and obviously the agreement with the PLO, and that Lebanon in the end would be left a free and independent state, independent of all foreign forces. We talked about that quite explicitly, and he was quite clear in saying that he would support that.

President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria

Mr. King. Was it tough to sit with Asad, who has been on a list of—as a terror leader for years? I mean, I know Presidents have to do things—was that hard?

The President. Well, it wasn't an easy meeting. I mean, I knew it would be a challenging and a difficult meeting. And I think the most important thing for me was to make it clear that I—my overriding agenda was to do whatever I could to make an honorable, decent, lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. King. Do you think he was sincere?

The President. Yes, I think he really wants to make peace. I think there are a lot of reasons why it's in the interests of the Syrian people and in his own interest to do it, and I think he does. I also made it clear that we still had real differences between us in our bilateral relations, and one of them was what we feel about terrorism. And we talked about it for an hour. And he gave his side, and I gave mine. But the American people are entitled to know that. We talked about it for an hour——

Mr. King. Did he deny that he——

The President. We didn't skirt it. He did in a way, and he defined it in a different way, and he made some arguments about what Syria has done and not done. But the point is, we got it out on the table. He said what he thought; I said what I thought. And maybe most important, we agreed that our Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, and their Foreign Minister, Mr. Shara, would meet and really try to get beyond the charges to very specific things, that we would come forward with specific instances of things that we believe have been done that are a violation of international law that cannot be tolerated, and we would try to work through them. So I think that it was an honorable meeting from my point of view and from the point of view of the United States because of that.

Mr. King. New York City for President Clinton. Hello.

Health Care Reform

Q. A lot of companies are hiring people on a part-time or temporary basis because they don't want to give them benefits. Under your health care plan, how will people who work part-time or freelance have their benefits paid for?

The President. That's a great question. Let me answer the question and make a general point. First of all, under our health care plan, part-time workers will be covered partly by their employers if they work more than 10 hours a week. They will pay a portion of their premiums. And then the rest of the premium will be paid for out of a Government fund set up for that purpose. But part-time workers will be covered, and their employers will have to pay something for their coverage, too. I think that's only fair. Also, if we can do something to slow the dramatic increase in the cost of health care and to make sure all workers are covered, that, I think, will help to stabilize this trend, and more and more employers will be willing to hire new workers on a full-time basis.

And let me say, we're beginning to see that now. Since I became President and we got serious about bringing the deficit down, bringing interest rates down, getting investment up, and employment started coming again, as confidence gets back into this economy, then employers will be able to hire more full-time workers. Then this year, what I have to be able to do is to show the business community that this health care plan of ours is going to stabilize health care costs while providing health care for all Americans through a guaranteed private insurance system, not a Government system but a private system. But we have to ask the employers to pay something for their part-time workers, too. I think that's only fair.

Mr. King. Back with more of this conversation with the President on his one-year in office on Larry King Live. He said he'd be with us every 6 months—holding right to it—he was with us July 20th, this is January 20th. We'll be right back.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

Mr. King. We're back with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. More phone calls—Hawaii. Hello.

Q. Yes, aloha, Larry, and Mr. President.

Mr. King. Aloha.

Q. This is the big island. Mr. President, in regards to sympathy for your mother, I had the opportunity to see your mother catch a fish when she was over here, and she's quite a fisherwoman. A great, great lady. I'm sorry to hear about that.

The President. She loved that tournament.

North Korea

Q. In regards to Korea, what's the possibility of the Koreans getting a nuclear weapon and maybe possibly striking Hawaii first since that's part of the United States now? What would the——

Mr. King. Yes, what is the current status of North Korea?

The President. Well, first let me say, thank you to the gentleman from Hawaii for the condolences for my mother, and mine to the mother of the Governor of Hawaii who passed away today. A wonderful woman.

The Korean—let me just tell you, if you follow the press you know that the intelligence reports are divided on the question of how far the North Koreans have gone in developing a nuclear weapon. But everybody knows they are trying to. Even if they develop one, then there's the question of their delivery capacity, which is in doubt.

I wouldn't say Hawaii is in serious danger right now. What I would say is that we need to keep working very hard and to be very firm about not wanting Korea to join the family of nuclear states. You know, I've been out here working to reduce the number of countries with nuclear weapons, with Ukraine and Kazakhstan and Belarus committing to get rid of their weapons. We are now involved in intense negotiations, and the only thing I can tell you is we're working as hard as we can to be as firm as we can and then to be as also as firm as we can about the security of our people and the South Koreans in the event all does not go well. But we are working very hard, and I certainly have not given up yet on getting the North Koreans to go back into the NPT system and agreeing to let the International Atomic Energy inspectors in there to look at what they're doing. They ought to do it.

The country is so isolated. They're isolated economically. Even China used to be a big ally of theirs. China now does 8 or 10 times as much trade with South Korea as with North Korea. And I think they believe that somehow this gives them some handle on national prestige. I think their best way to be esteemed in the rest of the world is to be a good citizen and give the rest of us a chance to relate to them.

Mr. King. Birmingham, Alabama. Hello.

Criticism of the President

Q. President Clinton, I find your political opponents' relentless efforts to undermine the credibility of your administration absolutely appalling. How much does this cost the American citizen in terms of wasted time and money? And does it affect the U.S. in the international community?

The President. Well, first I thank you for your sentiments and your support. And the most important thing of all is that the American people be able to see through it. When they see the politics of personal destruction, when they see people who obviously don't want to talk about how we're going to get this economy going or how we're going to get health care to all Americans or how we're going to deal with the other problems, crime in the streets, that they see it for what it is.

I think that abroad, frankly, our administration and me, that I personally, that we're able to do what we need to do for the United States. I was very gratified at the reception that I received in Europe and in Russia and throughout our travels. It does take time and attention and distraction when you're dealing with all that stuff, but as I said to Larry earlier, I can deal with it. The only thing that really steams me is what it does to my wife and my daughter, to my family. As a person, that bothers me. But it is not undermining our ability to go forward. Does it take time and attention, is it distracting, is it costly in that sense? You bet it is. It apparently is a part of the price of being in public life in the late 20th century in the United States. So we deal with it. But I just want you to know that having you call just redoubles my determination. And I thank you for that.

Mr. King. Fort Worth, Texas. Hello.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering what the progress on our situation with Bosnia-Herzegovina was? And what has happened to the sense of urgency we once had with that problem?

The President. Well, the United States had a position, as you know. When I took office I offered the Europeans my position, what I thought we ought to do, how I thought we ought to do it to get a quicker peace and, if not get peace, at least to give the government of that country a chance to defend itself. The Europeans disagreed and stoutly resisted. I did not believe that we could unilaterally or should unilaterally send ground troops there. I still think that was the right decision.

So let me tell you where it is now. First of all, don't forget what we have done. We have

led the longest airlift in history, now longer than the Berlin airlift, to give food and medicine to the people there. Secondly, we have enforced a ferocious embargo which has cost the Serbs, in particular, dearly. It has virtually wrecked the Serbian economy. They continue to fight, but they have paid a terrible price for it economically. And thirdly, we have tried to work with our allies at NATO to say that we would use air power if Sarajevo were subject to shelling and strangulation again. And finally, we're supporting the peace process. I hope the parties will agree. You see, the Serbs and the Croats have agreed now. The government had been losing on the ground. They'd been making some gains so they've not agreed to any peace—or they're going to have to give, I think, to Moslems, some access to the water in order to get a peace agreement. They're a little closer than I think it looks, but eventually they're going to have to agree to that or the fighting will go on.

Mr. King. Are you optimistic?

The President. Oh, I've learned not to be optimistic there. I was optimistic a time or two and had my hopes dashed.

Mr. King. ——got to take a break.

The President. But the people are still killing each other because they're fighting over land. They're going to have to reach a territorial accommodation so that all three of those ethnic groups can live with a reasonable breathing room there.

Mr. King. We'll be back with our remaining moments with President Clinton right after this.

[*The network took a commercial break.*]

The Presidency

Mr. King. We're running out of time. Biggest hope as we enter the second year of the Presidency?

The President. That we can get health care for all Americans.

Mr. King. Biggest fear?

The President. That democracy will face reversal somewhere in the world and dash my hopes of having a more peaceful world that has more trade opportunities and less military dangers for the United States.

Mr. King. Are you happy?

The President. Oh, yes, and grateful for the chance to serve and grateful that we're making progress. I know a lot of Americans are still in trouble, and their lives haven't been affected yet, but at least we're facing these tough issues that have been ignored for too long. And everybody here gets up and goes to work every day and works like crazy and I think in a spirit of genuine hopefulness.

Mr. King. Some said that you even like the bad days. I mean, you like this job, right?

The President. I like the job. I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve. The bad days are part of it. I didn't run to have a pleasant time. I ran to have a chance to change the country. And if the bad days come with it, that's part of life. And it's humbling and educational. It keeps you in your place.

Mr. King. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 9 p.m. in the Library at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan

January 21, 1994

Russia

Q. Mr. President, with the key reformers out of the Russian Government, does that mean that radical reform is over in Russia?

The President. I wouldn't go that far. Already Russia has privatized more rapidly than any of the other former Communist countries. They have a much higher rate of privatization than any of the other countries. But what we're concerned about obviously is whether they will be able to manage their inflation problem. And I think the Secretary of the Treasury said it the best: We're going to support democracy, and we're going to support the fact that Russia re-

spects its relationships with other nations, and those are fundamental to our interest. How much economic help they can get from the international community will be directly related to what kinds of reforms they decide to undertake. And that I think is the best connection. They'll have to make those decisions for themselves.

Q. Mr. President, the reformers who were pushed out were in favor of curbing inflation by cutting subsidies. The people who are staying on are the people who fear unemployment. Which is a bigger threat, and do you favor cutting subsidies or easing the cuts?

The President. As I said, that's a decision they'll have to make. But what we offered to do and what we still offer to do is to try to help set up the sort of job training and unemployment and other systems, support systems, that any market economy has to have. You can't blame them for being concerned about the consequences of going to a market economy if they're not able to cope with them. And they need it, and so do all the other countries. And we're prepared to help do what we can. But they'll have to chart their course, and then we'll be there to try to be supportive.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Your Majesty, after the signing of the accords, the economic accords between the PLO and the Jordanians and other agreements, how do you see the coordination continuing, and when do you expect to meet with Mr. Yasser Arafat? And how do you see the peace process going in the next peace round, sir?

King Hussein. I believe that—[*inaudible*]—very, very well and recent developments of—[*inaudible*]—encouraging. As far as coordinating the Palestinian—[*inaudible*]. And it's all part of the—[*inaudible*]—everyone, I believe is, the majority of the people are convinced that this is the time and that you must move rapidly to—[*inaudible*]. But we're working on our agenda and all the items there, and I hope that the crowning achievement will be a peace treaty.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:15 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Adjustment of the Deficit
January 21, 1994

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

Pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended ("Act") (2 U.S.C. 904(c)), notification is hereby provided of my decision that the adjustment of the maximum deficit amount, as allowed under section 253(g)(1)(B) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 903(g)(1)(B)), shall be made.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

The President's Radio Address
January 22, 1994

Good morning. This week we saw how events beyond our control can test the courage and fortitude of our people.

For many in the eastern half of our Nation, life is beginning to return to normal after the harshest stretch of winter in memory. And in southern California, there was another kind of disaster. I went to Los Angeles and saw the devastation that can occur in just a matter of moments in an earthquake. Freeways were

crumbled, homes were destroyed, lives were shattered.

But even in this kind of adversity, or maybe even because of it, our people have become more determined. We've seen neighbor helping neighbor and total strangers performing acts of quiet heroism. In addition to Federal funds we've pledged, our recovery efforts are being coordinated on the site by the head of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, James Lee Witt, and HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, who are looking for more ways to help the quake's victims.

Los Angeles will come back. Together with the people of Los Angeles, we'll help to make that happen. That's the American way. At every crucial moment in our history, our people have somehow found the courage, the will, and the way to come together in the face of a challenge and to meet it head on. For the last year, we've been doing just that here in Washington.

It was one year ago this week that I took office as your President. The challenges before us were many. We faced a debt that has been mortgaging our future; we were burdened by the cynicism created when Government does wrong by people who do right. For two decades, the middle class had been working longer and harder just to hold its ground with stagnant wages. Seemingly secure jobs were lost and, along with declining wages, people lost the security of stable and reliable health insurance.

Well, after one year, the challenges aren't gone, but together we are surmounting many of them. We've moved to offer opportunity, challenge our people to assume more responsibility, and restore a sense of community to our land.

We built the foundation for a lasting economic recovery. We've broken gridlock and made Government an instrument of our common purpose as a people. And from meetings in Moscow to promote democracy to meetings in Tokyo to revive the world economy, our seriousness of purpose is winning respect around the world and getting results.

Here at home we've transformed America's agenda, addressing problems long deferred or denied. Now the debate is not over whether to provide health security but how and how quickly, not whether to reform welfare but how, not whether to make well-intentioned but ultimately futile efforts to protect American workers from economic change but how to give them the tools and the skills to make those changes their friend. At long last, we're addressing our challenges with clarity and confidence instead of running away from them.

We built the foundations for a real recovery that will endure and enrich the lives of all our people. Of course, the recovery is not yet complete. Many Americans haven't felt it yet, and our work can't be done until every American has the security to embrace the future without fear. We do have a long way to go. But clearly, we've turned the corner, and we're moving in the right direction.

We passed an economic plan that reflects our new approach: doing more with less, cutting Government spending that doesn't work, and investing in people and in what does work. Our plan will reduce the deficit by $500 billion over 5 years, cutting $255 billion in spending.

Before our plan passed, the deficit for next year alone was projected at $300 billion. That's $300 billion. But I've just learned from our Director of the Office of Management and Budget Leon Panetta that the deficit projection for next fiscal year is now under $180 billion, over $120 billion less, thanks to the enactment of the economic plan. That's lower even than our initial projections.

The fact is, if we stay on this plan, we will have cut the deficit in half as a percentage of our national income by 1996. But we must pass health care reform if we're going to keep the deficit going downward for the long haul and eventually bring the budget into balance.

Slowly but surely, our economic plan is creating new opportunity and providing new security for middle class families. Today more of these families are buying cars and homes or refinancing their mortgages because deficit reduction has helped to push interest rates to record lows.

In our steady aim to create jobs and increase incomes, we've provided bold new initiatives for small businesses, encouraging growth in an important source of new jobs. Last year alone the private economy created 1.6 million new jobs, 1½ times as many as in the previous 4 years. We've reinforced these gains by passing NAFTA, by lifting export controls, by tearing down barriers to trade. All of these will translate into more jobs.

With the family and medical leave law, we've allowed Americans the freedom to take care of a sick loved one or a newborn without worrying that they'll lose their jobs for doing so. This

is an important thing because restoring our social fabric is critical. And providing the opportunity for work, protecting the worker, and helping to keep families and communities together are crucial elements in achieving that social fabric. And so is protecting our citizens' safety on the streets, in homes, and in our schools. That's why we enacted the Brady bill, to put common sense into gun selling, and why when Congress returns next week, I will ask them to quickly pass the crime bill and send it to me for signing.

Step by step, we are reviving our economy, renewing our sense of common community, and restoring our people's confidence that our Nation can be strong at home and abroad and our Government can work for the benefit of ordinary Americans.

Yes, we've done a lot, but we have so much more to do.

As we enter this second year of taking on these challenges together, we know this: What's important is not just how many programs we pass but how many lives we improve. What's important is not just what we do for people but also what we can help our people to do for themselves. Ultimately, that will be the measure of our success.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6 p.m. on January 21 in the East Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on January 22.

Teleconference Remarks on the Los Angeles Earthquake

January 24, 1994

The President. Hello.

Q. Hello, Mr. President.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. It's good to hear your voice. I've got Federico, Henry, and James Lee on the phone?

Q. Yes, sir.

The President. That's great. Well, I know you've all been working very hard. I know there was a problem with the overcrowding at the disaster assistance centers at first, but I'm really pleased by the work you've done. And I was glad to note in this morning's Los Angeles Times an acknowledgement that we'd gotten those centers up more quickly than in previous disasters and that things seem to be going better. But why don't you all give me a briefing. James Lee, why don't you start and just give me an overall briefing about where we are.

[*Federal Emergency Management Agency Director James Lee Witt explained the emergency response team's efforts to assist earthquake victims and stated that FEMA was in the process of providing applicants with disaster assistance checks.*]

The President. How long will it take to get the checks out?

Director Witt. We had checks coming out yesterday, and we will have thousands of checks coming out each day, and there will be more each day coming out. We're processing them very quick.

The President. What about the language barriers?

Director Witt. We have worked with Secretary Cisneros and Secretary Pena and other Cabinet Secretaries and the State and local emergency management people in all of the language barriers, in printing every type of information in every language of that community.

The President. That's good. You mentioned Secretary Riley. I know he's on the way back, but we got a report from him, and I've already directed the Department of Education to send $7 million to the school district there to provide emergency services for the students. That may not be enough, but it will get them started anyway. And I'm glad to hear that.

Henry, where are we on the housing situation?

[*Secretary Henry Cisneros discussed the availability of tents and shelters for victims who lost their homes, as well as use of a voucher system to provide permanent housing.*]

The President. You know, there were a lot of other communities affected. What about their housing? I mean, what kind of system do we

have to make sure we get out there to the other communities, too?

[*Secretary Cisneros stated that HUD was working closely with housing authorities in surrounding communities.*]

The President. Now, I know that only a minority of the houses had earthquake insurance, but what about those that had insurance? Are the insurance companies there? Are they speeding up payment? What's going to happen there?

Director Witt. Yes, sir, they are there. They're in there speeding up the payments as quick as possible.

[*Secretary Cisneros explained that many people did not have earthquake insurance because of high premiums and high deductibles.*]

The President. Is the voucher system the preferred way of dealing with this? I mean, are you going to come back and—will that be part of the supplemental that Leon Panetta sends up to Congress?

Secretary Cisneros. We've extended in this first effort 10,000 vouchers. I believe we probably will need to be on the safe side and ask for more. So the answer is, yes, it will be in the supplemental.

The President. Federico, what about the transportation situation? How are we doing with cleaning up the debris and at least preparing to go to work?

[*Secretary Federico Peña described Federal, State, and local efforts to rebuild the highway system and deal with traffic congestion.*]

The President. What about getting—if we had more rail cars, would they be full?

Secretary Pena. Yes. We have——

The President. What do we have to do to get more cars? And what about the buses? How many buses are out there? How many more can we get?

[*Secretary Peña discussed cooperation between Federal agencies and private businesses to provide more buses and rail cars to help deal with the transportation crisis.*]

The President. On the contracting work, we heard from the labor council out here, even here at the White House, they said they really wanted to help and do whatever they could to make sure that all the work was speeded up and as much was done as possible. So I know you're getting good cooperation from the labor people out there, too.

[*Secretary Peña stated that contractors and city mayors had been very helpful in providing suggestions and assistance.*]

The President. The Labor Department, we were in contact with them, and I know they've already committed another $3 million just to pay people to do the emergency and clean-up work. But I think the fact that we're ahead of schedule on that is important. And I know you're going to follow up on the question of how quickly then highway construction can be done, because, obviously, if you could do longer work weeks or 24-hour days in some of those places, it would make a big difference.

[*Secretary Peña explained that construction workers were working long hours to repair the highway system.*]

The President. Well, that's great. I was informed right before I came out to talk to you that Leon Panetta will be in a position to give me a report today, as I had asked last week, on the supplemental. Obviously, the mayor and all the folks, the local leadership in the Los Angeles area and the State folks have been very good about helping us to get the loss figures. So I think we'll be in pretty good shape today to know a little more than we have known for the last few days on what we can ask for from Congress when they come back. So I will follow up on that end.

I'm very encouraged that the lines have gone down some at the disaster assistance centers. And I just hope that we can just keep on top of all this. I appreciate the fact that all of you have stayed out there. I think that has been very good. And again, I want to compliment all the local folks. I'm sure there are a lot of people out there who have hardly slept since I was there a few days ago. So you all just keep your chins up and keep working at it. And we'll do what we can here to get the supplemental passed in a hurry.

[*Secretary Cisneros stated that he would be working with church leaders and volunteer services to provide help to those who are having difficulty dealing with their experiences.*]

The President. That's terrific. I think they can do an enormous amount of good. Cardinal Mahony obviously is very concerned about these

things, and he's got an awful lot of able leaders there among the priests and the nuns who can, I think, make a real difference. I've been in a lot of their schools, their community organizations. And there's also a very large evangelical community there and other religious groups. So I'm glad you're involving them; they can make a huge difference.

If there's anything else we need to know back here, let us know. But we'll be able to give you a report back about what we think the supplemental will look like probably before the end of the day. And then we'll just have to keep working together closely over the next few days as the situation unfolds. And if you know more—because it will take a few days for Congress to act on this, obviously, so we'll have some time. But I hope we can nail down the broad outlines this afternoon.

Thank you very much, and give my regards to the mayor and everybody else out there.

Secretary Cisneros. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:59 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Roger Cardinal Mahony, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Exchange With Reporters
January 24, 1994

Secretary of Defense Nominee

Q. Mr. President, how close are you to naming a Defense Secretary?

The President. I think we'll have an announcement today, just in a few hours.

Q. Is Bill Perry your choice, Mr. President?

The President. We'll have an announcement. You can wait and see.

Q. Why do you think it took so long, and what do you account for what seemed to be a reluctance by a number of people to take on the job?

The President. Well, I don't think it has taken that long. I mean, it's been, what, a week—less than a week since Mr. Inman said he didn't want the job.

Q. And at least two people who reportedly have said they weren't interested in the job, and Mr. Perry——

The President. But the stories are basically inaccurate. The only accurate story is the one that I have confirmed, which is that I talked to Senator Nunn during the transition before I became President, based on the fact that he was not only the head of the Senate Armed Services Committee but a longtime personal friend of mine and someone I sought advice from on these matters. And he told me then that he was not interested in being Secretary of Defense. And the only thing I did was to call him back and make sure he had the same position then that he had now.

The job was absolutely not offered to anyone else, absolutely, categorically not offered to anyone else. And it wasn't really offered to him. I just said, "Are you still in the same position you were in before?" And he said, "That's right." He said, "I'm doing what I think I should be doing." But he knows, I think—I don't want to overstate it. I think Sam Nunn always knew that if he were ever interested in that job, that I was very open to that. But—so the decision—then, after that, after it was clear that he was in the same position he was always in, I went about trying to pick a successor. I've done it, and I expect to have an announcement.

Q. Do you think you can twist someone's arm to take it?

The President. No.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, there have been new calls for air strikes in Bosnia. You talked about that a lot over this past trip to Europe. Can you give us any update? And what about what you said was your resolve to do something about this?

The President. Well, what I said was that NATO should not reaffirm its position unless the circumstances that they set out for bombing, if those circumstances occurred they'd be willing to go forward. Now, I presume you're referring to what was said in the European Parliament yesterday.

Q. And also the President of Bosnia calling for air strikes, too.

The President. Well, the President of Bosnia, yes—but what the NATO leaders, what the others voted for was to leave on the table the proviso that bombing could be done in order to relieve Sarajevo if that were appropriate or to further the U.N. mission by opening the airstrip at Tuzla or, if necessary, to facilitate the transfer of troops from Canadian to Dutch at Srebrenica. Now, that is a very rather narrow NATO mandate.

And what happened was as soon as the meeting was over, it was not clear how strongly or firmly some of them felt about that. But I think it's also clear that the U.N. Secretary General, who has a say in some of those decisions, but not all of them, based on what the international law is now, is still opposed to it. And I don't have any information that leads me to believe that the other NATO allies, that the heads of state as opposed to people in the European Parliament, have changed their mind about whether there should be any bombing at this time.

That's all I can tell you.

Q. What about——

The President. Let me say, I believe in general what I've always believed. There's not going to be a settlement in Bosnia until the sides decide that they have more to gain from signing a peace agreement than by continuing the fighting. And now the government finally has been able to get some arms, even through it was, in my view, unfairly the only side subject to the arms embargo—they've been able to get some weapons. And they appear to be, the Bosnian government, most reluctant to sign a peace agreement at this time. But if they can work out something on access to the sea and protection of Sarajevo and then the Moslem enclaves to the east, perhaps we can still get an agreement. But there will not be—the killing is a function of a political fight between three factions. Until they agree to quit doing it, it's going to continue. And I don't think that the international community has the capacity to stop people within the nation from their civil war until they decide to do it.

Now, there are things we can do to retard it, to keep it within bounds, to keep it within humanitarian limits. And I wouldn't rule out any of those options. But there has been no decision by anybody to enter the war on the side of one of the combatants, which is what some would like. But there has been no decision to do it. They're going to have to make up their own mind to quit killing each other, and the circumstances are, in fact, on the battlefield are somewhat different than they have been for the previous 12 months. But I hope that it means that it's more likely that there can be a settlement, and I still have some hope that that will occur.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:06 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks Announcing the Nomination of William Perry To Be Secretary of Defense and an Exchange With Reporters

January 24, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, and good afternoon. I want to welcome all of you here, especially the distinguished Members of Congress who are here and the members of Secretary Perry's family, whom he will introduce later.

One year ago I selected Dr. Bill Perry to serve as my Deputy Secretary of Defense. Today, based on his lifetime of accomplishment and his solid leadership at the Pentagon, I'm proud to announce my intention to nominate him as the next Secretary of Defense.

He has the right skills and management experience for the job. He has the right vision for the job. He has served with real distinction as both Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense. For years and throughout his service this past year he has been at the cutting edge on defense issues.

Years ago he had a vision of the power of Stealth technology, technology that helped the

United States to win the Persian Gulf war and helped save American lives. He's been a leader in reforming the Pentagon's procurement process and improving financial accountability. And I expect he'll have more to say about that today and in the weeks and months ahead.

He's been instrumental in developing a defense budget for the coming fiscal year that protects the readiness of our forces and promotes our aggressive efforts at defense conversion and the development of dual-use technologies and the creation and the preservation of American jobs. And he played an important role in the recent breakthrough to eliminate Ukraine's nuclear weapons.

He brings a broad and valuable background to this job. He has proven experience in the private sector, is chairman, director, and founder of several successful defense-related corporations. He's served in the United States Army. His academic career as a professor of mathematics and engineering has also contributed to our Nation's security. And in every aspect of his work, Bill Perry has earned high respect from members of both parties, in the Congress, in the military, among those who study military strategy, and in the business community.

He's demonstrated leadership, integrity, and a mastery of his field. Time and again, we heard about him what I have come to know personally: Bill Perry is a real pro. You can depend on him. That's why Secretary Aspin and many others recommended that I select Dr. Perry for this post.

Let me note with appreciation that Secretary Aspin has agreed to stay, as he said he would, until his successor is confirmed.

Now we have a lot of work ahead of us. We need to continue reshaping our forces for this new era so that they remain the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared, and the most strongly motivated in the world. We must implement the recommendations of the bottom-up review. We must continue to deal with the new threats of weapons proliferation and terrorism. We must continue our aggressive work at defense conversion to save and create American jobs and to maintain our industrial base that is so critical for our national defense. And we must reform the procurement process.

Bill Perry comes extraordinarily well-prepared to meet these challenges. I hope and I trust that Congress will quickly confirm him. And I look forward to working closely with him as an integral part of the national security team. I think he will do a remarkable job.

Dr. Perry.

[*At this point, Defense Secretary-designate Perry made brief remarks.*]

Secretary of Defense Nominee

Q. Did you have to be persuaded to take this job, and what do you think will be the toughest part of it?

Deputy Secretary Perry. No, I did not have to be persuaded to take the job. I met with the President to discuss this job Friday morning, and I left that meeting fully prepared to take on the job. I had a meeting with my family that evening, because it's not just me that's getting into this job. I put them under considerable strains when I do it, too. And we had a follow-up meeting on Saturday morning with the White House where I told them that if I had to accept the job at that time, my answer would have to be no.

I met then with the Vice President. And he told me I could take my time, take some more time on the decision, meet with my family further. I took advantage of that, and on Sunday afternoon I called the Vice President back and said if you still want me for your Secretary of Defense I'm eager to serve.

Q. Dr. Perry, why did you have second thoughts?

Deputy Secretary Perry. The second question here——

Q. Sir, why didn't you say yes immediately? What made you have to think about it?

Deputy Secretary Perry. I tried to explain that. It was because I did not want to drive my family into my decision without their support. And so I wanted to wait until I had the full support for it.

Q. Mr. President, why was this job so hard to fill?

The President. It wasn't easy to fill—it wasn't hard to fill, I mean. We had an abundance of talented people to consider, but I asked Secretary Perry, and he said yes. It wasn't difficult at all. I mean, I can't say any more than you already know about what happened in the previous example. But we didn't go on a big search here. We had a very short list, and I quickly narrowed it to one. I had an interview with one person. I asked him if he'd take the job, and he did. I don't think that qualifies as dif-

ficult. Now, I have had some difficult positions to fill, this one wasn't.

Q. Well, what do you think he brings to the job that your current Defense Secretary did not?

The President. I don't think the two things are related. Secretary Aspin made his statement last month; we had our press conference on that, we answered your questions. It's got nothing to do with what we said here today.

Women in the Military

Q. Mr. Perry, are you going to go along with Secretary Aspin's views on military women in planes and ships and——

Deputy Secretary Perry. Yes.

The President. Good for you, Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service].

Deputy Secretary Perry. Secretary Aspin created many important legacies in his year. I mentioned the bottom-up review, his work on all of the social aspects in the military. In particular, his advancement of the women in combat is one which I enthusiastically support.

Secretary of Defense Nominee

Q. Dr. Perry, is there anything at all in your background that's come up over this past weekend of vetting that could conceivably cause you or the administration any problems during the Senate confirmation process? In that regard, I'm specifically also referring to the so-called "nanny problem."

Deputy Secretary Perry. Nothing has come up that I believe would cause me any problems in the confirmation process.

Russia

Q. Dr. Perry, do you think that with the return to conservative government in Moscow, that there's a possibility there may be a new cold war starting? I mean, it's early, but are there trends?

Deputy Secretary Perry. I would observe that we cannot control the events in other countries, including Russia, but we can influence them. And I believe the President has adopted a program to assist not just the Russians but many of the nations in the former Soviet Union to help stabilize their economy, and this is the most constructive thing we can do to minimize the chance of that unfortunate disaster occurring.

Defense Budget

Q. Was your answer categorical about the nanny question, Dr. Perry?

Q. What about the current budgetary crunch, sir, that the Pentagon faces and the possible difficulty you may have in actually carrying out the blueprint that the President has laid out?

Deputy Secretary Perry. In order to carry out the bottom-up review with the funds that are posed for it, we will have to manage the Pentagon very well. We will have to have real acquisition reform. We will have to have careful planning and management of our programs. We have to do all of this while we're maintaining a very high level of readiness and a level of morale and cohesion in the military forces. It is a difficult management job, and I believe it's doable, and that's what I'm undertaking to do.

Thank you.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:08 p.m. on the State Floor at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict
January 24, 1994

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through September 15, 1993. The current report covers the remainder of September through November 15, 1993.

On September 20, 1993, the United Nations Security Council responded to the September 14 Report of the Secretary General on his good offices in Cyprus. The reply was contained in a Presidential letter and conveyed the Security Council's continued support for the Secretary General's efforts. In the letter, the Security Council reiterated the obligation of both parties

to cooperate fully and without delay in reaching an overall framework on the package of proposals. It also expressed the Council's recognition of the important role that Turkey could play in this effort.

On October 4, Under Secretary of State Peter Tarnoff met with Cyprus Foreign Minister Michaelides in New York City. Mr. Tarnoff stressed that the moment is ripe for pushing toward a resolution of the Cyprus conflict. They discussed proposals for an island-wide census as requested by the United Nations and the demilitarization of certain areas of the island. Mr. Tarnoff welcomed all ideas that might stimulate discussion and said that he appreciated the Cypriot's willingness to discuss new initiatives.

Ambassador John Maresca, U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, met with British Under Secretary Greenstock in London on October 7. Mr. Greenstock briefed the Ambassador on his September 16–18 visit to Cyprus. They discussed benefits for both communities in the Secretary General's confidence-building measures (CBMs), and agreed to the need to resume the intercommunal dialogue quickly after the Turkish Cypriot elections. He also stated that it was important to keep a dialogue open with both sides.

On October 12, Turkey dispatched former Deputy Prime Minister Inonu to northern Cyprus to help resolve the dispute among the Turkish Cypriot leadership about the election issue. Turkey's intercession was helpful in bringing about a compromise that enabled the Turkish Cypriots to hold their elections December 12.

On October 15, I met with Prime Minister Ciller of Turkey and expressed my personal interest in a just and permanent solution being quickly achieved on Cyprus. I also reiterated our position that Turkey must use its influence and good offices with the Turkish Cypriots. She assured me that Turkey fully supports the goal of a resolution of the Cyprus problem and would further explain the benefits of the CBMs to the Turkish Cypriots.

The first U.N. teams of experts began their review of the Varosha/Nicosia Airport CBMs in Cyprus on October 17. The teams established at the request of the Secretary General and endorsed by the Security Council, had the mandate to examine the various aspects of the package of CBMs related to the re-opening of the fenced area of Varosha and Nicosia International Airport.

United Nations Special Cyprus Negotiator Clark visited Cyprus November 7–10 where he met with the U.N. "experts teams" and with President Clerides and Mr. Denktash. He said that preliminary results from the teams showed tremendous benefits for the two communities. Mr. Clark also stated that progress on the CBMs must be seen by the end of January. A delay in implementing the CBMs, he added, could cause serious difficulty, and might result in the Security Council considering possible "alternative measures." Mr. Clark again stressed the need for Turkey to use its good offices in ensuring a quick resumption of the negotiating process.

Although there has been little movement during this period because of the elections in northern Cyprus, I am pleased to note that all involved have indicated a willingness to return to the negotiating table. Our position is well known—we expect both sides to return to the negotiations soon after the December 12 elections. As I noted several times, I firmly believe that the Secetary General's package of confidence-building measures is fair and balanced, and that its acceptance by both sides will hasten a final overall framework agreement. I hope that in my next report, I will be able to state that negotiations have resumed and that progress is being made.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Nomination for Assistant Secretaries of the Army and Air Force
January 24, 1994

The President announced his intention today to nominate three assistant secretaries at the Pentagon: Gilbert F. Decker to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development and Acquisition; Robert F. Hale to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management; and Sara E. Lister to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserves.

"As I ask William Perry to take over the reins at the Department of Defense, I am pleased to be continuing the process of ensuring that we have a strong team at every level of the Pentagon," said the President. "I expect Gilbert Decker, Robert Hale, and Sara Lister to all play an important role in keeping our armed services the best in the world."

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

Nomination for the Federal Maritime Commission
January 24, 1994

The President announced today his intention to nominate Joe Scroggins, Jr., to be Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission.

"Joe Scroggins is a talented public servant with an outstanding knowledge of maritime issues. I thank him for his service on the Maritime Commission," said the President.

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

Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union
January 25, 1994

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the 103d Congress, my fellow Americans:

I'm not at all sure what speech is in the TelePrompter tonight—[*laughter*]—but I hope we can talk about the state of the Union.

I ask you to begin by recalling the memory of the giant who presided over this Chamber with such force and grace. Tip O'Neill liked to call himself "a man of the House." And he surely was that. But even more, he was a man of the people, a bricklayer's son who helped to build the great American middle class. Tip O'Neill never forgot who he was, where he came from, or who sent him here. Tonight he's smiling down on us for the first time from the Lord's gallery. But in his honor, may we, too, always remember who we are, where we come from, and who sent us here. If we do that we will return over and over again to the principle that if we simply give ordinary people equal opportunity, quality education, and a fair shot at the American dream, they will do extraordinary things.

We gather tonight in a world of changes so profound and rapid that all nations are tested. Our American heritage has always been to master such change, to use it to expand opportunity at home and our leadership abroad. But for too long and in too many ways, that heritage was abandoned, and our country drifted.

For 30 years, family life in America has been breaking down. For 20 years, the wages of working people have been stagnant or declining. For the 12 years of trickle-down economics, we built a false prosperity on a hollow base as our national debt quadrupled. From 1989 to 1992, we experienced the slowest growth in a half century. For too many families, even when both

parents were working, the American dream has been slipping away.

In 1992, the American people demanded that we change. A year ago I asked all of you to join me in accepting responsibility for the future of our country. Well, we did. We replaced drift and deadlock with renewal and reform. And I want to thank every one of you here who heard the American people, who broke gridlock, who gave them the most successful teamwork between a President and a Congress in 30 years.

This Congress produced a budget that cut the deficit by half a trillion dollars, cut spending, and raised income taxes on only the wealthiest Americans. This Congress produced tax relief for millions of low-income workers to reward work over welfare. It produced NAFTA. It produced the Brady bill, now the Brady law. And thank you, Jim Brady, for being here, and God bless you, sir.

This Congress produced tax cuts to reduce the taxes of 9 out of 10 small businesses who use the money to invest more and create more jobs. It produced more research and treatment for AIDS, more childhood immunizations, more support for women's health research, more affordable college loans for the middle class, a new national service program for those who want to give something back to their country and their communities for higher education, a dramatic increase in high-tech investments to move us from a defense to a domestic high-tech economy. This Congress produced a new law, the motor voter bill, to help millions of people register to vote. It produced family and medical leave. All passed; all signed into law with not one single veto.

These accomplishments were all commitments I made when I sought this office. And in fairness, they all had to be passed by you in this Congress. But I am persuaded that the real credit belongs to the people who sent us here, who pay our salaries, who hold our feet to the fire.

But what we do here is really beginning to change lives. Let me just give you one example. I will never forget what the family and medical leave law meant to just one father I met early one Sunday morning in the White House. It was unusual to see a family there touring early Sunday morning, but he had his wife and his three children there, one of them in a wheelchair. I came up, and after we had our picture taken and had a little visit, I was walking off and that man grabbed me by the arm and he said, "Mr. President, let me tell you something. My little girl here is desperately ill. She's probably not going to make it. But because of the family leave law, I was able to take time off to spend with her, the most important time I ever spent in my life, without losing my job and hurting the rest of my family. It means more to me than I will ever be able to say. Don't you people up here ever think what you do doesn't make a difference. It does."

Though we are making a difference, our work has just begun. Many Americans still haven't felt the impact of what we've done. The recovery still hasn't touched every community or created enough jobs. Incomes are still stagnant. There's still too much violence and not enough hope in too many places. Abroad, the young democracies we are strongly supporting still face very difficult times and look to us for leadership. And so tonight, let us resolve to continue the journey of renewal, to create more and better jobs, to guarantee health security for all, to reward work over welfare, to promote democracy abroad, and to begin to reclaim our streets from violent crime and drugs and gangs, to renew our own American community.

Last year we began to put our house in order by tackling the budget deficit that was driving us toward bankruptcy. We cut $255 billion in spending, including entitlements, and over 340 separate budget items. We froze domestic spending and used honest budget numbers.

Led by the Vice President, we launched a campaign to reinvent Government. We cut staff, cut perks, even trimmed the fleet of Federal limousines. After years of leaders whose rhetoric attacked bureaucracy but whose action expanded it, we will actually reduce it by 252,000 people over the next 5 years. By the time we have finished, the Federal bureaucracy will be at its lowest point in 30 years.

Because the deficit was so large and because they benefited from tax cuts in the 1980's, we did ask the wealthiest Americans to pay more to reduce the deficit. So on April 15th, the American people will discover the truth about what we did last year on taxes. Only the top 1—[*applause*]—yes, listen, the top 1.2 percent of Americans, as I said all along, will pay higher income tax rates. Let me repeat: Only the wealthiest 1.2 percent of Americans will face higher income tax rates, and no one else will. And that is the truth.

Of course, there were, as there always are in politics, naysayers who said this plan wouldn't work. But they were wrong. When I became President, the experts predicted that next year's deficit would be $300 billion. But because we acted, those same people now say the deficit is going to be under $180 billion, 40 percent lower than was previously predicted.

Our economic program has helped to produce the lowest core inflation rate and the lowest interest rates in 20 years. And because those interest rates are down, business investment and equipment is growing at 7 times the rate of the previous 4 years. Auto sales are way up. Home sales are at a record high. Millions of Americans have refinanced their homes. And our economy has produced 1.6 million private sector jobs in 1993, more than were created in the previous 4 years combined.

The people who supported this economic plan should be proud of its early results, proud. But everyone in this Chamber should know and acknowledge that there is more to do.

Next month I will send you one of the toughest budgets ever presented to Congress. It will cut spending in more than 300 programs, eliminate 100 domestic programs, and reform the ways in which governments buy goods and services. This year we must again make the hard choices to live within the hard spending ceilings we have set. We must do it. We have proved we can bring the deficit down without choking off recovery, without punishing seniors or the middle class, and without putting our national security at risk. If you will stick with this plan, we will post 3 consecutive years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman lived in the White House. And once again, the buck stops here.

Our economic plan also bolsters our strength and our credibility around the world. Once we reduced the deficit and put the steel back into our competitive edge, the world echoed with the sound of falling trade barriers. In one year, with NAFTA, with GATT, with our efforts in Asia and the national export strategy, we did more to open world markets to American products than at any time in the last two generations. That means more jobs and rising living standards for the American people, low deficits, low inflation, low interest rates, low trade barriers, and high investments. These are the building blocks of our recovery. But if we want to take full advantage of the opportunities before us in the global economy, you all know we must do more.

As we reduce defense spending, I ask Congress to invest more in the technologies of tomorrow. Defense conversion will keep us strong militarily and create jobs for our people here at home. As we protect our environment, we must invest in the environmental technologies of the future which will create jobs. This year we will fight for a revitalized Clean Water Act and a Safe Drinking Water Act and a reformed Superfund program. And the Vice President is right, we must also work with the private sector to connect every classroom, every clinic, every library, every hospital in America into a national information superhighway by the year 2000. Think of it: Instant access to information will increase productivity, will help to educate our children. It will provide better medical care. It will create jobs. And I call on the Congress to pass legislation to establish that information superhighway this year.

As we expand opportunity and create jobs, no one can be left out. We must continue to enforce fair lending and fair housing and all civil rights laws, because America will never be complete in its renewal until everyone shares in its bounty.

But we all know, too, we can do all these things—put our economic house in order, expand world trade, target the jobs of the future, guarantee equal opportunity—but if we're honest we'll all admit that this strategy still cannot work unless we also give our people the education, training, and skills they need to seize the opportunities of tomorrow.

We must set tough, world-class academic and occupational standards for all our children and give our teachers and students the tools they need to meet them. Our Goals 2000 proposal will empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas like chartering their schools to be run by private corporations or having more public school choice, to do whatever they wish to do as long as we measure every school by one high standard: Are our children learning what they need to know to compete and win in the global economy? Goals 2000 links world-class standards to grassroots reforms. And I hope Congress will pass it without delay.

Our school-to-work initiative will for the first time link school to the world of work, providing at least one year of apprenticeship beyond high school. After all, most of the people we're

counting on to build our economic future won't graduate from college. It's time to stop ignoring them and start empowering them.

We must literally transform our outdated unemployment system into a new reemployment system. The old unemployment system just sort of kept you going while you waited for your old job to come back. We've got to have a new system to move people into new and better jobs, because most of those old jobs just don't come back. And we know that the only way to have real job security in the future, to get a good job with a growing income, is to have real skills and the ability to learn new ones. So we've got to streamline today's patchwork of training programs and make them a source of new skills for our people who lose their jobs. Reemployment, not unemployment, must become the centerpiece of our economic renewal. I urge you to pass it in this session of Congress.

And just as we must transform our unemployment system, so must we also revolutionize our welfare system. It doesn't work. It defies our values as a nation. If we value work, we can't justify a system that makes welfare more attractive than work if people are worried about losing their health care. If we value responsibility, we can't ignore the $34 billion in child support absent parents ought to be paying to millions of parents who are taking care of their children. If we value strong families, we can't perpetuate a system that actually penalizes those who stay together. Can you believe that a child who has a child gets more money from the Government for leaving home than for staying home with a parent or a grandparent? That's not just bad policy, it's wrong. And we ought to change it.

I worked on this problem for years before I became President, with other Governors and with Members of Congress of both parties and with the previous administration of another party. I worked on it with people who were on welfare, lots of them. And I want to say something to everybody here who cares about this issue. The people who most want to change this system are the people who are dependent on it. They want to get off welfare. They want to go back to work. They want to do right by their kids.

I once had a hearing when I was a Governor, and I brought in people on welfare from all over America who had found their way to work. The woman from my State who testified was asked this question: What's the best thing about being off welfare and in a job? And without blinking an eye, she looked at 40 Governors, and she said, "When my boy goes to school and they say, 'What does your mother do for a living?' he can give an answer." These people want a better system, and we ought to give it to them.

Last year we began this. We gave the States more power to innovate because we know that a lot of great ideas come from outside Washington, and many States are already using it. Then this Congress took a dramatic step. Instead of taxing people with modest incomes into poverty, we helped them to work their way out of poverty by dramatically increasing the earned-income tax credit. It will lift 15 million working families out of poverty, rewarding work over welfare, making it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents. Now that's real welfare reform.

But there is more to be done. This spring I will send you a comprehensive welfare reform bill that builds on the Family Support Act of 1988 and restores the basic values of work and responsibility. We'll say to teenagers, "If you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give you a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together"; say to absent parents who aren't paying their child support, "If you're not providing for your children, we'll garnish your wages, suspend your license, track you across State lines, and if necessary, make some of you work off what you owe." People who bring children into this world cannot and must not walk away from them. But to all those who depend on welfare, we should offer ultimately a simple compact. We'll provide the support, the job training, the child care you need for up to 2 years. But after that, anyone who can work, must, in the private sector wherever possible, in community service if necessary. That's the only way we'll ever make welfare what it ought to be, a second chance, not a way of life.

I know it will be difficult to tackle welfare reform in 1994 at the same time we tackle health care. But let me point out, I think it is inevitable and imperative. It is estimated that one million people are on welfare today because it's the only way they can get health care coverage for their children. Those who choose to leave welfare for jobs without health benefits, and many entry-level jobs don't have health benefits, find themselves in the incredible position

of paying taxes that help to pay for health care coverage for those who made the other choice, to stay on welfare. No wonder people leave work and go back to welfare to get health care coverage. We've got to solve the health care problem to have real welfare reform.

So this year, we will make history by reforming the health care system. And I would say to you, all of you, my fellow public servants, this is another issue where the people are way ahead of the politicians. That may not be popular with either party, but it happens to be the truth.

You know, the First Lady has received now almost a million letters from people all across America and from all walks of life. I'd like to share just one of them with you. Richard Anderson of Reno, Nevada, lost his job and with it, his health insurance. Two weeks later his wife, Judy, suffered a cerebral aneurysm. He rushed her to the hospital, where she stayed in intensive care for 21 days. The Andersons' bills were over $120,000. Although Judy recovered and Richard went back to work at $8 an hour, the bills were too much for them, and they were literally forced into bankruptcy. "Mrs. Clinton," he wrote to Hillary, "no one in the United States of America should have to lose everything they've worked for all their lives because they were unfortunate enough to become ill." It was to help the Richard and Judy Andersons of America that the First Lady and so many others have worked so hard and so long on this health care reform issue. We owe them our thanks and our action.

I know there are people here who say there's no health care crisis. Tell it to Richard and Judy Anderson. Tell it to the 58 million Americans who have no coverage at all for some time each year. Tell it to the 81 million Americans with those preexisting conditions. Those folks are paying more, or they can't get insurance at all, or they can't ever change their jobs because they or someone in their family has one of those preexisting conditions. Tell it to the small businesses burdened by the skyrocketing cost of insurance. Most small businesses cover their employees, and they pay on average 35 percent more in premiums than big businesses or Government. Or tell it to the 76 percent of insured Americans, three out of four, whose policies have lifetime limits, and that means they can find themselves without any coverage at all just when they need it the most. So if any of you believe there's no crisis, you tell it to those people, because I can't.

There are some people who literally do not understand the impact of this problem on people's lives. And all you have to do is go out and listen to them. Just go talk to them anywhere in any congressional district in this country. They're Republicans and Democrats and independents; it doesn't have a lick to do with party. They think we don't get it. And it's time we show them that we do get it.

From the day we began, our health care initiative has been designed to strengthen what is good about our health care system: the world's best health care professionals, cutting-edge research and wonderful research institutions, Medicare for older Americans. None of this, none of it should be put at risk.

But we're paying more and more money for less and less care. Every year fewer and fewer Americans even get to choose their doctors. Every year doctors and nurses spend more time on paperwork and less time with patients because of the absolute bureaucratic nightmare the present system has become. This system is riddled with inefficiency, with abuse, with fraud, and everybody knows it. In today's health care system, insurance companies call the shots. They pick whom they cover and how they cover them. They can cut off your benefits when you need your coverage the most. They are in charge.

What does it mean? It means every night millions of well-insured Americans go to bed just an illness, an accident, or a pink slip away from having no coverage or financial ruin. It means every morning millions of Americans go to work without any health insurance at all, something the workers in no other advanced country in the world do. It means that every year more and more hard-working people are told to pick a new doctor because their boss has had to pick a new plan. And countless others turn down better jobs because they know if they take the better job, they will lose their health insurance. If we just let the health care system continue to drift, our country will have people with less care, fewer choices, and higher bills.

Now, our approach protects the quality of care and people's choices. It builds on what works today in the private sector, to expand employer-based coverage, to guarantee private insurance for every American. And I might say, employer-based private insurance for every American was proposed 20 years ago by Presi-

dent Richard Nixon to the United States Congress. It was a good idea then, and it's a better idea today.

Why do we want guaranteed private insurance? Because right now 9 out of 10 people who have insurance get it through their employers. And that should continue. And if your employer is providing good benefits at reasonable prices, that should continue, too. That ought to make the Congress and the President feel better.

Our goal is health insurance everybody can depend on: comprehensive benefits that cover preventive care and prescription drugs; health premiums that don't just explode when you get sick or you get older; the power, no matter how small your business is, to choose dependable insurance at the same competitive rates governments and big business get today; one simple form for people who are sick; and most of all, the freedom to choose a plan and the right to choose your own doctor.

Our approach protects older Americans. Every plan before the Congress proposes to slow the growth of Medicare. The difference is this: We believe those savings should be used to improve health care for senior citizens. Medicare must be protected, and it should cover prescription drugs, and we should take the first steps in covering long-term care. To those who would cut Medicare without protecting seniors, I say the solution to today's squeeze on middle class working people's health care is not to put the squeeze on middle class retired people's health care. We can do better than that.

When it's all said and done, it's pretty simple to me. Insurance ought to mean what it used to mean: You pay a fair price for security, and when you get sick, health care's always there, no matter what.

Along with the guarantee of health security, we all have to admit, too, there must be more responsibility on the part of all of us in how we use this system. People have to take their kids to get immunized. We should all take advantage of preventive care. We must all work together to stop the violence that explodes our emergency rooms. We have to practice better health habits, and we can't abuse the system. And those who don't have insurance under our approach will get coverage, but they'll have to pay something for it, too. The minority of businesses that provide no insurance at all, and in so doing shift the cost of the care of their employees to others, should contribute something. People who smoke should pay more for a pack of cigarettes. Everybody can contribute something if we want to solve the health care crisis. There can't be any more something for nothing. It will not be easy but it can be done.

Now, in the coming months I hope very much to work with both Democrats and Republicans to reform a health care system by using the market to bring down costs and to achieve lasting health security. But if you look at history we see that for 60 years this country has tried to reform health care. President Roosevelt tried. President Truman tried. President Nixon tried. President Carter tried. Every time the special interests were powerful enough to defeat them. But not this time.

I know that facing up to these interests will require courage. It will raise critical questions about the way we finance our campaigns and how lobbyists yield their influence. The work of change, frankly, will never get any easier until we limit the influence of well-financed interests who profit from this current system. So I also must now call on you to finish the job both Houses began last year by passing tough and meaningful campaign finance reform and lobby reform legislation this year.

You know, my fellow Americans, this is really a test for all of us. The American people provide those of us in Government service with terrific health care benefits at reasonable costs. We have health care that's always there. I think we need to give every hard-working, tax-paying American the same health care security they have already given to us.

I want to make this very clear. I am open, as I have said repeatedly, to the best ideas of concerned Members of both parties. I have no special brief for any specific approach, even in our own bill, except this: If you send me legislation that does not guarantee every American private health insurance that can never be taken away, you will force me to take this pen, veto the legislation, and we'll come right back here and start all over again.

But I don't think that's going to happen. I think we're ready to act now. I believe that you're ready to act now. And if you're ready to guarantee every American the same health care that you have, health care that can never be taken away, now—not next year or the year after—now is the time to stand with the people who sent us here, now.

As we take these steps together to renew our strength at home, we cannot turn away from our obligation to renew our leadership abroad. This is a promising moment. Because of the agreements we have reached this year, last year, Russia's strategic nuclear missiles soon will no longer be pointed at the United States, nor will we point ours at them. Instead of building weapons in space, Russian scientists will help us to build the international space station.

Of course, there are still dangers in the world: rampant arms proliferation, bitter regional conflicts, ethnic and nationalist tensions in many new democracies, severe environmental degradation the world over, and fanatics who seek to cripple the world's cities with terror. As the world's greatest power, we must, therefore, maintain our defenses and our responsibilities.

This year, we secured indictments against terrorists and sanctions against those who harbor them. We worked to promote environmentally sustainable economic growth. We achieved agreements with Ukraine, with Belarus, with Kazahkstan to eliminate completely their nuclear arsenal. We are working to achieve a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons. We will seek early ratification of a treaty to ban chemical weapons worldwide. And earlier today, we joined with over 30 nations to begin negotiations on a comprehensive ban to stop all nuclear testing.

But nothing, nothing is more important to our security than our Nation's Armed Forces. We honor their contributions, including those who are carrying out the longest humanitarian air lift in history in Bosnia, those who will complete their mission in Somalia this year and their brave comrades who gave their lives there. Our forces are the finest military our Nation has ever had. And I have pledged that as long as I am President, they will remain the best equipped, the best trained, and the best prepared fighting force on the face of the Earth.

Last year I proposed a defense plan that maintains our post-cold-war security at a lower cost. This year many people urged me to cut our defense spending further to pay for other Government programs. I said no. The budget I send to Congress draws the line against further defense cuts. It protects the readiness and quality of our forces. Ultimately, the best strategy is to do that. We must not cut defense further. I hope the Congress, without regard to party, will support that position.

Ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere. Democracies don't attack each other. They make better trading partners and partners in diplomacy. That is why we have supported, you and I, the democratic reformers in Russia and in the other states of the former Soviet bloc. I applaud the bipartisan support this Congress provided last year for our initiatives to help Russia, Ukraine, and the other states through their epic transformations.

Our support of reform must combine patience for the enormity of the task and vigilance for our fundamental interest and values. We will continue to urge Russia and the other states to press ahead with economic reforms. And we will seek to cooperate with Russia to solve regional problems, while insisting that if Russian troops operate in neighboring states, they do so only when those states agree to their presence and in strict accord with international standards.

But we must also remember as these nations chart their own futures—and they must chart their own futures—how much more secure and more prosperous our own people will be if democratic and market reforms succeed all across the former Communist bloc. Our policy has been to support that move, and that has been the policy of the Congress. We should continue it.

That is why I went to Europe earlier this month, to work with our European partners, to help to integrate all the former Communist countries into a Europe that has a possibility of becoming unified for the first time in its entire history, its entire history, based on the simple commitments of all nations in Europe to democracy, to free markets, and to respect for existing borders.

With our allies we have created a Partnership For Peace that invites states from the former Soviet bloc and other non-NATO members to work with NATO in military cooperation. When I met with Central Europe's leaders, including Lech Walesa and Vaclav Havel, men who put their lives on the line for freedom, I told them that the security of their region is important to our country's security.

This year we must also do more to support democratic renewal and human rights and sustainable development all around the world. We will ask Congress to ratify the new GATT ac-

cord. We will continue standing by South Africa as it works its way through its bold and hopeful and difficult transition to democracy. We will convene a summit of the Western Hemisphere's democratic leaders from Canada to the tip of South America. And we will continue to press for the restoration of true democracy in Haiti. And as we build a more constructive relationship with China, we must continue to insist on clear signs of improvement in that nation's human rights record.

We will also work for new progress toward the Middle East peace. Last year the world watched Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat at the White House when they had their historic handshake of reconciliation. But there is a long, hard road ahead. And on that road I am determined that I and our administration will do all we can to achieve a comprehensive and lasting peace for all the peoples of the region.

Now, there are some in our country who argue that with the cold war, America should turn its back on the rest of the world. Many around the world were afraid we would do just that. But I took this office on a pledge that had no partisan tinge, to keep our Nation secure by remaining engaged in the rest of the world. And this year, because of our work together, enacting NAFTA, keeping our military strong and prepared, supporting democracy abroad, we have reaffirmed America's leadership, America's engagement. And as a result, the American people are more secure than they were before.

But while Americans are more secure from threats abroad, I think we all know that in many ways we are less secure from threats here at home. Every day the national peace is shattered by crime. In Petaluma, California, an innocent slumber party gives way to agonizing tragedy for the family of Polly Klaas. An ordinary train ride on Long Island ends in a hail of 9-millimeter rounds. A tourist in Florida is nearly burned alive by bigots simply because he is black. Right here in our Nation's Capital, a brave young man named Jason White, a policeman, the son and grandson of policemen, is ruthlessly gunned down. Violent crime and the fear it provokes are crippling our society, limiting personal freedom, and fraying the ties that bind us.

The crime bill before Congress gives you a chance to do something about it, a chance to be tough and smart. What does that mean? Let me begin by saying I care a lot about this issue. Many years ago, when I started out in public life, I was the attorney general of my State. I served as a Governor for a dozen years. I know what it's like to sign laws increasing penalties, to build more prison cells, to carry out the death penalty. I understand this issue. And it is not a simple thing.

First, we must recognize that most violent crimes are committed by a small percentage of criminals who too often break the laws even when they are on parole. Now those who commit crimes should be punished. And those who commit repeated violent crimes should be told, "When you commit a third violent crime, you will be put away, and put away for good; three strikes and you are out."

Second, we must take serious steps to reduce violence and prevent crime, beginning with more police officers and more community policing. We know right now that police who work the streets, know the folks, have the respect of the neighborhood kids, focus on high crime areas, we know that they are more likely to prevent crime as well as catch criminals. Look at the experience of Houston, where the crime rate dropped 17 percent in one year when that approach was taken.

Here tonight is one of those community policemen, a brave, young detective, Kevin Jett, whose beat is eight square blocks in one of the toughest neighborhoods in New York. Every day he restores some sanity and safety and a sense of values and connections to the people whose lives he protects. I'd like to ask him to stand up and be recognized tonight. Thank you, sir. [*Applause*]

You will be given a chance to give the children of this country, the law-abiding working people of this country—and don't forget, in the toughest neighborhoods in this country, in the highest crime neighborhoods in this country, the vast majority of people get up every day and obey the law, pay their taxes, do their best to raise their kids. They deserve people like Kevin Jett. And you're going to be given a chance to give the American people another 100,000 of them, well trained. And I urge you to do it.

You have before you crime legislation which also establishes a police corps to encourage young people to get an education and pay it off by serving as police officers; which encourages retiring military personnel to move into police forces, an inordinate resource for our country; one which has a safe schools provision

which will give our young people the chance to walk to school in safety and to be in school in safety instead of dodging bullets. These are important things.

The third thing we have to do is to build on the Brady bill, the Brady law, to take further steps to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. I want to say something about this issue. Hunters must always be free to hunt. Law-abiding adults should always be free to own guns and protect their homes. I respect that part of our culture; I grew up in it. But I want to ask the sportsmen and others who lawfully own guns to join us in this campaign to reduce gun violence. I say to you, I know you didn't create this problem, but we need your help to solve it. There is no sporting purpose on Earth that should stop the United States Congress from banishing assault weapons that out-gun police and cut down children.

Fourth, we must remember that drugs are a factor in an enormous percentage of crimes. Recent studies indicate, sadly, that drug use is on the rise again among our young people. The crime bill contains—all the crime bills contain—more money for drug treatment for criminal addicts and boot camps for youthful offenders that include incentives to get off drugs and to stay off drugs. Our administration's budget, with all its cuts, contains a large increase in funding for drug treatment and drug education. You must pass them both. We need them desperately.

My fellow Americans, the problem of violence is an American problem. It has no partisan or philosophical element. Therefore, I urge you to find ways as quickly as possible to set aside partisan differences and pass a strong, smart, tough crime bill. But further, I urge you to consider this: As you demand tougher penalties for those who choose violence, let us also remember how we came to this sad point. In our toughest neighborhoods, on our meanest streets, in our poorest rural areas, we have seen a stunning and simultaneous breakdown of community, family, and work, the heart and soul of civilized society. This has created a vast vacuum which has been filled by violence and drugs and gangs. So I ask you to remember that even as we say no to crime, we must give people, especially our young people, something to say yes to.

Many of our initiatives, from job training to welfare reform to health care to national service, will help to rebuild distressed communities, to strengthen families, to provide work. But more needs to be done. That's what our community empowerment agenda is all about, challenging businesses to provide more investment through empowerment zones, ensuring banks will make loans in the same communities their deposits come from, passing legislation to unleash the power of capital through community development banks to create jobs, opportunity, and hope where they're needed most.

I think you know that to really solve this problem, we'll all have to put our heads together, leave our ideological armor aside, and find some new ideas to do even more. And let's be honest, we all know something else too: Our problems go way beyond the reach of Government. They're rooted in the loss of values, in the disappearance of work, and the breakdown of our families and our communities.

My fellow Americans, we can cut the deficit, create jobs, promote democracy around the world, pass welfare reform and health care, pass the toughest crime bill in history, but still leave too many of our people behind. The American people have got to want to change from within if we're going to bring back work and family and community. We cannot renew our country when within a decade more than half of the children will be born into families where there has been no marriage. We cannot renew this country when 13-year-old boys get semiautomatic weapons to shoot 9-year-olds for kicks. We can't renew our country when children are having children and the fathers walk away as if the kids don't amount to anything. We can't renew the country when our businesses eagerly look for new investments and new customers abroad but ignore those people right here at home who would give anything to have their jobs and would gladly buy their products if they had the money to do it. We can't renew our country unless more of us—I mean, all of us—are willing to join the churches and the other good citizens, people like all the—like ministers I've worked with over the years or the priests and the nuns I met at Our Lady of Help in east Los Angeles or my good friend Tony Campollo in Philadelphia, unless we're willing to work with people like that, people who are saving kids, adopting schools, making streets safer. All of us can do that. We can't renew our country until we realize that governments don't raise children, parents do.

Parents who know their children's teachers and turn off the television and help with the homework and teach their kids right from wrong, those kinds of parents can make all the difference. I know; I had one. I'm telling you, we have got to stop pointing our fingers at these kids who have no future and reach our hands out to them. Our country needs it, we need it, and they deserve it.

So I say to you tonight, let's give our children a future. Let us take away their guns and give them books. Let us overcome their despair and replace it with hope. Let us, by our example, teach them to obey the law, respect our neighbors, and cherish our values. Let us weave these sturdy threads into a new American community that can once more stand strong against the forces of despair and evil because everybody has a chance to walk into a better tomorrow.

Oh, there will be naysayers who fear that we won't be equal to the challenges of this time. But they misread our history, our heritage. Even today's headlines, all those things tell us we can and we will overcome any challenge.

When the earth shook and fires raged in California, when I saw the Mississippi deluge the farmlands of the Midwest in a 500-year flood, when the century's bitterest cold swept from North Dakota to Newport News, it seemed as though the world itself was coming apart at the seams. But the American people, they just came together. They rose to the occasion, neighbor helping neighbor, strangers risking life and limb to save total strangers, showing the better angels of our nature.

Let us not reserve the better angels only for natural disasters, leaving our deepest and most profound problems to petty political fighting. Let us instead be true to our spirit, facing facts, coming together, bringing hope, and moving forward.

Tonight, my fellow Americans, we are summoned to answer a question as old as the Republic itself: What is the state of our Union? It is growing stronger, but it must be stronger still. With your help and God's help, it will be.

Thank you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:15 p.m. in the House Chamber of the Capitol.

Nomination for Commandant of the United States Coast Guard

January 25, 1994

The President announced his intention today to nominate Rear Admiral Robert E. Kramek, USCG, to be the 20th Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

"Admiral Kramek has served his country proudly for 33 years and has distinguished himself through his performance in a number of challenging assignments," said the President. "He has consistently demonstrated the strong leadership ability the Coast Guard needs to remain the vital service that it always has been. I am confident that he will perform up to the high standards set by his predecessor, Admiral Bill Kime."

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

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Bulgaria

January 26, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On June 3, 1993, I determined and reported to the Congress that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This determination allowed for the continuation of most-favored nation (MFN) status and certain U.S. Government financial programs

for Bulgaria without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Bulgaria. You will find that the report indicates continued Bulgarian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the areas of emigration and human rights policy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 26, 1994.

Message to the Senate Transmitting Organization of American States Protocols

January 26, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the "Protocol of Washington" adopted on December 14, 1992, by the Sixteenth Special Session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) and signed by the United States on January 23, 1993, and the "Protocol of Managua" adopted by the Nineteenth Special Session of the OAS General Assembly on June 10, 1993, and signed that day by the United States. I also transmit for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the two Protocols, both of which comprise amendments to the Charter of the Organization of American States.

The Charter amendments of the "Protocol of Washington;" (a) incorporate a procedure for suspending the right of a Member State to participate in OAS policy bodies when its democratically constituted government has been overthrown by force; and (b) address the situation of extreme poverty in the hemisphere.

The Charter amendments of the "Protocol of Managua" are aimed at rendering the delivery of OAS provided technical cooperation more effective and thereby giving practical effect to the Organization's efforts to eliminate extreme poverty. The Charter amendments would create a single Inter-American Council for Integral Development to replace the existing Inter-American Economic and Social Council (CIES) and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science and Culture (CIECC).

Early and favorable action by the Senate on the "Protocol of Washington" and the "Protocol of Managua" would send a strong signal to other OAS Member States that the United States is firmly committed to strengthening the multilateral and institutional means for protecting and promoting democracy in the region and to addressing the problems of extreme poverty and integral development.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocols and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Protocols at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 26, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Greece-United States Social Security Agreement

January 26, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Agreement between the United States and Greece

on Social Security, which consists of two separate instruments: a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Agreement was signed at Athens on June 22, 1993.

The United States-Greece agreement contains all provisions mandated by section 233 and other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4). It is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services explaining the key points of the Agreement, along with a paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the provisions of the principal agreement and the related administrative arrangement. Annexed to this report is the report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the effect of the Agreement on income and expenditures of the U.S. Social Security program and the number of individuals affected by the Agreement. The Department of State and the Department of Health and Human Services have recommended the Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Greece Social Security Agreement and related documents.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
January 26, 1994.

Appointment for a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs

January 26, 1994

The President today appointed Gil Coronado, a retired Air Force Colonel with service in Vietnam, to be Deputy Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Legislative Affairs.

"Gil Coronado has served this country with distinction for more than 30 years," said the President. "I think he will do an outstanding job helping to steer our veterans' legislation through Congress."

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

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges

January 27, 1994

The President today nominated ten individuals to serve on the Federal bench, four for the U.S. Courts of Appeals and six for the U.S. District Courts, representing the States of California, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

Diana Motz of Maryland was nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and the President named three individuals to the Fifth Circuit: Fortunato "Pete" Benavides and Robert M. Parker of Texas, and Carl E. Stewart of Louisiana.

The President also named six U.S. District Court judges: Audrey B. Collins, Central District of California; Ruben Castillo, Northern District of Illinois; Deborah A. Batts, Southern District of New York; James G. Carr, Northern District of Ohio; Mary M. Lisi, District of Rhode Island; and Cameron M. Currie, District of South Carolina.

"These ten individuals have records of distinction and achievement in public service and the legal profession," the President said today. "I am confident that they will continue to distin-

guish themselves, as members of the Federal judiciary."

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

Appointment for Environmental Protection Agency Regional Administrator
January 27, 1994

The President today appointed former Massachusetts secretary of environmental affairs John P. DeVillars to be the Environmental Protection Agency's Region I Administrator.

"I have worked with and respected John DeVillars for nearly a decade," said the President. "I am proud that he is bringing his considerable energy and talent to protecting the very special environment of New England."

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

Remarks to a National Conference of Mayors
January 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, all the members of our Cabinet who are here, and all those who have been here. I trust they've done such a good job that they've taken care of all the heavy lifting. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Abramson, I'm glad to be here with you and all your colleagues. And I thank you for coming to the White House and for coming to Washington. We need your help. I look out in this crowd today, and I see a lot of people with whom I have worked, people I know, people I consider my friends, and most importantly people I consider to be Americans in the best sense now, trying to come to grips with these problems.

This is going to be a good week for me. I long for the days when the mayors and the Governors come to town. It is in those days that this city is at its least partisan. When we have people who are responsible for running things, getting results, dealing with problems that have no necessary partisan content, I feel that at least there is a moment of hope in the air that we will be able to break out of this crazy paralysis that too often dominates this city. And so I am delighted to see you all.

I also want to thank you for the contributions you have made and will continue to make to the life and the ideas of this administration. I saw the press conference yesterday that Mayor Daley, I think, and Mayor Johnson, maybe some others had, on the meltdown of the weapons. I received a copy of Mayor Rendell's letter to the Vice President on suggestions for an urban agenda, gave the instructions that we should review those ideas in a hurry. I've had a lot of talks in the last few days with Mayor Archer, Mayor Riley, and Mayor Rice. Mayor Webb has talked to me about his efforts.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Mayor Abramson for the op-ed piece that he wrote about—I think it was called your Russell Project, is that what—because you made the point that I have seen in Louisville, in Cleveland, in Chicago, and many other places, that there really are things that we can do if we have the right sort of partnership. There are ways to use the relatively modest amount of Federal money now available to match with local funds and private sector funds to really do things to get a lot of our troubled urban areas going again. And that was a very important point because there's a lot of cynicism about that around this town. And you helped to put a fresh note of reality into our discussions, and I appreciate that very much.

We're working hard up here to do a number of things, and I won't go through all of them. The Cabinet has doubtless discussed them with you. I would prefer, if I might, just to talk for a few moments about the crime bill. Yesterday I received a letter from the mayors of eight of our largest cities—Mayors Giuliani, Daley, Riordan, Rendell, Lanier, Archer, White, and Goldsmith—all backing the plan to put another 100,000 police officers on the street.

In the days following the quake in Los Angeles, the number of police officers on patrol, on actual patrol, was tripled, and crime in Los Angeles dropped so much that there were just 50 arrests per day in the whole huge city. That's one-tenth, I'll say again, one-tenth the normal number of arrests on any given day. In other words, crime dropped by 90 percent. I want to ask each of you here today, therefore, to help us to pass this crime bill and to do it in a timely fashion, to come back here with your colleagues without regard to party, and when you can, to bring your police chiefs and work for the next 60 days walking a beat in the Halls of Congress. You can be the community police for your cities here for the next 60 days.

With the crime bill, we'll get the police. We'll get drug treatment for those charged and convicted of crimes. We'll get boot camps for first time offenders. We'll get a ban on assault weapons and a number of other useful features. Just yesterday, the Vice President went to Dunbar High School where the day before there were shootouts in a hallway and in front of the school. In too many of our schools, guns have transformed the environment from one of learning to one of fear. And I looked at the television news last night, and I saw one of the young women looking at the Vice President saying, "If you guys can send a person to the Moon, why can't you get guns out of our streets and schools?" Inconveniently, the television switched to another subject before I heard his answer. But the young woman certainly asked the right question.

This administration does favor stronger punishment when it's appropriate. I do believe in the "three strikes and you're out" concept for violent criminals. It is clearly true that a small number of total criminals commit a large portion of violent crimes. So that is something we ought to do. But I think every one of us know, if you've ever walked the streets, really walked the streets of the crime-infested area, have ever really talked to the people who live there, who ever really focused on the fact that most people in the highest crime areas of America still obey the law, get up every day and go to work, try to raise their kids, try to do the very best they can. What they really want is safety in the first place, which means that we have to follow strategies that can also prevent crime, and we have to bring hope back to those places. We have to support the families and rebuild the communities and give people work.

I know of no example where you have a successful civilized society without strong elements of work, family, and community. And when all three break down at once, it should not be surprising to anyone that the vacuum created leads to crime and gangs and guns. So we have a lot of work to do.

Our community empowerment agenda is the beginning of that work, and it can lead to a lot more projects like the one that Mayor Abramson discussed in his fine op-ed piece. But let me say for now, if you want me to be able to go out across this country and tell the American people they need to take more responsibility for their children and their neighborhoods and their communities, to try to help you to mobilize the support of the private sector to invest in the empowerment zones and take advantage of other opportunities in cities, the first thing we have to do is to do our part by passing a good crime bill and by doing it in a timely fashion. When I discussed this with some of you recently, one of the things you wanted to do is to make sure that if we said that bill would fund 100,000 policemen, that it would in fact do that on the terms as advertised. I think you need to make sure that's going to happen.

Another thing we discussed is to make sure that we had some initiatives which would also provide incentives for people to avoid crime or young people to turn away from crime. We need to experiment with things to see what actually lowers the crime rate. We know for sure that more people on patrol lowers the crime rate. I mean, Los Angeles just taught us that one more time. And we know there are some other things that do as well.

So, as you come up here to lobby, I ask you to give us the benefit of your ideas, your experience, and make sure we get the best possible bill. But the main thing is, we do not

need to fool around with this for 6 months. I mean, there's already been a crime bill passed the Senate; there's already been a number of bills passed the House. We know now how we're going to pay for this and within range how much money we can spend on it, and we have it paid for. And our administration's budget, tight though it is, actually provides the funding for it. So let's do it, and let's do it with the benefit of the mayors and the chiefs of police who know what it is to do it right.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:57 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the following mayors: Jerry Abramson of Louisville, KY; Richard Daley of Chicago, IL; Paul Johnson of Phoenix, AZ; Edward Rendell of Philadelphia, PA; Dennis W. Archer of Detroit, MI; Joseph P. Riley, Jr. of Charleston, SC; Norman B. Rice of Seattle, WA; Wellington E. Webb of Denver, CO; Rudolph W. Giuliani of New York City; Richard Riordan of Los Angeles; Bob Lanier of Houston, TX; Michael White of Cleveland, OH; and Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis, IN.

Statement on Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts' Decision Not To Seek Reelection

January 28, 1994

It was with regret that I learned of Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts' decision not to seek reelection.

I have been very fortunate to work with the Governor on issues affecting the people of the Northwest and the Nation: health care, economic opportunity, and the protection of our natural resources. Her leadership on these and other issues will be missed.

I commend Governor Roberts for her dedication to the people of Oregon throughout her 20 years of public service. My best wishes go out to the Governor and her family.

Nomination for District of Columbia Superior Court Associate Judges

January 28, 1994

The President today announced that he intends to nominate Judith Bartnoff and Zoe Bush to serve as Associate Judges on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

"Judith Bartnoff and Zoe Bush have both distinguished themselves throughout their legal careers as dedicated and accomplished professionals," said the President. "I am confident that they will serve the people of the District of Columbia well on the Superior Court bench."

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

The President's Radio Address

January 29, 1994

Good morning. If I sound a little hoarse today, it's because I haven't completely recovered my voice which I lost after I gave the State of the Union Address to Congress. You know, I don't like losing my voice, but frankly, it wouldn't be a bad thing in Washington if more people had to lower their voices and listen to you a little more. I think if they did, it would

strengthen their determination to keep fighting to change this country for the better.

A lot of changes have occurred in the last year, and you, basically, deserve the credit for it, even though Congress had to enact the laws that I proposed. There's been an economic plan that cuts the deficit by half a trillion dollars, more than 1.6 million new jobs in the private sector, tax relief for 15 million low- and moderate-wage workers to reward work over welfare, a family and medical leave law to enable people to take a little time off when there's a child born or a parent sick without losing their jobs, the Brady bill to keep more guns out of the hands of criminals, more affordable loans for the middle class, and a national service program for young people who want to give something back to their communities and their country and earn credit toward a college education.

And it's beginning to pay off. Yesterday we received very encouraging growth figures for the last 3 months of 1993. This economic plan is promoting the right kind of recovery and growth through smaller deficits, lower interest rates, lower inflation, and productive investment. It's not the kind of growth we had too much in the 1980's, where there was ballooning debt and paper prosperity.

I know a lot of you aren't yet feeling the benefits of these changes, and our work won't be done until every American has the security to face the future without fear. But because you've demanded change, Washington finally is addressing America's agenda, the problems you face in your jobs, your communities, and your families.

Because good skills are the only tickets to good jobs and growing incomes, I'm asking Congress this year to invest more in education and training, to transform the unemployment system into a reemployment system that teaches new skills for new jobs. We need to do more to help people who don't go to college to move from high school to work. And we need to improve all our schools with our Goals 2000 plan, which links world-class standards to grassroots reforms.

Because the welfare system discourages work and destroys families, I'm asking Congress to help to revolutionize it. For those who depend on welfare, we should provide the support, the job training, and the child care needed for up to 2 years. But after that, anyone who can work must work.

Change is never easy, and I especially need your help on two crucial challenges: fighting crime and reforming our health care system. We need to make the criminal justice system work for the victims, not the criminals. And we must make the health care system work for all the hard-working families in this country, and put an end to the inefficiency, the fraud, and the abuse that has made our system the world's most expensive and the only one in the advanced world that doesn't provide some coverage to every family.

I'm asking Congress to pass a strong, smart, tough anticrime bill. We must tell career criminals, "If you commit a third violent crime, you'll be put away for good; three strikes and you're out." We should hire 100,000 more police officers to protect our communities. They help to reduce the crime rate. We must ban assault weapons that make criminals better armed than police. And we need more drug training and alternative punishments for young people, like boot camps.

And this year, we must make history by reforming the health care system and providing guaranteed private insurance for every American. The First Lady and I have traveled across the country; we've received almost a million letters. And you know, the only place where people say there's really no health care crisis is right here in Washington where so many enjoy secure health benefits at reasonable cost paid for by the taxpayers.

Let's face it, the health insurance system is rigged against ordinary families and small businesses. Insurance companies control it: They pick and choose whom they cover; they charge more if your business is too small; they might not cover you at all or a member of your family or one of your employees if you have what they call a preexisting condition. Unless we change things, 58 million Americans may have no coverage at all for some time this year, and experts say 3 of every 10 small businesses may be forced to stop covering their employees in the years ahead because small business costs are going up so much faster than big business and Government costs.

Let those who say there's no crisis tell it to Rick Tarnow of Longview, Texas. He left his job and secure benefits at a large corporation to start a small business. Then his son was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis. Because of the disease, the son can't get coverage. Every insurance

company tells the Tarnows, "Until there's a cure for cystic fibrosis, we will not cover your child." As Rick's wife, Tracy, told my wife, "It's devastating enough to learn that your child has a chronic illness and then have to deal with the nightmare of insurance."

Those who say there's no crisis should tell it to the Janetakos family of Woburn, Massachusetts. Twelve years ago, Corrine Janetakos had a stroke, leaving her partially paralyzed. Now she and her husband, who owns a painting business, have trouble getting insurance because of her preexisting condition. She wrote to Hillary because, quote, "It's been very frustrating arguing my dilemma to the numerous insurance companies that we've applied to for coverage."

Well, with our approach it will be illegal for companies to deny anyone coverage for any reason, and every family will have comprehensive benefits that can never be taken away. The Tarnow family, the Janetakos family, and millions of other Americans live every day with the health care crisis. It's time we stopped denying there's a crisis and started fixing it.

Now is the time to debate and decide America's real agenda: health care, crime, jobs and skills, welfare reform, more hope for our young people. The debate is between those who don't even understand how you live and those who understand the urgency of change, between those who don't even see these problems and those who are working to solve them, between those who are comfortable with deadlock and drift and those who call for continuing the American journey of progress and renewal. If you raise your voice, the forces of change will prevail.

With your help, I'll keep speaking out for reforming health care, fighting crime, ending welfare as we know it, and improving our skills, our schools, and our future. And I'll try not to shout myself hoarse tomorrow on Super Bowl Sunday.

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

Letter Accepting the Resignation of Philip B. Heymann as Deputy Attorney General

January 29, 1994

Dear Phil:

It is with deep regret that I accept your resignation as Deputy Attorney General, effective upon the availability of a successor.

You brought a most impressive history of service to the Department of Justice and distinguished yourself at every turn. During your time as Deputy Attorney General, you consistently demonstrated intelligence, integrity, sound judgment, and an unyielding commitment to the cause of justice.

I am very grateful for all of your many contributions to my Administration and our nation. I wish you the very best as you return to your academic career at Harvard Law School.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

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

Remarks to the National Governors' Association

January 31, 1994

I want to thank you all again for coming. Since we're running a bit late, I want to be brief and get on to hearing from Governor Campbell and Governor Dean. The primary thing that I was hoping we could talk about in this morning's session is the crime bill.

I wanted to emphasize that I am very aware that this is an issue that historically has been dealt with primarily at the local and State level, one that I spent an enormous amount of time on as a Governor and as attorney general.

There are things that I think should be and indeed almost have to be done at the national level. We passed the Brady bill at the end of the last session of Congress, which I think was a very important thing. And many of you were helpful in that regard, and I appreciate that. We have a number of grants to cities and communities to help with law enforcement, and we had enormous application, actually a terrific surplus of applications for the Attorney General's discretionary funds on community policing. This summer—Eli Segal is here—our summer of service program, as part of the national service this summer, will be called the summer of safety. And we hope thousands of our young people will be out there working with law enforcement people all across the country.

I really appreciate a lot of the things that all of you have done in this regard. Let me just say that the crime bill itself has a number of provisions that I think are quite important and some with which you may or may not agree. Two things that I feel very strongly about are the community policing provisions and the "three strikes and you're out" provision. I'd like to say something about each of them.

One, we know that there's been a dramatic reversal in the ratio of police officers to crime in the last 35 years. Thirty-five years ago, there were three police officers for every serious crime reported. Today, there are three crimes for every police officer, particularly in the high crime areas of the country. We have ample evidence that community policing actually works to reduce crime by having people on the block who are well-trained and know the people who live there. Dr. Lee Brown, our Director of Drug Policy, instituted community policing programs in major cities all across this country and can speak to that. The mayors were here last week. They were exceedingly enthusiastic about that provision, and we're looking forward to working with them and with you about it.

The second thing I'd like to say about stiffening the penalties is I know many of you have included versions of the "three strikes and you're out" in your own legislative programs. I believe Washington State even had a referendum on the issue. I would just like to urge that we be both tough and smart on this issue. We know that a small number of people commit a significant number of the truly violent crimes and are highly likely to be repeat offenders. If, therefore, this law is drawn properly, it will affect a small percentage of the prison population at the Federal level and a somewhat larger percentage at the State level. But you actually will be keeping people in prison who will be overwhelmingly likely to commit a serious violent crime if they get out.

I think it is important not to make these provisions too overbroad to undermine the flexibility that people at the State and at the local level need to run their criminal justice systems and, at the same time, to keep people off the street who are involved in crimes like the terrible tragedy involving Polly Klaas.

So I want to invite you not only to do whatever you were doing at the State level but to be involved with us here as we work through this crime bill to make sure that it is well-drawn, well-drafted, and achieves the objectives it is designed to achieve.

The third thing I'd like to say is there are a number of other things in the crime bill which I think are worthy of your attention. There's the provision which bans possession of handguns by minors except in limited circumstances, which many of you have already done at the State level. There is the ban on several assault weapons. There are funds for alternative incarceration, like boot camps, and for drug treatment. And of course, there are significant funds, which I heard you all discussing yesterday in the committee chaired by Governor Wilson, about jails and Federal funds for jails. I heard the discussion on television yesterday. I think you need to have a committee that works with us on it to make sure that it makes sense to you. Many times I think things come up in the context of crime here in Washington which sound good here but which may or may not make sense out there on the front lines of the fight against crime. So I want to invite you all to be a part of that.

Just one other thing I'd like to say. In addition to the focus on the crime bill this morning, I'm obviously open to any questions or comments you want to have about the other areas of our partnership, on welfare reform, health care reform, what we're going to do on the budget, which will be a very tough budget, difficult for us, difficult for you. And Mr. Panetta

is here. We have tried to be good partners. We've granted 5 comprehensive health care waivers, 90 smaller waivers in the health care area, 7 welfare reform waivers already. We have tried to make good on our commitment to push through a new partnership with the States. And I think that you will find that we'll continue to do that and we're eager to do it.

But the first major thing that will happen in this legislative session is, in closing, the crime bill. After we pass the education bills—I think that Secretary Riley is in pretty good shape with Goals 2000 and the school-to-work transition. But then the next thing that will come up is the crime bill. Then we'll go to the other measures I mentioned. And I really look forward to working with you on them.

I ask you for your help. I asked the mayors, and I will ask you to put together a bipartisan committee to come up here to work with us, to be willing to lobby with us, and to help us pass a bill that is tough and smart.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:03 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Governors Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., of South Carolina, Howard Dean of Vermont, and Pete Wilson of California.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany

January 31, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, do you agree with Chairman Greenspan's comments this morning that interest rates need to be raised to get ahead of inflation?

The President. Well, I agree that there's no evidence that inflation is coming back into the economy. There is still a kind of a gap between short- and long-term rates, so it may be that—if they make that decision on short-term rates, what I hope is that it won't raise long-term rates, because there's no need to do it. And I hope that the stock market won't take an adverse view because we've still got good, strong growth in this economy.

But we want to manage it with real discipline, that is we don't want to have one of these roller coaster things. We want the economy to grow in a very stable, solid way. And obviously, low interest rates are critical to that. I consider that part of the kind of compact we've all made where we'll continue to reduce the deficit, and we've got to keep inflation down and interest rates down so that people can afford to borrow money and invest.

Northern Ireland

Q. How does letting Gerry Adams into the U.S. advance the cause of peace?

The President. Well, we hope it will advance the cause of peace. You know, that's a very thorny problem. But his comments over the last several days on the questions of violence and the joint declaration, I thought, justified not a general visa but a very narrow visa for the purpose of coming to this conference in the hope that it will advance the peace process. Ultimately, of course, that's an issue that's going to have to be worked out by the parties themselves, as all these matters do. But I thought it was the appropriate thing to do for those reasons, because of what he said and because he's in a position, I think, to push this process forward.

White House Press Corps

Q. Have you been sneaking out on us?

The President. No. I was amazed when I read that. We tried to remember if that happened. I don't think so. George and I couldn't think of a time.

Q. You're always willing to take us with you?

The President. You know, once I went running when the press had gone home, but I think they found me before it was over. And then when I was home for my mother's funeral, I went out in the town there and went to my old high school, but the press found me. I don't think we have. We were trying to think of—

we can't—we've not been successful in thinking of five or six instances in which that has occurred. I saw the story. All I know is what I read this morning, but I'm not aware of it.

Q. Do you feel cloistered in here, Mr. President?

The President. Oh yes, I do. I mean, I wish it weren't so. And as far as I know, no other—maybe President Bush had these same sort of understandings where the press went everywhere but—I take a pool when I go to a Christmas party. Hillary and I went to Christmas parties; we took the pool with us.

Q. And we enjoyed it.

The President. You do enjoy it? Did somebody say that? [*Laughter*] I don't believe that. A lot of times you'd like to dump me.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Discussions With Chancellor Kohl

Q. Mr. President, are you going to discuss the Bosnia situation with the Chancellor?

The President. I'm sure we will.

Q. What will you——

The President. I want to talk to him about it.

Q. Are you looking forward to the restaurant, Filomena's, Mr. President?

The President. Oh, yes. You know, he told me about it, and so I went there. I took my family and some friends, and we had a wonderful dinner there. And I would not have even known about it if Chancellor Kohl hadn't mentioned it. So I told the people when I was there that the next time he came, perhaps we would both come together.

Chancellor Kohl. And we'll do that today.

Q. Will there be—[*inaudible*]—for Russia today?

The President. We might discuss Russia.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. During the exchange, the President referred to Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams and Senior Policy Adviser George Stephanopoulos. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

January 31, 1994

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

The U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have effectively put the Iraqi nuclear weapons program out of business in the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. It has reduced Iraq's ability to produce chemical weapons; UNSCOM teams continue to inventory and destroy chemical munitions. The United Nations has inspected, and will monitor, several facilities identified by Iraq as capable of supporting a biological weapons program.

Iraq's formal acceptance of UNSCR 715 (long-term monitoring) in November was an important step, although long overdue. It is necessary to ensure that Iraq does not break its promise on long-term monitoring as it has many times in the past on other commitments. Continued vigilance is necessary because we believe that Saddam Hussein is committed to rebuilding his weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capability, especially nuclear weapons. We also remain seriously concerned about the many contradictions and unanswered questions remaining in regard to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capability. It is therefore extremely important that the international community continue its efforts to establish the long-term monitoring regime required by U.N. Security Council Resolution 715. Although Iraq has said that it is ready to comply with that Resolution, it still must take

significant steps, including the provision of new data about the suppliers of its WMD program and acceptance on the ground of a functioning monitoring program for a sustained period. Iraq has provided some further data on suppliers which is still being evaluated by UNSCOM.

Rolf Ekeus, the Chairman of UNSCOM, has told Iraq that it must establish a clear track record of compliance before he can report favorably to the Security Council. We strongly endorse this approach and reject any establishment of a timetable for determining whether Iraq has complied with Resolution 715. There must be a sustained period of unquestionable, complete compliance with the monitoring plans.

The "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq permit the monitoring of Iraq's compliance with Security Council Resolutions 687 and 688. Over the last 2 years, the northern no-fly zone has deterred Iraq from a major military offensive in the region. Since the no-fly zone was established in southern Iraq, Iraq's use of aircraft against its population in the region has stopped. However, Iraqi forces have responded to the no-fly zone by stepping up their use of land-based artillery to shell marsh villages.

The U.N. Special Rapporteur on Iraq, Max van der Stoel, published a report in November describing the Iraqi military's ongoing repression against civilian populations in the marshes. The Rapporteur has judged that Iraq is in violation of UNSCR 688, which demands that Iraq cease repression of its civilian population and allow immediate access by international humanitarian organizations to all those in need of assistance in all parts of Iraq. On January 4, the United States—along with the Governments of France, Russia, and the United Kingdom—presented a demarche to the Iraqi government strongly condemning its repression of the Iraqi people.

The United States is working closely with the United Nations and other organizations to provide humanitarian relief to the people of northern Iraq, in the face of Iraqi government efforts to disrupt this assistance. We have provided temporary generators and spare parts to preserve supplies of electricity in the region since the Iraqi government cut off power on August 5, 1993. We continue to support U.N. efforts to mount a relief program for persons in Baghdad and the South, provided that supplies are not diverted by the Iraqi government. We are continuing to work toward the placement of human rights monitors for Iraq as proposed by the U.N. Special Rapporteur, and to support the establishment of a U.N. commission to investigate and publicize iraqi war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law.

On January 18, after a review of Iraqi compliance with Security Council resolutions, the President of the Security Council issued a statement noting that there was no consensus to modify the existing sanctions regime. That regime exempts medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the U.N. Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The Sanctions Committee also continues to consider and, when appropriate, approve requests to send to Iraq materials and supplies for essential civilian needs. The Iraqi government, in contrast, has maintained a full embargo against its northern provinces and has acted to distribute humanitarian supplies only to its supporters and to the military.

The Iraqi government has so far refused to sell $1.6 billion in oil as previously authorized by the Security Council in Resolutions 706 and 712. Talks between Iraq and the United Nations on implementing these resolutions have ended unsuccessfully. Iraq could use proceeds from such sales to purchase foodstuffs, medicines, materials, and supplies for essential civilian needs of its population, subject to U.N. monitoring of sales and the equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies (including to its northern provinces). Iraqi authorities bear full responsibility for any suffering in Iraq that results from their refusal to implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

Proceeds from oil sales also would be used to compensate persons injured by Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The U.N. Compensation Commission has received about two million claims so far, with another 500,000 expected. The U.S. Government has now filed a total of eight sets of individual claims with the Commission, bringing U.S. claims filed to roughly 3,000 with a total asserted value of over $205 million. At a meeting on January 13, the Commission's Government Council continued discussions on how to allocate future funds among different claimants but did not make any decisions. Meanwhile, a panel of commissioners began to work on the first set of individual claims for serious personal injury or death. The panel is expected to report its findings to the Governing Council in the spring.

Security Council Resolution 778 permits the use of a portion of frozen Iraqi oil assets to fund critical U.N. activities concerning Iraq, including humanitarian relief, UNSCOM, and the Compensation Commission. (The funds will be repaid, with interest, from Iraqi oil revenues as soon as Iraqi oil exports resume.) The United States is prepared to transfer up to $200 million in frozen Iraqi oil assets held in U.S. financial institutions, provided that U.S. contributions do not exceed 50 percent of the total amount contributed. We have arranged a total of about $107 million in such matching contributions thus far.

Iraq still has not met its obligations concerning Kuwaitis and third-country nationals it detained during the war. Iraq has taken no substantive steps to cooperate fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), as required by Security Council Resolution 687, although it has received more than 600 files on missing individuals. We continue to work for Iraqi compliance.

The Iraq-Kuwait border has been demarcated, and the U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observer Mission (UNIKOM) continues its monitoring mission. However, the Iraqi government continues to refer publicly to Kuwait as a "province" and "governorate" of Iraq.

Examples of Iraqi noncooperation and noncompliance continue in other areas. For instance, on December 22, Iraqi military forces attacked a four-vehicle coalition military convoy near the Faydah checkpoint. This was the first time Iraqi forces have fired directly on coalition forces since the Gulf War. We, along with the British and the French, issued a demarche to the Iraqi government, warning Baghdad that a repetition of the incident would have consequences.

Iraq can rejoin the community of civilized nations only through democratic processes, respect for human rights, equal treatment of its people, and adherence to basic norms of international behavior. Iraq's Government should represent all Iraq's people and be committed to the territorial integrity and unity of Iraq. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) espouses these goals, the fulfillment of which would make Iraq a stabilizing force in the Gulf region.

I am grateful for the support by the Congress of our efforts.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Nomination for Ambassadors to Hungary, Micronesia, and Azerbaijan

January 31, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate three United States Ambassadors: Donald M. Blinken to the Republic of Hungary, March Fong Eu to the Federated States of Micronesia, and Richard Dale Kauzlarich to the Republic of Azerbaijan.

"Donald Blinken, March Fong Eu, and Richard Kauzlarich have all proven themselves to be dedicated to public service and capable of achievement at the highest levels," said the President. "I expect that they will do an outstanding job of representing our country abroad."

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

Remarks at the Democratic Governors Association Dinner
January 31, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor Bayh, Father Malloy, Chairman Wilhelm. I want to begin by just congratulating Governor Bayh and your dinner committee, Bob and the others and Katie Whelan, on this wonderful evening in which you have raised $2 million to continue the work of changing our country for the better.

I was outside in the holding room looking at Evan Bayh introducing me, and I thought to myself, was I ever that young? [*Laughter*] Three years ago Roy Romer invited all of the Democratic Governors up to Colorado so we could powwow about the coming Presidential election. And we all talked and emoted and said everything we had to say, and as usual, Ned Ray McWherter just sat there and didn't say a word—[*laughter*]—looking like a cross between a country sage and the Grand Old Opry's Buddha. And all of a sudden, he said, "You know something, we need to nominate somebody in '92 that's a new face, that's younger, got a head full of hair and a bunch of new ideas." And I got all puffed up, and he said, "Go get that Bayh boy and put him in there." [*Laughter*]

I am so glad to see all of you here. I enjoyed my time with the Governors this morning and will again tomorrow. And I've enjoyed having the chance to visit with so many of you. I'd like to, before I say anything else, just say a personal word of thanks to my former colleagues who are leaving the statehouses this year:

My good friend John Waihee from Hawaii, who headed our campaign out there last year—it was our first Western States victory—and who lives in a State that has proved now for many years you can actually have a comprehensive, affordable health care system that covers everybody, something the Republicans don't believe can be done.

Governor Cece Andrus of Idaho, the only person along with Bruce King and me, the three of us, the only remaining survivors who actually served as Governors in the seventies, the eighties, and the nineties. I will miss him enormously and his wisdom.

Joan Finney, who leaves after 20 years in statewide office and led an awful lot of fights out there. And I want to thank her for a lot of things but especially for being a source of personal encouragement to me in the last year. Thank you, Joan, and good luck, and God bless you.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to one of my neighboring Governors now, William Donald Schaefer of Maryland, who has done a lot of things, been more outspoken than me. But don't you ever forget this: In addition to helping revitalize and rebuild Baltimore, he was out there fighting to do something sane and strong about guns a long time before it was popular. He was on the cutting edge of change.

My friend and neighbor David Walters of Oklahoma, who I saw take over that State when it was in terrible shape financially. When the price of oil collapsed, it was good for the rest of us, but it was awful for Oklahoma and for Texas. And I saw them make improvements in education and turn their economy around, redo the entire budget, thanks to David's leadership. And his friendship and cooperation with me when I was his neighbor is something I will never forget, and I thank you, David.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation, too, to my friend and colleague Barbara Roberts, the Governor of Oregon, who has had more difficult, courageous stands on more issues, she has had more things to face than anybody. And she had one of those catch-22 situations where the voters said, "We're going to do away with one form of funding and leave it to you, Barbara, to figure out how to pick up the pieces." And she did it with good cheer, without ever complaining, and with a great deal of courage. She is a real example, I think, not only for women officeholders but for all elected officials everywhere, and I thank her for that.

Finally, I don't know if he's here tonight, but I have to say a word of awe-inspired respect for Bob Casey of Pennsylvania for his personal courage and his record as Governor. I thought when he got sick that if anybody could ever come back, he could. He is tough as a boot, but he loves his State. And he said once that he knew he would be elected Governor of Pennsylvania on his fourth try because he was more

like Pennsylvania than anybody else running. That's a compliment to him and a compliment to Pennsylvania.

And finally, I want to thank my neighbor and friend whom I made fun of, but who has been my counselor for many years now, who's calmed me when I was excited and lifted me up when I was down. Ned Ray McWherter is one of the finest people I've ever met, and I thank him. And I'm certainly going to miss him as a Governor.

Now I want to mention two other people. You know, I used to be chairman of the DGA, but I couldn't raise this much money. [*Laughter*] But when I was chairman 5 years ago, we had just lost our third straight Presidential election, and people said, well, the Democratic Party is on its way out. And there were two people who ran for office in that year who proved them wrong, Doug Wilder and Jim Florio. And what they did to win is something we would do well to remember even though we have the White House and a good record in 1994, and that is, they waged tough, outsider, aggressive, pro-change campaigns. And when they got in, they were as good as their words. Both of them brought extraordinary discipline to their budgets under difficult circumstances, and they will be thanked for it for a long time to come, and especially in New Jersey, which was in terrible budget shape when Jim Florio took over. Both of them fought for tougher and more responsible laws affecting guns in their respective States, successfully. Both of them fought for a brighter future. And I know that we all wish for them a bright future. They gave it to their States, and we hope that they get it in turn.

Finally, I want to say a special word of thanks to the DGA's treasurer for a long time now, my friend Bob Farmer, one of the first people who signed on to my Presidential campaign. And Bob Farmer could talk an owl out of a tree if he made up his mind to do it. He could raise $1 million at a convention of bankrupts if he made up his mind to do it. [*Laughter*] And he's been working hard for the DGA for a long time now. And I know that as we go into this very vigorous and challenging election year with 36 seats up, that every person in this room joins me in our appreciation, our gratitude, our support, and our friendship for the years and years of work that Bob Farmer has given to the Democratic Governors. And I thank you very much, Bob.

Ladies and gentlemen, this has been an invigorating year. It's been full of challenge and change. And many, many times I have felt that I was fighting a war on two or three fronts, not only a war to change the policies of the Government but to change the attitudes of the people who live in this city about what is possible, in an environment that I found, frankly, pretty negative when I got here and one always vulnerable to being sidetracked by some political distraction, always vulnerable to being sidetracked by what is negative, to playing to people's fears instead of their hopes, to assuming the worst instead of working for the best.

I was raised to believe that most people are good people—if you give them a chance, they'll do the right thing—and that ordinary people will do extraordinary things if they're just given the opportunity to do it. I tried to put together a government of people who felt the same way, who looked like America, who shared the experiences of America, and who could work with people at the grassroots to do that. And after a year in which we have a lot of things we can be proud of—and I thank the Democratic Committee for that fine film that was just shown—the American people are beginning to believe it, too: that we really can change things, that politics is for producing things, not for posturing, that it really is for moving forward and bringing people together.

I ran for this job for three reasons. One is I thought we were going in the wrong direction economically, and I wanted to revitalize the country. The second is I was convinced we were coming apart as a people when we ought to be coming together and that unless we worked to rebuild our sense of common community and our grassroots communities and our families, our sense of togetherness, we could never be what we ought to be. And finally, I did it because I wanted to restore faith in the political system. I wanted the political system to work for the people of this country instead of having it work the other way around. And I think in the last year, we have made major strides in all three areas.

As my colleague and the best—I would argue that history will record—the best Vice President in the history of the Republic, Al Gore, said, "What should be up is up, and what should be down is down." [*Laughter*] But if we want to keep what should be up, up and what should be down, down, then the Democratic Governors

need to be up in '94. We need to win these seats.

I am convinced that the yearning of the American people to see a responsive, change-oriented, open political system, that that appetite has not been satisfied; it has only been barely whetted. The American people think, well, we've made a good start, but we've got a long way to go. And you know as well as I do that the things that I'm trying to do up here cannot be done by the President and the Congress alone. I see many Members of Congress here tonight, and I am delighted to see them here making common cause with you.

If you think about what it is we seek to do in reviving the economy, or totally reorganizing our job training program so that people who lose their jobs can constantly be retrained for the jobs of the future, or developing a health care system that will be more efficient and more effective and provide comprehensive benefits to all Americans, or reforming the welfare system, or having a crime bill that is both tough and smart—none of these things can really be done in ways that change the lives of the American people unless the people who occupy the statehouses are committed to that change, unless they think every day about what they can do to change the lives of the people who live and work in their States.

I was raised to believe that public service can be a noble profession and that people who work in it and give themselves to it and spend themselves completely in the attempt to achieve great things are doing the work of citizenship in a profoundly important way and should be bound to, not divided from, the rest of the American people. That is the spirit that the Democratic Party has to bring not only to national politics but also to every one of these governorships. And if we can do that, we will not only win the governorships in 1994, we will be able to continue to change the country. And that is how we will be judged in 1996 and beyond: Are we doing what we said we would do? We have a bigger burden to bear than our adversaries, because we don't enjoy getting up every morning and saying no to family leave, no to motor voter, no to meaningful deficit reduction, no, no, no. We want to say yes, we believe we can do better. And our burden must be borne by you.

I've told a lot of people that in many ways being Governor was the best job anybody could ever have. And I want to thank you again, all of you who have been my colleagues over the years, for your friendship, your wisdom, your support, and your continuing insights. It's easy for us up here in Washington to get out of touch with what's going on in the heartland, and we depend upon you to keep us in touch. But we're glad to be here; I am, this association is, the national Democratic Party is, Members of Congress who are here are. We're glad to be here to support the efforts of the people who want the statehouses to be the people's houses. The White House belongs to the people of this country tonight a lot more than it has in many years in the past, and we are going to keep working together until we do what we promised to do in 1992.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:08 p.m. at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Evan Bayh of Indiana; Edward A. Malloy, former president, University of Notre Dame; David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee; Bob Rose, dinner chairman; Katie Whelan, executive director, Democratic Governors Association; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; Gov. Ned Ray McWherter of Tennessee; Gov. Bruce King of New Mexico; Gov. Joan Finney of Kansas; and Gov. L. Douglas Wilder of Virginia.

Remarks to the American Hospital Association

February 1, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Dick, and thank you, Carolyn. And thank you also for bringing my tea out here. The Hospital Association is giving care to the President for his sick voice today. [*Laughter*] I thank you.

I appreciate so much what both Dick and Carolyn said, and I want to begin by thanking all of you here who have ever had me in your hospitals—[*laughter*]—which is a large number of people. Especially all the people who represent my native State and who have done so much to help educate me on these issues over the years.

The time that I have spent in hospitals since I was a small boy has made a very big impression on me. I always learn something. I always leave with a sense of inspiration about the dedication of the people who work there. And I want to say a special word of thanks to this association for the work that you have done with our administration over the last year, in a very constructive way, in helping us to try to develop an approach which would solve the problems of the American health care system and protect and enhance what is good about it.

I know that there will still be some issues on which there will be disagreement as we go forward, but I think it's important that we clarify today, as Dick did so well in his introduction, that we agree on the most important issue: We have to preserve what is right; we have to fix what is wrong; we have to guarantee private insurance to every American so that everybody will be covered. That is the only way to stop cost shifting, the only way to be fair, the only way to solve this problem.

The problem with the health care system in this country did not just happen overnight. It happened because of the way this system is organized. Anybody who thinks there are no serious problems, no crisis in the health care system, I would say go visit your local hospital.

Over the years, because of the insurance system we have in America, which is unlike any in the world and which, I will say, is irrelevant to the fact that we have the highest quality care in the world for the people who can afford it and access it, we have created a system which often makes it impossible for hospitals to do their jobs. While insurance companies have set up a system which enables them to slam the door on people who aren't healthy enough to get covered, hospitals open the door to everyone, whether they're covered or not.

We have created in this country, through the systems of hundreds of different insurance companies writing thousands of different policies, a giant bureaucracy which on the insurance side sorts the healthy from the sick, the old from the young, the geographically desirable from the undesirable. And as more and more insurance companies sell more and more customized insurance policies to smaller and smaller groups, each of them has created its own set of forms and different sets of what would cover, spelled out in endless fine print. The result, as all of you know, has been a bureaucratic nightmare.

And what about the hospitals? You have had to create your own bureaucracy to deal with the insurance bureaucracy and the Government's as well, to fight redtape, close loopholes, and to try to get reimbursed somehow. And that only covers the patients who have good insurance. For those without insurance or with barebone coverage, you're forced to jump through a whole lot of other hoops. And you probably still often don't get any reimbursement.

Hospitals did not invent this system. You didn't choose a system which has resulted in hospitals hiring clerical workers at 4 times the rate of doctors being added to hospital staffs in the last 10 years. You did it because of the redtape of the present system, the insurance redtape and the Government program redtape.

Meanwhile, your mission didn't change, it's still to treat the people who are sick who need to be in the hospital. Regardless of their age or medical history, of what may or may not be covered, you have to deal with the people that the insurance industry decides are not profitable. You can't ask whether an illness was a preexisting condition, it's still an illness.

So what are we left with today? A system where we're ruled by forms and have less time to make people healthy. A system that forces doctors and nurses and clerical workers in hospitals to write out the same information six times in six different ways just to satisfy some distant company or agency. It doesn't make sense, and you shouldn't have to put up with it anymore.

Just listen to Joan Brown, a registered nurse who works at a teaching hospital in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. She wrote to the First Lady that she spends, and I quote, "more time with paperwork than with any other aspect of health care." They've got a joke at her hospital, she said, "We'll do the patient care after we finish the paperwork, if we have time." It's not just a joke; it's a sign of a crisis and one we've got to do something about.

I visited Children's Hospital here in Washington last year. The pediatrician, who is from this community and who has dedicated her life to

the children of this community, told me she spends up to 25 hours a week filling out forms instead of tending sick children. "It's not what we trained all these years to do," she said. "Reducing paperwork would enable me to practice medicine again. It would free me," she said, "free me from the shackles and the burdens of the paperwork maze."

Let's be honest. In his wildest dreams, Rube Goldberg could never have designed a system more complex than the present health care system. You in this room understand this better than anyone else in the world today. You see the crisis when people without insurance come to emergency rooms with serious injuries or illnesses. Many of those illnesses could have been prevented if only they had been covered and had access to a doctor, to primary and preventive care. The emergency room is the most expensive place to treat people. It should be reserved for emergencies. I know you believe that, and you can make sure it happened if everybody had access to health care coverage.

You see the crisis when people come in who aren't fully insured, and you become loaded up with what's called uncompensated care. The smallest estimate of that is $25 billion a year. It either comes out of your budgets, which hurts your ability to provide health care at a high quality, or you have to shift the cost on to the bills of those who can pay them.

A lot of people who complain about hospitals overcharging, about inflated bills, have no idea how much of this cost shifting occurs simply because of the insurance setup that we have in the United States. No other country in the world is burdened with it. And we should not tolerate it any longer.

You also see it because a lot of the people who come to you, either before they come or sometime during their treatment, deal with the problems of preexisting conditions or lifetime limits on insurance policies. Three out of four policies have such lifetime limits. I know a lot of times you wind up having to send a collection company after a patient that you know is not going to be able to pay the bill anyway because of these problems.

You see this crisis when a doctor prescribes prescription drugs, but then a person comes back to the hospital 3 or 4 weeks later because she couldn't afford to fill the prescription. So the illness got worse. One study says that problems related to the lack of appropriate medication lie at the root of up to 25 percent of all hospitalizations and cost over $21 billion a year. Our plan is the only one that takes account of this and covers prescription drugs along with other medical services.

You see it with the crisis of violence in the emergency room. We have to learn to treat violence as a public health problem. Billions of dollars a year again are loaded onto the health care system because we are the most violent country in the world. Many people in health care supported the Brady bill, support our attempts to restrict assault weapons, to put more police officers on the street. That also will help alleviate the health care problem. So I hope you'll be out there after we deal with this the best we can, also supporting what the administration is trying to do on crime.

I came here today once again to thank you for the work you have done with us and to appeal once again for your support, for the real battle is now being joined in Congress. And though we may disagree about the details, we all agree the time has come to do something. We have to do it now. And what we have to do includes providing guaranteed private insurance to every single American. That is what I need your help to do.

I implore you to go to Capitol Hill and tell your Members of Congress again what is going on in your hospitals. Go home and talk to your friends and neighbors about it and the people who come in to your hospitals. Talk to business leaders in your communities and local media people.

One of the biggest problems we have in this fight today is that this issue is so complex and people are naturally enough so concerned that they don't want to lose anything good that they have now, that it is easy to confuse people about what the real issues and the real facts are.

I love having a discussion with your representatives, even if there is some disagreement around the edges of policy. We come to the table with an accumulated knowledge of how the world really works. Our biggest problem in passing this is that there are too many people even in the Congress who have not had the opportunity to study this program in all of its complexity. This is a tough, tough issue. And as I could tell from your applause, you know that the most complex system that could ever be designed is not the one in the administra-

tion's bill, it's the one you're living with right now.

Our approach is not to tell you how to deliver health care, not to build barriers or bureaucracy. What we want to do is to establish a framework in which people are covered, provide the right incentives, help to remove the barriers to access, and get out of the way. We agree that local community-care networks must be the center of any reform system, groups of providers who see their mission as keeping people well, treating the sick when they are sick, and having the right incentives to do exactly that. We need to look no further than your own NOVA award winners for examples of providers who come together and make collaboration work.

One example, the Health Partners of Philadelphia, where six urban teaching hospitals came together and worked together to deal with violence and drugs and teen pregnancy in one community—this is a very moving sort of thing. This can be done throughout America. And we could do more of it if we covered everybody. It would lower the cost to the overall health care system if we did it, because we could practice prevention, we could give more primary care. The system as a whole would be less burdened, and we could have more networks like the one in Philadelphia you have honored.

I know that many of you are already finding incredibly creative ways to serve your community and are forming these networks. That approach will be quite consistent with the administration's approach. We helped to do that with clear incentives for people to join together in networks and guarantees that when they do there will be compensation there for the services that are provided. And we agree that reform must simplify the system for you by reducing the paperwork burden. There's no excuse for not having a single standard form to replace the thousands of forms that exist today. And we want to help you move forward; electronic billing, less regulation by the Government, and other ways to help get rid of some of this paperwork hassle. I am tired of trying to explain why we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork, regulation, and premiums than any other country in the world and we still don't even cover everybody. It cannot be explained, so it should be changed.

And I want you to help me do something else, too, when you go up to Congress. Ask every Member of Congress, the next time somebody comes to them and says, "What we really ought to do is tax the benefits, the health care benefits of middle class working people," say, "Well, before you tax the benefits of working people whose wages have been stagnant for 20 years, why don't you ask how we can justify spending a dime on the dollar more on paperwork, regulation, and insurance premiums than anybody else?" That is waste. Why take something away from hard-working people before you squeeze the system and its unconscionable burdens on hospitals, doctors, nurses, and the American people themselves? That is where we ought to start.

I also want to talk a little bit about the guarantee of private insurance. Most people, under our approach, would get insurance the same way they do today, through their employer. Each consumer, not an employer, not a bureaucrat, would have a choice of health care plans and doctors.

Let me point out something else on this choice. Today, 55 percent of the companies who insure their employees and 40 percent of the total work force insured through their employer have no choice today in doctors or health plans. They take the plan the employer has chosen. Under our plan, everybody would have at least three choices of plans, including the right to simply pick a doctor and have fee-for-service medicine. That is more choice than exists today, not less. Again, the rhetoric of people who have attacked change defies the reality of what people face and deal with in their daily lives in the health care system today.

Once someone has picked a plan, if they need to go to a doctor for a checkup or if they get sick, they'll simply take a health care security card, show it, and get the care they need. Then they'll fill out one standard form, and they're done. That way, we can go back to seeing hospitals as places of healing, not monuments to paperwork and bureaucracy.

I have heard so many stories in so many hospitals, I could keep you here all day laughing, but it would be like preaching to the saved. The only thing I want you to do is to go tell the Congress about it and that we can do better.

Last week when I spoke to Congress, I said that I would veto any legislation that did not cover every American with guaranteed insurance. Now, again I want to say that I did that because you know that unless we do that we can't have everybody playing by the same rules,

using the same forms, ending the cost shifting, and getting people the preventive and primary care they need so they don't simply wind up in the emergency room. That is, all the systematic problems that the Hospital Association brought to the administration when we began this discussion will continue unless we provide coverage to everyone.

Now again, I know there are issues to work out. There are differences about what level of Medicaid savings can be achieved. I'll tell you this: Our plan is the only one that takes the Medicare savings and puts it back into the health care system, which is very, very important. But the biggest thing you need to do, I would argue, to get a good health care bill out of Congress is make sure that the people in the Congress understand how the system works today and what these various approaches would do if they were passed.

Yesterday, Families USA issued a very valuable document which I just received a copy of this morning which takes 10 different families, 10 different health situations, and goes through in practical terms how they would be affected if each of the major plans now pending in the Congress were the law of the land. I would urge you to read it. But it won't surprise any of you because you know how the system works today.

Again, I implore you to take this debate to Congress, get beyond the rhetoric, get beyond the ideology, talk to people in the Congress about the American people and how the American health care system affects them. That is the only way we can work through the real problems as opposed to the imagined one.

One distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who represents a district with a wonderful teaching hospital and who has been required by virtue of his membership—his constituency—to become an expert on health policy over the years, read our plan the other day, and he said, "It's the only one that really takes account of so many different problems that most people don't even know about. But I have no idea how to get my colleagues in the Congress to take this issue seriously and spend all the time it would take to absorb it all."

You can do that. Every Member of Congress has a lot of hospitals in his or her district. Every Member of Congress basically cares a lot about health care. And you can come to this debate with a perspective that is not ideological, not partisan, has no ax to grind, doesn't care who wins except the American people and the American health care system. That's what you can bring to this debate.

So I would ask you, at a time when some say we just need a little tinkering and others say there are ideological barriers to changing it, I just want to say that Dick Davidson, your president, in my view, said it as well as it could be said last December. He said, "Comprehensive reform is what the American people are asking us to do. To do nothing, or worse, to fall back on simplistic solutions, only postpones and complicates our task." And that's the truth.

Let us stand together for the health care of the American people. We have a chance finally for the first time in decades to do this right. You know what needs to be done. I pledge to you an open door, a listening ear, a firm partnership. Let's go out there and solve this problem for the American people.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:18 a.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Davidson, president, American Hospital Association, and Carolyn Roberts, chairman-elect, American Hospital Association Board of Trustees.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association

February 1, 1994

Thank you very much. If anyone ever asks you what do Carroll Campbell and Bill Clinton have in common, you could say they have the same throat disease. [*Laughter*] He's doing better today than he was yesterday. I'm doing slightly worse. The good news is, you get a shorter speech.

I want to thank you all for being here and for your common concerns. Yesterday we had a good meeting and especially, I thought, a very

good discussion about the problem of crime in our country and the crime bill, the necessity to put more well-trained police officers on our streets and to take repeat violent criminals off the streets forever but also the necessity to be smart about the crime bill, to do things that make sense to you and to your law enforcement officials.

Today, I want to talk a little bit about two other fundamental challenges that we face: health care reform and welfare reform. They are linked inextricably to each other. And in order to meet these challenges, we will have to have an open and honest partnership both in passing the laws and, perhaps even more important, in implementing them.

We began our partnership, at least with me in this new job, about a year ago today when we had a very long and fruitful meeting at the White House. I think it ran in excess of 3 hours. That meeting resulted, among other things, in the approval of every major waiver for State health care reform that you have requested. There have been 5 of them and about 90 smaller waivers to enable different changes to be made at the State level. In addition to that, we've now granted waivers to nine States in the area of welfare reform.

I do believe the States are the laboratories of democracy. I do believe that where people are charged with solving the real problems of real people, reality and truth in politics often is more likely to give way to making progress.

Last August you all said, Democrats and Republicans alike, that our health care system is in crisis. In the last several days we've had a big linguistic battle in Washington about whether we have a crisis or a serious problem. I think it's better, since we're at the Governors' meeting, to focus on the facts. We do have a system, unlike any other in the advanced countries in the world, in which insurance companies decide who's covered and who isn't, what the cost of insurance is, and what's covered in specific policies. We do have a system in which the number of uninsured people is going up significantly. We do have a system in which more and more Americans, therefore, who have insurance are at risk of losing it if they get sick or if their job goes away.

We clearly have a system, as our SBA Director Erskine Bowles, from North Carolina, never tires of telling me, where small businesses have premiums that, on average, are 35 percent higher than large businesses or Government. We have a system in which State budgets have been extraordinarily burdened by the exploding costs of their Medicaid match, so that last year, for the first time ever, States spent more money on health care than on State-funded higher education.

We have a system in which the lowest estimate of uncompensated care burdens on hospitals is $25 billion a year; in which 58 million Americans, according to the Medical Association, are without coverage at some time during the year; in which 81 million Americans have a preexisting condition, which means either that their premiums are higher or that they can't get insurance or that they can't ever change jobs, which is an enormous burden in a system in which labor mobility is, I am convinced, the key to personal and family prosperity as we move toward the 21st century.

Finally, we have a system in which three out of four insurance policies have lifetime limits, which means if you get really sick you might run out of insurance in the middle of the time when you need it most.

Now, those are facts. They can be seen in the million letters, almost, that the First Lady has received since we started this whole effort to deal with health care. On the way in, I was describing briefly to Governor Campbell a letter I got from—or she got from Jo Anne Osteen of Sumter, South Carolina, who owns a small business, works 6 days a week, raised three children by herself with diabetes and arthritis. Although she had diabetes and arthritis, when she wrote us she hadn't been in the hospital one time in the 12 years that she'd been with her insurers. But her insurance rates went up to $306 a month, even though she was only taking home $205 a week from her business. Her doctors told her that the answer was to quit and go on disability. So she wrote, "Those high premiums are going to force people like me to the welfare and food stamp lines with no insurance. I am a proud American, and I don't want this to happen to me. I have thought about nothing but this problem, and I don't know where to turn."

Well, I think we ought to heed her call for help. A lot of you do, too, and that's why you've tried to reform your health care systems. After all, this woman has values that keep this country together. They're the ones that built our Nation. And we shouldn't force people like that to con-

sider seriously whether they should go on to public assistance in order to take care of their children.

There's a flip side to this, too, this connection between welfare and health care, which I want to mention. I talked about it a little in the State of the Union Address. But we often say to people they should leave welfare and go to work. And we know that welfare benefits themselves in real dollar terms are lower today than they were 20 years ago in most States. So that the welfare check has almost nothing to do with why people stay on welfare. They stay because of the medical care and because of child care and because they have low skills. But we have this incredible situation in our country where if someone on welfare leaves welfare to take an entry-level job that doesn't have health insurance, as soon as the coverage of the Family Support Act runs out, you have people making low wages paying taxes to pay for health care for people who stayed on welfare and didn't make the same decision they did.

So these two issues are clearly tied together, and we need to see them together as a part of what it would take to make America a place where people who work hard, play by the rules, and believe in the kind of values that permeate the efforts that all the Governors around this table are making are rewarded for that.

Now, we've made a beginning. Last year, the Congress passed in the context of the budget act a huge increase in the earned-income tax credit which lifts families with children on modest wages out of poverty. When tax bills come due this April, 15 million families with a total of about, we estimate, 50 million Americans, will be lifted beyond the poverty line by getting tax reduction under the earned-income tax credit. That means that there will no longer be an income incentive for people to choose welfare over work.

But the welfare system has a lot of other problems as well. Too often it still rewards values other than family and personal responsibility. Instead of encouraging those to stay together as we should, it often encourages families to break apart. Instead of encouraging children who have children to live with their parents or grandparents, it often encourages them to leave home. Instead of enforcing child support and asking those who bring children into the world to take responsibility for them, it too often ignores—it's too difficult to collect the $34 billion absent parents should be paying to their children.

Perhaps most important—we were talking about this on the way in—an enormous part of this problem is the explosion of births to people who have never been married at all. And there is nothing in the present system, except where the States have taken the initiative to do it, to stop teen pregnancy from occurring in the first place. Even in the Family Support Act of '88, and I want to say more about that because I'm really proud of what we did on it, there was nothing to stop the condition from occurring in the first place.

And we need to devote, as this debate takes place, an enormous amount of attention to some of the decisions that we ought to make, some of them quite politically courageous. Governor Campbell was talking about some of the things they're doing in South Carolina which mirror some of the things we tried to do at home to try to stop these things from occurring in the first place.

This year I have committed, and Senator Moynihan, I think, and Senator Dole probably both talked about this—to offer in the springtime a comprehensive welfare reform bill to restore these values of responsibility and family. We want to help those who are on welfare to get on their feet. We want to help them for up to 2 years with training and child care and other supports. But after that, we need to have a system that says anybody who can work and support themselves and their families must do so, in the private sector where possible, with a community service job if that's the only work available, to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life.

Now, those of us in this room have worked on this issue for years. I was privileged, along with the then-Governor of Delaware, Mike Castle, to be the representatives of the Governors who work with Senator Moynihan and with Congressman Ford and others on the welfare reform effort that became the Family Support Act of 1988. Mike Castle is now in the Congress, having changed jobs with Tom Carpenter. Guess who thinks he got the better deal out of that?

We never fully implemented that act. You know it, and I know it. So we ought to begin asking ourselves: Did we do a good job then? What progress has been made in the States? There's a lot of evidence that significant

progress has been made in the States that have been most aggressive.

Why was it never fully implemented? Partly because Congress never fully funded it, partly because—as you will never hear the end of it, they'll say, "Well, but the States never fully used all the money we came up with. States must not have really cared about this because they never provided the State match to use all the funds." You know why the States never provided the State match, don't you? You had to spend all your money making the Medicaid match, which was not optional, it was mandatory, and building prison cells. That's where we spent all of our new money in the 1980's and the early nineties.

So I point this out not to do any finger-pointing but just to say one of the things we need to do is to go back and look at that bill, see what's good about it, figure out what will be necessary to change so that the States can take full advantage of that bill, because it had incentives to work, it had supports for families. It was never fully implemented because you had to spend all your money on mandatory explosions and medical costs and building prison cells, many of which were also mandated by the Federal courts, not the Congress. So we need to begin there.

We also need to know that—to recognize again—though I will say that we estimate that about one in five, just under one in five people who get back on welfare after they get off do so for a health-related reason. Because so many people on welfare, virtually everyone has younger children, the loss of the health care coverage for the younger children for people who leave welfare is an enormous disincentive to get off of it.

That's why I think that a year ago in the winter meeting, the Governors hit the nail on the head when they said the kinds of structural changes that must occur in the health care system can't be effective until every legal resident of America has health insurance. I believe that the health care solution and the welfare solution are inextricably linked.

Let me say just a few words about health care. I'm encouraged by what I understand was said by the speakers before I got here today. And again, I wish I could keep you in constant session here. You seem to have a leveling effect on the political rhetoric of the Nation's Capital. Guaranteed private insurance for every American is the only way we'll ever be able to control the cost of this system, simplify it, and provide the American people with security of health benefits that can never be taken away. Unless we do that, too many will continue to get their care in emergency rooms, which will add billions of dollars to the health care bill. Too many will continue to not have certain things covered. Too many, for example, will be part of the Americans who add an estimated $21 billion to our health care bills every year because they can't afford medicine that would keep them out of hospitals, so they wind up going to the hospitals and costing the American people much more. We certainly won't be able to simplify the system and reduce the unnecessary bureaucracy.

One of the things that I challenge all the folks to do who believe that the beginning of health care reform is to tax the benefits of middle class workers who have generous health care packages, is to say: How can we do that? How can we start with that when we know we have a system where we spend 10 percent more on paperwork, bureaucracy, and insurance premiums than any other nation in the world? And these things have nothing to do with health care. We just have a system that is organized so that we spend a dime on the dollar more on paperwork than any other country in the world, paperwork in the insurance office, paperwork in the hospitals, paperwork in the doctor's office.

I just left the American Hospital Association, and they have said, clearly, the only way you'll ever fix this is to have a system that provides basic coverage to everybody, so that you can have a single claims form which will be imposed on the patients, single claims form for the hospitals, single claims form for the doctors. It is imperative that we do that.

There was a study in the New England Journal of Medicine a year or so ago: two hospitals, one in the United States, one in Canada, same number of beds, same rate of occupancy, same general mix of treatment, one of them had 200 people in their clerical department, the other had 6. Now, I don't advocate going to the single-payer system for other reasons; there are other problems in the Canadian system. And it is the second most expensive in the world. I think managed competition will work better. But it is clear that we cannot justify, in my view, taking something away from the working people of this

country before we clean up the administrative costs of the present system.

I also will say without full coverage, I don't see any way to avoid the conclusion that States will continue to bear a disproportionate burden of skyrocketing health care costs. The Lewin study showed that States would pay less under our approach than if we just left things the way they are and that health care would improve.

I still believe in the requirement for employers to cover their employees. First of all, that's the way most people get their health insurance today. Under our approach people would have a choice in their health care program. There's been a lot of discussion about this. Let's go beyond the rhetoric to the reality today.

Today, 55 percent of all employers and 40 percent of all employees who are covered with health insurance through the workplace have no choice in the health care plan or the doctors they get, they are selected by the employer, today. Under our plan, every employee would have to get at least three choices once a year, one of which would be just picking your doctor and having fee-for-service medicine.

So I'm all for choice, but we need to recognize that if we want the benefits of competition and the benefits of choice, we have to move away from the trend that we are setting now. We are moving in the direction of getting the benefits of competition and market power for big business and Government. And some of you have asked for reforms, Governor McWherter, among others, to put Medicaid into a managed competition environment to get the benefits of that. But the problem is some people will get the benefits of that, other people on the other end will lose choice. So if you want to pursue both values at once, we plainly have to change the direction in which we are going. And we have to have a different framework if you wish to have both.

Now, in spite of some of the interesting art work that you've seen in the last couple of weeks, the Washington Post said that our approach would create, and I quote, "a surprisingly simple world for consumers." You make a decision once a year, among at least three plans, based on what you want. I wish we could even have more choice. We haven't figured out how to do that yet. But Federal employees have a great deal, for example, and many of you in States have given your State employees more and more choices. And because you have market power, you can do that, which is why you have to give some framework for the small businesses to have the same market power that big business and Government does.

Now, a lot of this approach builds on what I have seen a lot of you do in the States. Hawaii proved a long time ago that if you did it right, you can have an employer requirement to cover employees without bankrupting small business but providing better coverage, stronger work force, and lowering health care costs because of the way the market can be organized. The Governor of Hawaii has spoken eloquently about this. You can say, "Well, Hawaii is geographically isolated and, besides that, we all like to go there and surf and play golf or whatever." Well, that's why we want to do it for the whole country instead of just impose it on one State or another.

We learned from Minnesota that health care cost targets can be set and met through strong leadership, market-forces competition, and high quality. And I might say, Governor Carlson, that the Mayo Clinic stands—if there were no other example in this country, and there are—but if you just take that one example, it is a sterling and a stunning rebuke to those who say you cannot provide the world's highest class health care and control costs.

We learned from the example of Washington State and of Florida and most recently of Maryland that you can pool businesses and families together to change the David-and-Goliath equation, and then small businesses and families can get affordable health insurance that covers the things which need to be covered. We learn from Pennsylvania—we learn two things from Pennsylvania. The first thing is that the Governor of Pennsylvania proves that you can do anything in the health care system. We also learn that better tracking of costs and outcomes improves the quality and lowers the cost. This is an amazing thing they did, and our approach encompasses this. Whatever the Congress does, this should be a part of it. Pennsylvania actually took the time to study and report on the cost of different procedures in different hospitals in different parts of the State and then measured the cost against the results, proving that there was not a necessary connection in many areas between cost and quality and changing the whole environment in terms of what consumers then could ask for and get. This sounds like

a simple thing, but in a system this complicated this information, available in a way that people can act on it, is a rarity, not the rule, in American health care.

So I believe that if we at the Federal level can learn from these things and finally solve this problem in a comprehensive way, we will go a long way toward dealing with the welfare reform issue, and we will lay to rest one of the biggest problems for American families and for the long-term stability of our society.

Now, what normally happens around here is that everybody gives their speeches, and then we have Washington-style reform where we tinker at the edges, expand the Medicaid program a little more. That's what we've been doing for years, you know, just kind of backing toward universal coverage by expanding Medicaid mandates. And then at the same time, we try to ratchet down the Federal spending a little more and pass some other incremental reforms. You know what's going to happen? We do that, more mandates on you and less money for you to pay. That's what's going to happen. More State money put into a system that is fundamentally broken, without enough security, where someone else is making the fundamental policy decisions.

I talked to you a few moments ago about Jo Anne Osteen from Sumter, South Carolina. She wrote us last June, struggling to hang on to both her small business and her insurance. She had to make a choice, and she chose her business and lost her coverage. After decades and decades, it's time to solve that woman's problem, because her problem is our problem. And her problem is now the State government's problem.

We really can do things around here when we put our minds to it. We've got the deficit going down instead of up. We all got together, some of you mentioned it yesterday, in a bipartisan and Federal, State way and passed NAFTA when it was given up for dead. That enabled us to get a GATT agreement which was stalled for 7 years. Congress passed the Brady bill after a 7-year stall. We actually can do things around here when people work at it and they keep pushing us to make a decision and they keep us all in the right frame of mind and they keep us thinking about real things. You cannot escape the real world and the rhetoric. You can't do it because you're too close to your folks.

Here, we communicate most often with the American people through an array of intermediaries. And most times, too many times people can't get to us with their real problems. So there is always a danger here that the policy apparatus will just slip the tracks and that we'll forget what this is about.

Yesterday, Families USA issued this report, which I urge you all to get and read. It just takes 10 typical health care situations that actually happen to real Americans and identifies how those things would be dealt with under the major bills pending before Congress. In other words, it's not about politics and rhetoric and theory, it's about real lives.

So I ask you to help us do this. You all differ among yourselves; we have some differences with you. That's fine, that's good, that's what this is all about. But I remember in 1987 and 1988, we were struggling to deal with welfare reform. And every Governor in the country wanted to do something about it. And the political rhetoric—the Governors were converging around an issue, but the political rhetoric in Washington was diverging right and left. And we sat around here and talked; we tried to get agreement on a policy position. And Governor Campbell had just left the Congress where he had been the minority leader of the subcommittee that dealt with welfare. And he said to the Democrats and Republicans alike, "Look, I had to go talk to a bunch of people on welfare, and here is the way this works. Here is the intersection of welfare, health care, food stamps, the whole thing."

It was an incredible moment where all of us had to say, this is not about rhetoric, this is about real people. And we went on and passed the Family Support Act, which Senator Moynihan said was the most significant piece of social reform in the welfare area in three decades.

Now, we can do this on health care. I don't believe we can do it unless everybody gets coverage. But we can do it, and you can help us do it if you push the thing together around real problems, real facts, and real issues, and don't let Washington rhetoric pull the country apart. The country needs you, and I hope you'll stay with us until the job is done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:46 a.m. at the J.W. Marriott. In his remarks, he referred to Gov-

ernors Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., of South Carolina, Ned Ray McWherter of Tennessee, and Arne Carlson of Minnesota.

Remarks Announcing the Nomination of Deval L. Patrick To Be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and an Exchange With Reporters

February 1, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. For tens of millions of Americans the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has historically embodied what is best about our country. It's helped us to keep the promise of our Constitution, to provide to every American equal opportunity and equal protection under the law, regardless of race or gender or disability. Because of our pursuit of equal treatment under the law, we've made a lot of progress in this country in the workplace, in the schools, in the voting booths, and in the courts. But there is still much more to be done. We need a strong and aggressive Civil Rights Division and a strong and compassionate advocate for freedom and fairness at the helm of that Division.

Today I am proud to nominate Deval Patrick to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. I believe he is uniquely qualified to lead this Division in this decade. He's been chosen because he has distinguished himself as a lawyer whose wise counsel, keen negotiating skills, and mastery at litigation are held in the highest esteem.

He's fought successfully against discrimination and for civil rights for his entire life, both professionally and personally. He understands that the law is a tool to help real people with real problems. He's here with his family today, having come a long way from his childhood on the south side of Chicago through a distinguished academic and professional career of which any American could be proud.

The quest for civil rights gives life to our highest ideals and our deepest hopes. For his entire career Deval Patrick has played a role in that struggle, and he has made a real difference. Therefore, I know he will perform in a very outstanding manner in his new role as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Mr. Patrick?

Attorney General? [*Laughter*] I don't know what order he's in.

Mr. Patrick. Stick with me.

The President. That's the idea.

[*At this point, Attorney General Janet Reno and Mr. Patrick made brief remarks.*]

Assistant Attorney General Nominee

Q. Mr. President, conservative groups are already attacking Mr. Patrick, the same groups that attacked Lani Guinier, saying that he is the "Stealth Guinier." How are you going to sell this nomination and make sure that your view of his record gets out accurately?

The President. Well, I think that this nomination may be about those groups and whether they're proceeding in good faith. That is, you know, before those groups said, "Well, we don't object to Lani Guinier's career as a lawyer. We just don't agree with her writings about future remedies." So now when they say "Stealth Guinier," what they mean is that both these people have distinguished legal careers in trying to enforce the civil rights laws of the country. I hope that Mr. Patrick would plead guilty to that.

And the truth is, a lot of those people are going to be exposed because they never believed in the civil rights laws, they never believed in equal opportunity, they never lifted a finger to give anybody of a minority race a chance in this country. And this time, if they try that, it's going to be about them, because they won't be able to say it's about somebody's writings, about future remedies. If they attack his record it means just exactly what we've all suspected all along, they don't give a riff about civil rights.

Well, those of us who care about civil rights were elected by the American people to take care of them. That's what we intended to do.

Death Penalty

Q. Mr. President, do you agree with his argument that the death penalty is racially discriminatory against blacks?

The President. Do I agree? He's made that argument in court. I don't agree with that, no.

Q. A 1987 Supreme Court case.

The President. No.

Q. Have you talked with him about——

The President. But I think the most compelling evidence that was introduced to support it, as I've said many times as a supporter of capital punishment, is that the race of the victim seems to determine the outcome of the verdict. There's a lot of evidence—the Supreme Court actually did not reject that evidence. They just said that that was not sufficient to outlaw the penalty as a constitutional matter. And I have repeatedly said I think that every State prosecutor ought to examine that. If there is evidence—every State ought to look and see, is there evidence that there's a disparity in the application of this penalty based on the race of the victim. If there is, States ought to take steps to try to do something about it.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, Senator Dole says that your staff shouldn't go around calling people liars just because they disagree with them on health care. Is this exchange beginning to escalate out of hand?

The President. No. I don't know what he's talking about. I'm sorry, I can't—I don't——

Q. Well, he's talking about the reply that your office put out to an article about the Clinton health plan in the New Republic last week, which goes in several places to say that they are blatant lies. He was addressing it specifically to Mr. Magaziner.

The President. Well, I hate to use that word, but the New Republic article was way off base. And the New Republic didn't make total disclosure about the source of the article.

But I think Senator Dole was quite conciliatory at the Governors' Association today, and I have certainly tried to be constructive. And I know it may make better news for you all to drive a wedge between us, but it's better for the American people if we work together and tone our rhetoric down.

Northern Ireland

Q. On a foreign policy matter, sir, Gerry Adams says the time has come for the United States to weigh in on the Ireland question. You had spoken in the campaign of becoming more involved or having the United States more involved in trying to find a peaceful solution there. Will you take a more aggressive stance toward trying to promote a peace settlement in Northern Ireland?

The President. Well, when I spoke about that in the campaign, we didn't have the evidence that we now have that the British and the Irish Government would take the steps that they have taken. Let's be fair. The people that have to resolve this are the Irish and the British, and since that campaign, I think it's astonishing what's been done. The joint declaration is something the United States very much supports.

I did believe that by giving Mr. Adams this visa, this limited visa to come here, that we might have a constructive role in pushing the peace process, which is why I did it. And I think that was an appropriate thing to do. But I think we should also support the work being done by the Prime Ministers of both Ireland and Britain in pursuing the peace.

Health Care Reform

Q. Senator Rockefeller today said that he thought you were being a little bit too conciliatory to your good friends the Governors on health care, and he thought that maybe Mrs. Clinton could bring you back. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, Senator Rockefeller made a big mistake today. He's a wonderful man, but he made a big mistake. He read a press report and assumed it was true, I mean—[*laughter*]—or fully accurate. That is, he read a report of someone else's characterization of what I said and assumed it was fully accurate. And the people who were characterizing it obviously were characterizing the conversation in the light most favorable to their position.

I don't mean that the press misreported it. I mean the press reported it accurately. But that's what they do. When you have private conversations with people, they often characterize it in the light most favorable to their position. I think that's what happened.

I didn't say anything differently in that meeting than I have said repeatedly, which is that we are and we should be flexible on the size of the alliances—that's already been said by Secretary Bentsen—and that in order to have a health care plan which passes muster in the Congress, we have to have some way of showing how much taxpayer money is at risk over a 5-year period. That's required of every bill passed by Congress.

That's all I said, and I think the interpretation of it—while I don't dispute whatever they said, I think that the folks who communicated that to the press were doing it in the light most favorable to their own position. I understand that; that's fair game. But I would caution Senator Rockefeller to not think that I'd left his position. In many ways he's the heart and soul of this fight for health care. And if we change positions, he and I, we're going to try to do it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:38 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Message to the Congress on Small Business
February 1, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present my first annual report on the state of small business. This report covers data for fiscal year 1992, a period of slow economic recovery that occurred just before my Administration took office.

Small businesses create many new jobs and are an important part of our Nation's economic growth. That is why, in my first address to the Joint Session of the Congress, I proposed some of the boldest targeted incentives for small business in history. These measures will benefit not only small businesses, but the American work force, our Nation's economy, and our international competitiveness.

At the same time, we must undertake some major corrective efforts. As small business owners will testify, the best thing the government could do for small business and the economy is to reduce the deficit. The primary goal of the economic program is to set the economy on the proper course for the short- and long-term future. Deficit reduction and shifting consumption to investment are the ways to accomplish that goal.

Reducing health care costs while ensuring that all Americans have access to health care is another national imperative. I have said it before: bringing health spending in line with inflation would do more for the private sector than almost any incentive or tax cut we could promote. At the same time, we must find a way to provide health care for everyone. Currently two-thirds of the Americans without health insurance are employed—many in small businesses. My health care task force has evaluated many proposals to ensure that health care is available to small business employees and affordable for small business owners. It will take time to change our health care system, but we are taking the important first steps.

We will also need to keep looking for better ways to provide for workers upon retirement. As this report documents, pension plans, like health plans, are much less available and affordable in small businesses. And as the baby boom generation moves toward retirement, issues related to Social Security and pension plan availability take on new urgency.

Beyond these long-range efforts, I have asked the Congress to join me in investing in small business and economic growth through specific tax incentives, capital formation initiatives, enterprise and empowerment zones, technology investments, and education and job training efforts.

To encourage long-term investment in small business, I supported—and the Congress passed—a 50 percent tax exclusion on capital gains from investments in qualified small business stock held for at least 5 years. This incentive, which will help small businesses raise critically needed capital, is projected to create 80,000 new jobs over the next 5 years. I also favored such an exclusion for investment in small business venture capital firms targeting investments to minority-owned businesses. Another small business incentive I supported increases the "Section 179" expensing limitation from $10,000 to $17,500, which will enable a number of smaller firms to purchase equipment needed for modernization and growth.

My Administration supports easing the regulatory burden on small firms so that more of the time spent filling out paperwork—especially complicated or duplicative paperwork—can be

used for more productive activities. There are a number of measures we can take. We have already simplified the computation of certain taxes such as the alternative minimum tax and we have eased the safe harbor rules related to the individual estimated tax. And we can ensure that Federal agencies comply with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which requires them to assess the effects of their proposed regulations on small firms.

Recent low interest rates have made resources more available to consumers for purchasing the products and services of American business and have made loans somewhat less expensive for the business community. In addition, I have proposed a number of measures to make capital more available to small business. To ease the "credit crunch" faced by many small firms, new provisions are loosening restrictions on banks so they can more easily make "character" loans, easing appraisal requirements for real estate used as collateral for small business loans, eliminating overlapping Federal regulations on lending institutions, and establishing an appeals process for banks and consumers who believe they have been unfairly treated by regulators.

Small and minority-owned businesses would also benefit from a strengthened system of community development banks. A proposed Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Fund would support investment in community development financial institutions (CDFIs). These CDFIs would be a source for loans and technical assistance to individuals and businesses in communities underserved by traditional lending institutions.

Another way we plan to support the growth of new small enterprises, especially in economically depressed areas, is through the establishment of empowerment zones, enterprise communities, and rural development investment areas. The zones and communities will be nominated by State and local governments and chosen on a competitive basis after certain criteria based on population, geographic area, and poverty level are met. Businesses in these designated communities can take advantage of expanded tax-exempt financing. Businesses in empowerment zones will be given additional employment credits and tax incentives.

Only by fully developing our technological and human resources can we expect to be leaders in the international marketplace. That means investment in technology and worker skills.

There are a number of actions we can take to remain technologically competitive. We can extend the research and experimentation tax credit to encourage more research activities by American small businesses. I would like to see an expansion of the Small Business Innovation Research program, which, as documented in this report, helps channel Federal research funding to innovative small firms. I support a strong Small Business Technology Transfer program in which small businesses work with Federal laboratories and universities to develop promising technology and introduce it into the marketplace. The manufacturing extension centers we have proposed would help small- and medium-sized businesses evaluate new manufacturing technology. And I'd like to see an expansion of the Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program, which provides matching grants to companies working on generic technology. Finally, we need to speed up computer networks and coordinate Federal information and telecommunications policy.

We are looking at innovative ways to employ, train, and provide for a work force second to none. To begin with, we have extended the targeted jobs tax credit, which is available to employers who hire economically disadvantaged youth and members of specific at-risk groups. But that is just a small part of a large picture: many State, local, and private groups are experimenting with innovative ways to develop and train a competitive work force for the 21st century.

Clearly, our Nation faces many challenges. Fortunately, we face them with an almost limitless resource—the variety and ingenuity of the American people. If we can meet our national challenges with the energy and innovative spirit of America's small business owners, we will be doing very well. So I encourage the Members of Congress, together with young people and small business owners and all Americans to reach into your imaginations: dream boldly and begin something new.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 1, 1994.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

February 2, 1994

The President. Let me say just a word here. I can't speak very loud. This is our first but what will be the first of several bipartisan leadership meetings, and I'm looking forward to a productive year. We had a good year working together in 1993. We did a lot of things, and even though we have some differences to resolve, I'm convinced that we can resolve them and work together on crime and welfare reform and health care. And I'm looking forward to it.

Vietnam

Q. Mr. President, there seems to be a bipartisan majority, at least in the Senate, urging you to finally lift the trade embargo against Vietnam. Is this the moment that you're ready to move forward on that?

The President. Well, I've not made a final decision, but we are reviewing it and will be reviewing it over the next couple of days.

Q. ——this week—have a decision this week?

The President. Well, I'll have a decision, I'd say, within the next several days.

Q. Is that decision harder, sir, because of your college-age protest against the war? Is it politically more tough?

The President. Not really. I mean, I think the fact that there are so many distinguished veterans who think that the embargo should be lifted and there are people on the other side who voted who were not veterans; this is an issue for the present day, and we just have to do what's right today.

Q. Is there any connection at all to the apparent exoneration of Commerce Secretary Ron Brown by the Justice Department and the grand jury, to this decision that could happen on Vietnam?

The President. No.

Health Care Reform

Q. The Business Roundtable today is supposed to support Cooper's bill. How will that affect you?

The President. They're trying to decide what their negotiating position would be. They told me yesterday, the representatives, that they had no thought that it would pass. They're trying to decide what their best negotiating position is. I made an argument that their best negotiating position ought to be to say what they thought was wrong with our bill, because almost all of them—not all of them, but almost all of them—favor guaranteed private insurance for everyone to stop the cost shifting to them. Most big businesses have paid higher premiums than they should have because of the cost shifting. And since they all cover their employees, most of them favor some form of universal coverage.

And so I argued that if that was really their position, their best policy ought to be to give a laundry list of everything they thought was wrong with our bill and that that was an appropriate thing, but they'll have to make their own decision about what they want to do.

Q. Can you convince them?

The President. I don't have any idea. I only talked to a handful of them, so I didn't have a shot at most of them.

President's Health

Q. How are you feeling?

The President. Good. It's getting better.

Q. Are you going to do mostly listening or talking?

The President. What do you think? I never learned anything talking in my life. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:13 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the Department of Labor Conference on Reemployment
February 2, 1994

First of all, let me thank all of you for being willing to be a part of this program today, and all of you who are here. And let me thank whoever set the microphone up for my hoarse voice. I presume you can hear it out there, even in its depleted condition.

Before I became President, I worked, incidentally, with some of the people in this audience today as a Governor for a dozen years on a lot of these kinds of programs which we know work. And we did an awful lot of work in my home State to try to help customize programs to meet the needs of not only the people who were losing their jobs but also to fit them to the economy that existed and the economy that was emerging in our State and to try at the same time to shape the economy so that there would be opportunities for people who were willing to go through the retraining programs. Nonetheless, I always had this frustration that there were a lot of people who were succeeding because they were good people, and there were good people running these programs and they were making them work sometimes against all the odds, but I never had the feeling that there was a system established in our country that made any real sense for the economy that exists today and the one that's going forward.

Now, Secretary Reich and I were talking on the way over here, and I had already reviewed all the materials on this conference, about the morning session focusing on what's wrong with the present system and the second session talking about things that work. We obviously have some real success stories here, and what I would like to do is to maybe just ask some of the panelists to talk a little bit about their own experiences and then to try to identify whatever was in their experience that ought to be part of a national program, that ought to be part of—in other words, every program with Federal money in it everywhere. That's really what we mean by national program because there's not a national economy in that sense.

I mean, the economy is different, and the pool of people and what their needs are is different in every place. But it seems to me there ought to be some common elements to these programs. So that's kind of what I hope will come out of this, and I hope that all of you who are out here will also be thinking of that. We have to shape in this year legislation that will, to use our common phrase that the Vice President's given us, reinvent the way we provide these training opportunities in the hope that we can create more success stories.

There are other things we have to do, too. And I'll say more about that at the end of the program. But that is what I'd like to focus on, because we have to make some hard decisions in the next 30 to 45 days about what ought to be in these programs, what we can fund, and what we can't. Inevitably we'll come up against budgetary constraints, and there will be some things we'll be able to do and some things we won't. So, I'd like to start by asking each of you to talk maybe in a little more detail about your personal experiences. And then if you can say in your own words what you think ought to be in every program in every State that affects someone like you, I hope you will do that.

[*At this point, the President participated in a panel discussion with formerly displaced workers and representatives of the programs which helped them to find jobs, and his remarks were not released by the Office of the Press Secretary. The President then made the following concluding remarks.*]

Let me wrap up by just making a couple of observations, first of all, to thank all those panelists who were here, the ones on my panel and the ones who were here earlier, and all of you for coming.

What we are trying to do in our administration with the leadership of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education and many others is to establish a system of lifelong learning, to recognize that people are going to change work seven or eight times in a lifetime, that even if you're fortunate enough to have your employer able to keep you with the same company for a lifetime, doing that will require continuous changing skills.

The way we do things will be different tomorrow than the way we did things today. You heard Father Cunningham talking about making a clean car. Well, being a bank teller is a very

different job today than it was 5 years ago, too. Working in most hospital jobs are different today than it was 5 years ago. Things are changing rapidly, and they will continue to.

We have some major pieces of legislation: Our Goals 2000 bill, which affects the way public schools operate and tries to give them some international standards against which to measure their own efforts; a school-to-work initiative which tries to recognize that a lot of young people don't go to college but do need the kinds of skills that we've been talking about today. And we are going to propose transforming the whole unemployment system to try to deal with some of the problems you heard about today, to make it a continuous reemployment system so that there is at least no delay from the time a person stops getting a paycheck until a person starts into a retraining program, because we know that the old jobs don't come back anymore. And we're going to try to do it in a way that will give enormous incentives to support programs at the local level that get rid of bureaucracy and that aren't all divided up, not only consolidating the training programs but, with these one-stop centers, making sure that nobody who loses a job is left to the chance of whether some coworker says, "Well, here's a program that might work," and that no one on welfare wanders out of the welfare office and has to depend on the luck of someone else saying, "Here's something that will help you turn your life around." It seems to me that we have to do that.

The second thing we have to do, to follow up on what Linda said, is to reward programs that produce results and to make it absolutely clear that those results are what matter, that in the end, that the job training programs have to lead to work or they don't work.

Later this month we will introduce the "Reemployment Act of 1994" which will, hopefully, contain the wisdom that all of you have imparted to us today. And I hope you will help us to pass it. In a time in which we have to cut domestic spending, we have to find more money to spend on this. And I am presenting a budget to the Congress on Monday which will eliminate completely 100 Government programs and cut back over 300 others, so that we can squeeze the money out of this budget to put more money into people to get jobs in the private sector where the future of the country is.

And again, I will say that I hope all of you will support that, because we've got a lot of yesterday's programs in the Government, too, and we're just kidding ourselves if we just keep spending money on things that don't really move the whole economy forward, don't create more jobs, don't give people a different and a better future.

We know right now from what you've told us that we have to consolidate all these different programs for laid-off workers. And again, it won't be easy because there will be people, good people in the Congress who will say, "Well, there was reason we had this separate program. There were people we were trying to help."

We've got to learn to trust people like Father Cunningham and Linda Butler, and other people at the grassroots level who are producing jobs. We have to consolidate the programs in law and let them diversify, in fact, where it makes sense, out in the country. Instead of that, we had the reverse. We have diversified the programs in law so that they can't have any impact out there in the country. So I hope you will help us to do that.

The bill will create one-stop shopping centers, and it will create incentives to put the consumer first and to try to bring the business community into this so that employers, even when they don't have to, will want to give their workers more notice. Working people in this country are grownups. They understand the global economy. They know what is happening, and they deserve the right to control their destiny in a better way. And so we will try to engage the employer community in that and the labor community in that. And I'm very hopeful that we can.

And finally, we're working hard to get as much money as we can to make this training long-term, to have enough time to meet the needs of people, and to meet the needs of our future economy. And I have learned some very specific things today that we're going to go back and try to make sure we've got in that bill as well as in the welfare reform bill. Three years from now, I never want to hear another Cynthia Scott story like that again. The welfare office ought to be the work office; it ought to be the job training office; it ought to be the place where you can be a successful worker and a successful parent.

So, I thank you all for coming. I thank you for your contributions. I want to say a little

about my friend of 25 years, our Labor Secretary. I think he's done a wonderful job because he cares about people like you, and we're trying to be relevant to your future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Blue Room at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following panel participants: Rev. William Cunningham, executive director, Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI; Linda Lyons Butler, job placement specialist, Tradeswomen of Philadelphia/Women in Non-Traditional Jobs (WIN/TOP), Philadelphia, PA; and Cynthia Scott, participant, Project QUEST, San Antonio, TX.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Railroad Safety

February 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report on the Administration of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970, pursuant to section 211 of the Act (45 U.S.C. 440(a)).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 2, 1994.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund

February 2, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I transmit herewith the first annual report on the status of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as required by section 330 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–580). This report covers the history of the Trust Fund from its inception in 1987 through fiscal year 1992.

The Harbor Maintenance Fee and Trust Fund program now provides 100 percent of the operations and maintenance expenditures for those activities of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the Army Corps of Engineers, which benefit commercial navigation. In fiscal year 1992, nearly $500 million was appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for such purposes. This report provides an evaluation of the Trust Fund, including its administration, use, and prospects for the future.

I have delegated responsibility for transmittal of this report in future years to the Secretary of Defense.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Norman Y. Mineta, Chairman, House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and Max Baucus, Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Nomination for the African Development Foundation
February 2, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate John F. Hicks, Jr., to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation. The African Development Foundation is an independent, nonprofit Government corporation which seeks to provide self-help initiatives to the poor populations of Africa. Last week, the President announced his intention to nominate Willie Grace Campbell and Marion M. Dawson to be among the Board's members.

"John Hicks has served our country well for almost 20 years and knows what the developing economies of Africa need in order to prosper," said the President. "He will be a strong addition to the African Development Foundation's Board."

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

Remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast
February 3, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Senator Stevens. Ladies and gentlemen, you have to forgive me; my voice has not quite returned. The Vice President said earlier that being on the same program with Mother Teresa reminded him of the basketball player who scored one point in a game where Michael Jordan scored 68, and then he said for the rest of his life, "Well, we scored 69 points together." I feel like the guy who comes in with 5 seconds left to go with—the team's gotten a 40-point lead, and all I have to do is hold the ball until the buzzer rings. [*Laughter*]

First of all, I thank you, Mother Teresa, for your moving words and more importantly for the lifetime of commitment, for you have truly lived by what you say, something we would all do well to emulate, and I thank you for that.

Like all of you, I was so moved by the profession of faith and the experiences of Mother Teresa that almost anything that any of us could say would be anticlimactic. However, I would like to make these points as briefly as I can, for we come here to pray for those in authority, those given, by the people of the United States under our Constitution and laws, responsibility and the opportunity of making decisions every day which affect all of us.

First, I say that this prayer breakfast is an important time to reaffirm that in this Nation where we have freedom of religion, we need not seek freedom from religion. The genius of the book which I have promoted almost shamelessly for the last several months, "The Culture of Disbelief," by Professor Stephen Carter, is that very point, that we should all seek to know and to do God's will, even when we differ.

Second, if we really seek to do that, it requires certain personal characteristics that, very frankly, all of us in this room who have ever been elected to anything have abandoned from time to time, including me. It requires first that we be humble, that we know that even as we seek to do God's will, we remember what President Lincoln said, "The Almighty has his own purposes, and we are not capable of fully knowing them." It requires, second, that we be honest and that we be fair. Sometimes I think the commandment we most like to overlook in this city is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Third, it requires that we give our bitterness and our resentments up.

I was thinking of this when Mother Teresa told the story of the person who died in her arms saying simply, "Thank you," not "I'm cold, I'm hungry," a simple thank-you; someone with more cause to be resentful, more cause to be bitter, more cause to be angry than anyone in this room could ever be bitter or angry or resentful because of what one of us has said or done to the other, and still dying with a simple thank-you. Somehow we all have to give up our

resentments. We have to find the courage and the faith to forgive ourselves and to forgive our foes. And if we cannot, we will surely fail.

Finally, that will permit us to do what Mother Teresa has done, to focus every day on other people. If Christ said we would all be judged by how we treated the least of these—the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the strangers, the imprisoned—how can we meet that test in a town where we all spend so much time obsessed with ourselves and how we stand on the totem pole and how we look in the morning paper? Five years from now, it will be nothing. Five hundred years from now, the papers will be dust. And all that will endure is the strength and the integrity and the beauty of what we felt and what we did.

Today this headline is in our papers: "Nineteen Children Found Amid Squalor in Chicago Apartment," not in Calcutta but in Chicago, 19 children living amid human waste and cockroaches, fighting a dog for food.

I say to you, we will always have our differences; we will never know the whole truth. Of course, that is true. But if we have learned today, again, that we must seek to know the will of God and live by it, that to do it we have to give up our bitterness and our resentment, we have to learn to forgive ourselves and one another, and we have to fight, as hard as it is, to be honest and fair, and if we can be focused on others and not ourselves, realizing that we did not get one whit of power from the Constitution and laws from the framers to do anything for ourselves, it all comes for the purpose of helping others, then perhaps we can do honor to the faith and to the God who has brought us all here today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:47 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at Kramer Junior High School

February 3, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Give Carlotta another hand. Didn't she do a good job? [*Applause*] She was nervous. I told her there was nothing to it. She did a great job. Thank you, Carlotta. Thank you, Mr. Poles. I'm very, very glad to be here.

I wanted to come here the day after I gave the State of the Union Address last week, but I lost my voice. And as you can hear, I haven't quite gotten it back. But I think I can at least say what I came to say and hopefully answer some of your questions.

Every year the President gives the State of the Union Address to report to our whole country on the accomplishments and goals of the country and of the Government. But I came to Kramer this morning because I wanted to say something else. And that is that the future of our Union depends not just on the President and the Congress, on what I do or don't do, it also depends on you, every boy and girl in this school and every person like you all across this country, in the biggest cities, in the smallest towns and all the places in between, on how well you prepare for your life and how well you're able to lead it. That will shape what kind of country America is, and it will affect all the rest of us as well.

I think all of you know this, but this school has produced two graduates who are now part of what I do at the White House. And I want to formally introduce them. First, the Assistant Agent-in-Charge of my Secret Service detail, a person in charge of protecting me, Mr. Danny Spriggs. Stand up, Danny. He graduated from this school, went on to the University of New Mexico, and played football for the Dallas Cowboys, and then came back to the Secret Service and progressed through the ranks to his present, very important position. Second, I'd like to introduce one of my very talented White House photographers, also a graduate of this school, Ms. Sharon Farmer. Sharon, where are you? There she is, down in front. She graduated from this school, went on to Ohio State University where she was elected president of the student

body, then became a photographer, and is so good at what she does that she is on the staff of the President. I'd also like to tell you that the head of our Secret Service detail, Rich Miller, grew up in this neighborhood. So there was a lot of interest in Kramer.

The Secret Service agents every year who protect the First Family give the President and the First Lady a Christmas gift. I don't know what those gifts have been in the past, but this year I got a letter from my Secret Service detail saying that because I had emphasized service so much and worked so hard to pass a national service bill, which gives young people like you the chance to earn some money to go to college by serving in their community, that they wanted their gift to me to be the adoption of this school. They wanted the people on the Secret Service detail to come into this school, to work with the young people, to try to make it a healthy, safe, growing place where you could learn more and where you could have contact with them, some very good people who have led very interesting lives. I can tell you, for my money, it was the best Christmas present I got this year. And I am very, very grateful for it.

When these two people who work for me went to this school years ago, our country had some problems then, too; the bigotry, the racism that then existed in our country was more overt than it is now. And they had some hills to climb to achieve what they have achieved in life.

In the years since, some of that open injustice has gone away, but all of you know now we have a whole set of new problems, our problems that were maybe there then but are worse now. There are too many neighborhoods where it seems that nobody has a job, too many places where families don't stay together, and too many places where kids are literally at risk of being shot or beat up going to and from school and sometimes in school. To correct this problem we've got to work together. I've got to do my part, and you've got to help, to create safe schools where learning occurs and to make sure that we have the kind of neighborhoods and the kind of futures that all of you deserve.

I know that a lot of you have lived with violence. I know you've seen it up close. I imagine some of you have people in your own family who have been hurt. And maybe you know people who have given up on themselves and given up on our country, who've dropped out and are just angry all the time, doing their best to live from day to day, not thinking much about the future.

The first thing I want to ask of you is not to give up. Don't give up on yourselves, and don't give up on your country. I very much want you to go to school in safety, where you learn things and can look forward to a brighter and richer future. I want you to feel that you should and that you must stay off drugs and graduate from high school and go beyond. I want you to believe that you can do as much with your life as Danny Spriggs and Sharon Farmer have, or for that matter, that if you work hard and you really care enough about it, you might someday be in the United States Congress like Eleanor Holmes Norton or maybe even be running for President.

I came here, more than anything else today, to say I don't want you ever to give up on yourselves. I don't intend to give up on you as long as I am President. I'm going to keep working for better education, safer streets, and a brighter future, but it's for your life. And no matter what I do, I can't live your lives for you. No matter whether we do the right or the wrong things in public life, we can't live your lives for you. You have to do that. Every day you have to decide whether you're going to be here on time with a good attitude, learning as much as you can. Every day you have to decide whether the future is what happens to you 30 minutes from now or what happens to you 10 or 20 years from now. Every day you have to decide what you believe, what you care about, and what kind of person you're going to be.

I'm doing what I can to make the future better for you. Even as we are here today, the United States Congress is debating a bill that the Secretary of Education, Secretary Riley, introduced with my administration called Goals 2000. It embodies some ideas I have been working on for years and years, ever since I was a Governor. And I think it's fair to say that I have probably spent more time in public schools like this one all over America, as well as in my own State, than any person ever elected President. I have listened to teachers, I have listened to principals, and I have listened to students, not for just a year but for more than a decade.

What this legislation that Congress is debating does is to try to establish what kind of education

every child needs in every school. It sets out some goals that will guarantee that if we reach them, all of our young people, wherever they are, whether they come from poor families or middle class families or wealthy families, if their schools work right, they'll be prepared to compete and to win in the 21st century.

One of those goals says by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. No one should have to go to school afraid, and no school should operate in a way that makes learning impossible. But the truth is that while we have some legislation up there to make our schools safer, you have a lot to do with what goes on in this school and whether the environment is good for learning.

Another goal says that by the year 2000 the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent. That's the international standard. Another says that every adult should possess the knowledge and the skills needed to get and keep a good job, a job as good as people have in other countries.

When I drive up and down streets in some neighborhoods in this country and I see grown people standing on the street without work, it breaks my heart. And I know a lot of them would like to go to work, and I know a lot of them don't get work in part because they don't have a good education. These goals, all of these goals, are critical to your future. I want to start with the last one.

When I was your age, the unemployment rate in this country was 3 percent, more or less. When I graduated from high school, I knew a lot of people who dropped out of high school. I mean, that was a long time ago, lots of folks didn't finish school. But I didn't know a soul, black or white, with or without an education, who wanted a job who didn't have one. That's the literal truth when I was 17. That's the economy we had then. That was the reality then. Everybody I knew who was willing to work could find work.

Now, that's not true anymore, is it? It's just not true. Today, more than ever before, whether you have a job or not and how much you can earn at the job and what your future is depends upon how much you can learn, not just what you know, but how much you can learn. People who graduate from high school make twice as much as those who don't. Those who get training after high school make more. Those who graduate from college make twice as much again. And those who are willing to learn for a lifetime can deal with the hard truth that the average 18-year-old today will change work seven or eight times over the course of a lifetime.

Now, that can be a good deal. You might, if you do it right, live in the most exciting time America has ever known, because the world is changing so fast. You'll get to know people all over the world. By the time you're my age, you'll be routinely calling people around the world with a television screen along with your telephone, you'll be talking to people and there will be instantaneous translation. It will be an exciting time. But it will change so fast that you'll have to be able to learn new things all the time. And you have to decide whether you're going to do that, just like we have to decide whether we're going to give you the tools to do that.

I also think that we've got to say, all of us, there's something wrong. I heard the Vice President went to one of the schools here in DC last week, and I don't know if you saw it on television, but one of the students asked him, said, "How can we send a person to the Moon, and we can't make our schools safe?" Pretty good question, isn't it? What kind of country is it that can send somebody to the Moon and can't make our schools safe?

Well, we've got some legislation in Congress today designed to do that, designed to take guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them, to restrict semiautomatic and assault weapons, designed to provide more security for our schools, and designed to give our schools the tools they need; in high violence areas to teach young people to find other ways, nonviolent ways, to resolve their differences, to stop people from thinking about the future as what happens 5 seconds or 30 minutes from now and start thinking about what happens 4 years and 10 years and 20 years from now, building a life, not acting on a violent impulse. We're working on that.

What the Secret Service did in adopting this school is also a wonderful thing because, you know, you can see me today and you can ask me questions. And then these good folks in the media, they'll report it all over the country. And a lot of young people like you will identify with what happened. They'll say, "Well, he didn't

come to my school, but at least he came to a school like my school and talked to kids like me." But the President can't see everybody. So I hope that my Secret Service detail, by adopting this school, first of all, will make a difference in your life. I hope it will make your education more rewarding, more interesting, and I hope you'll get to know these people because they're good people. And secondly, I hope they will set an example, and all over America now more people will say, "Well, maybe I ought to go out into the schools. Maybe I ought to help. Maybe I ought to do something for these kids." And if that happens, Kramer will have done a great service for young people all across the United States.

I want to ask you all, before I open the floor to questions, to think about what I said today. Yes, we need to do a better job in making the streets safer and the schools safer. Yes, we've got to do a better job of creating more jobs so you have some opportunity out there. Yes, we've got to do a better job of giving your schools the tools they need so that you can get the best possible education. But you've got to decide what happens to you. You have to decide whether you're going to give up on you or whether someday you're going to play football for the Cowboys and be in the Secret Service or go off to a fine school like Ohio State and come back and have a job at the White House. You have to make that decision. No President, no politician can make that decision for you.

I haven't given up on the young people of this country. I think you are as smart and as good as any generation we have ever produced, and you deserve better, than you are getting. And I am going to try to make your streets safe, your schools better, and the job future better. But you also have to say, "I am going do the most I can with my life. I'm going to be what God meant for me to be." I'll try to keep up my end of the deal, and I want you to keep up yours.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

Principal Ray Poles. Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, we will have some questions from our student body before the President comes—I would also like to take the opportunity to introduce to you our school board president, Ms. Linda Moody. It was an oversight on my behalf. Thank you, Ms. Moody. We will proceed with the questioning period. You have a mike, okay.

The President. Now, where are the mikes out in the audience? Where are they? Oh, okay. Now, how are we going to do this? The mikes have a long cord so that the ladies can go all the way up. If you've got a question or a comment, raise your hand, and they'll bring you the microphone. Don't be shy. There you go. Take mine. Tell us who you are and what grade you're in.

Coed Lunch

Q. I'm in the ninth grade. And I would like to know why Kramer ain't got coed lunches.

The President. Coed what?

Q. Lunch.

The President. Lunch? That's one thing I don't know the answer to. I don't know why Kramer doesn't have coed lunch, but surely the principal can answer the question before I leave. But if I were you, I'd want it, too. [*Laughter*]

Go ahead. Listen now; you all be quiet and listen to your classmates, one at a time.

Crime Bill

Q. I am in the ninth grade, and I would like to know, in respect to the crime bill, what happens on the first or second strike?

The President. I'm sorry, I didn't—what?

Q. In respect to the crime bill, what happens on the first or second strike, since we're trying to avoid the third strike?

The President. What are the strikes?

Q. What happens on the first and second strike?

The President. Yes. Well, on the first or second, what happens—he's asking—the crime bill, there's a provision, that will be a provision which says if you commit three violent crimes, you can't be paroled. No parole after three violent crimes. You asked what happens on the first or the second crime. It depends on, frankly, what the offense was. In other words, those people will go through the criminal justice system. And let's suppose it's an armed robbery, and the maximum sentence is 20 years, and a jury gives 15 years. Then the person will go to prison under a 15-year sentence and will be eligible for parole after serving a certain amount of that time.

So then most States—and the Federal Government has sentencing guidelines on this—most States have laws which say if you commit a second crime, you have to serve a much longer period of time before you're eligible for parole.

But under this provision we say if the crimes are violent, if you're really hurting somebody, then you shouldn't be paroled at all if you do it three times, because you've obviously shown that you're going to spend your life hurting other people, and it's not worth the risk.

But the first two will be covered by whatever the law is now. And it depends on what the crime is and what the circumstances are.

Safe Drinking Water

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I'm in the seventh grade. In your State of the Union Address, you mentioned the Safe Water Act. What are some of the specifics of this act?

The President. It's a drinking water act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and what we have to—we have to reauthorize it, but basically what it does is to set standards. It's important now in Washington, you know, because you just had some problems with that, serious problems. What it will do is to set standards for the testing of water throughout the country and all municipalities, all cities, and the evaluations of the water systems and will have certain requirements to upgrade those systems, hopefully before something terrible happens like this; that the whole idea of it is to find out problems, if the drinking water of a given community—normally it will start to get bad and will slowly deteriorate. So the idea is to have a testing procedure so that the quality of the water can always be monitored. And if it starts to deteriorate, there will be a requirement that it be cleaned up so that people will always have a safe water supply all over the country.

Crime

Q. Hello, Mr. President. I would like to know, what can I do in my community to stop crime?

The President. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] That's great. Well, I think there are several things that you can do as a young person in your community to stop crime. But let me just mention, if I might, two or three.

One is, people always talk today about gangs, people joining gangs and how bad it is, right? But the truth is, everybody wants to be in some kind of gang. If you play on a football team, it's a gang, right? If you belong to a certain church, that's a group of people who believe like you do, and you're with them every Sunday, and they're part of your crowd, and it's part of your identity. In other words, all of us want to be with other people who are like us, who make us feel good and important because we're a part of their group. In a way, the Kramer School is a gang, right? It's a group of people who go here, and there's a limited number of people, and others don't go here. So the first thing I want to say to you is, I think that the more you can do as a young person to get other young people to associate with each other in positive ways, the less likely they'll be to associate with each other in negative ways. You can't just tell kids no all day; sometimes you've got to have something to say yes about. There has to be something to say yes to. And you can ask adults to do what they need to do; if there needs to be more opportunity for recreation or something else that adults should do, provide for you, so that people can have positive associations, I think that counts, first thing.

The second thing I think is important is that we know crime goes down where police officers work in neighborhoods on a consistent basis, know the young people, know the adults, and work to prevent crime instead of just to catch criminals. So the second thing you could do is to help organize people in your neighborhood to work with people in the police to stop crime before it happens, that is, to report suspicious things; if you think there is drug dealing going on or you think there are people with illegal weapons or you think there is something else going on, there's some risk that might be happening, to let people know in advance. And that really counts for a lot. I have seen cities in this country with very tough neighborhoods where the crime rate dropped dramatically because the people in the neighborhood got organized and worked with the police on the front end to stop things from happening.

The third thing you could do that I think is really important is to do everything you can to organize young people to keep each other in school, because most people who show up for school on time, stay in school, learn something when they're in school, and try to work out their problems in a positive way in school don't wind up getting in trouble with the law. Those are the three things that I think you could do that would have the biggest impact on the crime problem.

Family Life

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. Since family life has been breaking down for the last 30

years, what can my generation do to restore family values?

The President. Did you hear what she said? She said, "If family life has been breaking down for 30 years, what can my generation do to restore it?" Good question. First thing you can do is make up your mind you're not going to have a baby until you're old enough to take care of it, until you're married. I mean, that's the most important thing.

You know, I gave—how many of you all saw my speech the other night? Did any of you see it? I guess you knew I was coming, so some of you watched it. Did they tell you to watch it? The principal told you to watch the speech. We spent all this time—now, I'm trying to figure out how to help people get off of welfare, good people who are strapped on welfare, who hate it, who don't want to be on it. And I've got some ideas, and I've learned a lot from people who are on welfare about it.

But one big problem is, people get on it because they start having children when they are children. And that's the first thing. The second thing that you ought to do is something you can't do alone, and that is that we need to organize, starting about this age, young men to start talking among each other about what their responsibilities are, and that they shouldn't—they should not go out and father these kids when they're not prepared to marry the mothers, they're not prepared to take responsibility for the children, and they're not even able to take responsibility for themselves. This is not a sport. This is a solemn responsibility. Look, it's hard.

Then, once you get married, people have to realize they're going to have to ride through some tough times to keep the family together. There is no such thing as a trouble-free family. There's no such thing as a family where fights never occur, where differences never happen, where some days you think it wouldn't be easier to quit than to go on. There is no such family.

So the third thing we should be doing when young people are young is to say, look, the family is the most wonderful institution in society, but it's a human thing, which means it's full of fault, too. And you need to think about it. And when you make a commitment to it, you need to do everything you can to hang in there with it, all the way, because it makes life much more meaningful. Life is lonely enough as it is. And if you have a family and you have people that are helping you, it makes a huge difference, and it makes life better.

I'm telling you, until we decide this is a—this is a big cultural thing. We've got to make a decision. Every one of you have to make it. Is it right or wrong, if you're a boy, to get some girl pregnant and then forget about it? I think it's wrong. I think it's not only wrong for them, I think it's wrong for you. It's something you pay for the rest of your life. You carry that in the back of your head: Somewhere there's some child out there you didn't take care of that's in terrible shape because of something you didn't do. And if you're a young girl, you've got to think being a mother is still the most important thing in society. It is the most important thing that any person can do. But when you do it, you ought to do it when it's right: when it's right for you, when it's right for the child, and when you can do it right.

And we just have to make a decision. If you really want to rebuild the family, then people have to decide: I'm not going to have a baby until I'm married. I'm not going to bring a baby into the world I can't take care of. And I'm not going to turn around and walk away when I do it. I'm going to take responsibility for what I do.

I wish there was some highfalutin easy way to say it, but there's not. There isn't any way to turn this thing around except to turn it around.

AIDS

Q. My question was, what type of steps are you going to take to help to slow up AIDS in the community?

The President. AIDS? The AIDS problem?

Q. Yes.

The President. Good, Jesse. He asked what we were going to do to try to slow down AIDS in the community. How many of you know somebody with AIDS? A pretty good number, huh? I'll tell you what we're doing; then let's talk about what's happening.

Even though, if you heard my speech the other night, I talked about how we were reducing Government spending in many areas to bring our debt down, our deficit down, we have increased Government spending a lot in trying to improve research, to try to find a cure or at least a treatment for AIDS that will keep people alive and to try to improve the ability of folks who care with folks with AIDS and

continue their useful life as long as possible. In addition to that, we've tried to promote more AIDS education and prevention. But this is kind of like the question you asked me about the family. Right now, the only thing we know that works with regard to AIDS is not to get it. And we know that AIDS is spread primarily in two ways: because of drug users using unsafe needles and because of unsafe sex, primarily homosexual sex but not exclusively.

Now, so what we're trying to do is to be honest, brutally honest about that, talk to young people, tell them that your life is on the line and the only safe way, the only way to avoid dying from AIDS that we know right now is not to get it. And that's the truth.

I think eventually we will, if not find a cure, because it's a virus, but we'll at least find a treatment that will keep people alive. But we're not there yet. So I'm going to spend more money every year I'm President to do more on research and development, to do more on care to try to lengthen the useful lives of people with AIDS. Any of us who've ever had friends with AIDS, some of you probably even have family members, have been gripped by this. It is agonizing, and it is a terrible problem for the United States. And I have friends who have died with AIDS or who have it now, so it's something I care a great deal about. But I have to tell you again—it's kind of like this schooling—that right now, as much as I can do about it, the most important person in determining what happens to you and AIDS is you. And I hope that you will do it.

Private and Charter Schools

Q. Hello. I'm in the eighth grade. I would like to know, what are your thoughts about privatization and private schools?

The President. Private schools and what? Privatization?

Q. Yes.

The President. Privatization of the schools. Well, first of all, you asked about the private schools. This country has always actually done pretty well because we've had private schools and public schools. Most people have gone to public school, but there have been private schools out there for people either who, for religious or other purposes, wanted to use them. And most schools, at least those that are religiously motivated, have always provided some scholarships for people who couldn't afford to pay the tuition. So I think it's provided some competition that on balance, I think, has been good.

There's a whole different thing going on about privatization, which I think is what you want me to talk about. Baltimore, for example, has 9 or 10 schools now where the local school board has contracted with a private company, and they've given them whatever the budget of the school was and let them organize the schools, try to improve the physical facilities, try to operate them well. Then they are responsible for the principal, the teachers, how the thing operates. I think school districts ought to try it if they have real problems in their schools.

Those schools are called charter schools, where the public school system gives a charter to a private group to operate the schools. If the schools aren't working and if the school board decides they can't make them work, then I think they ought to try this. If it works, great, and if it doesn't work, they're no worse off than they were. So I think they ought to have the right to try it. I think they should be encouraged to try it. Our legislation which is moving through Congress encourages this sort of experimentation.

Let me say this in defense of our schools: Public schools and public housing projects—let's put them in there, too—they both worked just fine when you had strong families, strong communities, and the people who lived in them had a job. Public schools and public housing projects didn't really start to break down until the family and the jobs and the community started breaking down. So we have loaded a whole lot onto our public schools. Now, that means we've got to be smart and we've got to be creative because, still, the schools is the best hope that all of you have. But do I think it ought to be tried if a school's not working and the school board wants to try it? You bet I do. I don't see what we have to lose by trying it. If the school board wants to do it, I'm all for them.

National Information Superhighway

Q. Mr. President, how will the national information superhighway impact schools?

The President. Great question. If we do it right, what the national information superhighway will do is to set up a system in which if the schools can get the appropriate computer equipment, which I think will happen in the

future, that a school like this one could be connected to schools all over the country, maybe all over the world, to libraries all over the country. You could interconnect with special television stations that were putting out certain information. In other words, you could have access in the school, in the classroom, to worlds of information that now you have to go someplace to find. It would, in effect, bring instantaneously, literally, in theory, billions of pieces of information into the fingertips of students all over America in all schools. And it's very, very important in its implications for American education because if we do the national information superhighway right and we make sure that we get the kind of communications equipment, the kind of trained personnel we need out in the schools, it could go an enormous way toward vanishing or erasing the difference between wealthy school districts and poor ones, between wealthy schools and poor ones, by giving everybody access to the same information at the same time.

You could also have special courses like interactive video to take courses that otherwise could never be made available in schools, immediately, everywhere. So, if we do it right, it's going to be great for education. It's also going to be a great equalizer for us. I'm really hopeful about it.

Federal Budget

Q. Hello. I would like to know how much money was cut from Government spending?

The President. How much money does the Federal Government spend?

Q. How much money was cut from Government spending?

The President. Oh, how much had been cut. I'm sorry. Well, we spend every year—let me tell you how much we spend so I can explain that. We spend every year about $1.5 trillion. When I became President we were taking in about $1.2 trillion, so our deficit was about $300 billion a year. Last year we cut $255 billion from last year's budget, and we increased spending in certain areas. We increased spending in education and health and in high technology. And we raised taxes on the wealthiest Americans, and we raised the gas tax some, and we cut the deficit $300 billion. So last year there were $255 billion of spending cuts in the budget. This year, the Congress hasn't started work on it. I just sent a budget up there this year, this time. So the Congress hasn't started work on it. But we'll have to have a whole range of other cuts, and I propose that they cut 300-plus different programs and eliminate 100 altogether so that we can continue to increase our investment in the things that matter, like these education programs.

Technology in the Future

Q. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning.

Q. I would like to know, in the year 2000, what level of technology should we have achieved?

The President. That is a great question. Let me say this: I don't think it's possible to answer that, because I don't think we know how fast technology will improve in the world. So I wish I could answer it, but I can't. Let me try to give you an answer, however, by starting with where we are now.

We know that there are seven or eight major areas of technology that will provide most of the high-wage, high-growth jobs of the future, that is, the good jobs, and that if we got a whole bunch of them, they in turn will create other solid jobs. One of those areas is civilian aviation. Another is biotechnology; that goes back to Jesse's AIDS question. Biotechnology—how are you going to solve all these problems of the human body and disease and everything—there's worlds of jobs there. Another will be telecommunications. Another will be computer software.

The answer to your question is, what we have to do is to educate our people well enough and to put enough money aside for research so that we achieve whatever level of technology anybody else in the world achieves. Otherwise, they will leave us behind. But technology is changing so fast—I can't say—I can tell you this: We know now that in order to have the assurance of having a job with a growing income right now in America, everybody that wants to have some assurance of a decent job with a growing income needs at least a high school education and 2 more years of training, every 18-year old looking forward, at least.

North American Free Trade Agreement

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I want to know how will NAFTA affect our job market in future generations?

The President. How will NAFTA affect our job market in future generations? NAFTA will

create—and of course, you know I'm for it, so I have my view; there are people who are against it who would give you something else. I believe NAFTA will create a lot more jobs for Americans because Mexico has almost 100 million people and is growing very rapidly. And most of the products the Mexican people buy that are made in other countries are products made in America. In order for us to create more jobs for the American people, we have to have more customers for our products and services, obviously. You look at the unemployment rate today, you can see that we're capable of producing everything Americans want to buy and still not using up all the labor we've got. In other words, we can produce everything that Americans want to buy, and there will still be Americans unemployed. So if we want every American who wants to work to have a job, we've got to have more customers. NAFTA gives us more customers, and it will create more jobs.

It will also—I don't want to gloss it over—there will also be some things that the Mexicans sell to Americans that used to be made by Americans. So there will be some job loss. But I'm convinced there will be a lot more jobs gained than lost. And if I weren't, I wouldn't have supported it in the first place.

Antidrug Efforts

Q. Good morning. I would like to know, how can we keep the drugs off the street?

The President. Well, I think there are two or three things we have to focus on. How can we keep the drugs off the street? Your ideas are maybe better than mine. Maybe you ought to tell me how you think we can keep the drugs off the street. I've got two or three ideas I want to mention, though.

One is, most cities do not have enough police officers to give the neighborhoods the kind of coverage they need. Thirty years ago, there were three police officers in this country for every violent crime reported. Today, there are three crimes, violent crimes, for every police officer. So most cities simply don't have the people they need to work in the neighborhoods, stay there, and help keep the places safe and drug-free—first thing.

Second thing is that schools should become drug-free areas. You ought to be able to get the drugs out of the schools, and then kids should be taught from a very early age about the hazards of drugs, that they can kill you, they can take your life away.

The third thing is, we've got to bring another economy to the areas where people are doing drugs, because it's a business. People have to have other ways of making a living. We have to create an alternative future.

So I think there's law enforcement. I think there's drug education and treatment, which I know works, because my own brother has had a drug problem, so I know that works. But I think you also have to create another future. We have to tell people—keep in mind, the drugs got real bad in the places where the family and the community and the jobs were all disappearing. So I think we have to again create an alternative reality. One of the things we're trying to do in our administration is to create some conditions in which people will go in and invest money and hire people in these areas where people have been making money off drugs instead of off honest jobs. But you all might have better ideas than that. If you've got any ideas for me about what to do about drugs, stand up and give me one of your ideas. I'd like to have—go ahead.

Goals for National Renewal

Q. I'm in the eighth grade. Mr. President, how will the renewal reform reach out for the betterment of our children?

The President. I understand now. I'm sorry. You have to forgive me, I'm a little hard of hearing. It comes with age for some people. Well, it will be better in several ways. First of all, obviously if we can keep creating more jobs, that provides more hope. Jobs and incomes help families to stay together; they help people to succeed as parents. Let me say one more thing about—I got asked some questions earlier about what can be done to strengthen the family. For people who already have children, you've got to do the best you can, and you can succeed. I mean, I was raised by a mother who was a single parent when I was born. So a lot of people do a good job. But the first thing we've got to do is to provide more jobs and keep doing it until we can put our people to work.

The second thing we have to do is to give people a sense that they can take their streets back, that through this crime bill and through these other initiatives, people that are willing

to obey the law can at least live in a safe environment and children can go to a safe school.

The third thing that we have to do, in my opinion, is to try to give people a leg up in life. That's what the education programs and the welfare reform programs are all about, giving people a chance to see that they can always do better than they're doing if they're willing to work at it.

The fourth thing we have to do, and this is why I want the health care program to pass so much, is to give people the security of knowing that they can succeed in all these different ways: that you can succeed as a student, you can succeed as a worker, you can succeed as a parent, and that if you work hard and play by the rules and you try to make something of your life, you will have a certain level of personal security. And that's what we're trying to do.

In other words, I think America should be seen as sort of an extended family, a big community. And I think we should look at all of our people, without regard to where they live or what their race is, as an enormous resource, as something precious, where everybody is equally important. And I don't think we can make it as a country unless we do that. I don't think we can make it as a country—in my old age, when I want to be retired and taken care of by somebody else—unless all of you do well. And we are going to have to reinvigorate our education system, our job system, our criminal justice system, and our health care system, at least, if you all are going to do that. And that's what I work for all the time, so that you'll have the freedom to make whatever you want of your life.

I mean, I don't like the fact that a lot of young people like you wake up every day and look in the mirror and don't believe that they could do whatever they want to do. The best thing that could ever happen to us is if tomorrow you and everybody like you got up and got ready for school and looked in the mirror and said, "You know, whatever I really want to do, I can go as far as my God-given abilities will take me. I'm not going to be burdened by violence. I am not going to be interfered with by drugs. I'm not going to be interfered with by bigotry. I'm not going to do anything stupid to mess myself up. I'm going to hold on and make my life something. And it's never too late to get a second chance. No matter what's happened before, I can do better." That would be the best thing that ever happened to this country, if all of you believe that and acted on it. And I'm just trying to create an environment where it's true enough so that all of you can believe it.

Are we done?

Principal Poles. Thank you, Mr. President. This concludes our question-and-answer series.

The President. Thank you. You guys have been great. Good luck. God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Carlotta Harper, president, student government association.

Remarks on Lifting the Trade Embargo on Vietnam and an Exchange With Reporters

February 3, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. I want to especially thank all of you who have come here on such short notice. From the beginning of my administration, I have said that any decisions about our relationships with Vietnam should be guided by one factor and one factor only: gaining the fullest possible accounting for our prisoners of war and our missing in action. We owe that to all who served in Vietnam and to the families of those whose fate remains unknown.

Today I am lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam because I am absolutely convinced it offers the best way to resolve the fate of those who remain missing and about whom we are not sure. We've worked hard over the last year to achieve progress. On Memorial Day, I pledged to declassify and make available virtually

all Government documents related to our POW's and MIA. On Veterans Day, I announced that we had fulfilled that pledge. Last April, and again in July, I sent two Presidential delegations to Vietnam to expand our search for remains and documents. We intensified our diplomatic efforts. We have devoted more resources to this effort than any previous administration. Today, more than 500 dedicated military and civilian personnel are involved in this effort under the leadership of General Shalikashvili, Secretary Aspin, and our Commander in the Pacific, Admiral Larson. Many work daily in the fields, the jungles, the mountains of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, often braving very dangerous conditions, trying to find the truth about those about whom we are not sure.

Last July, I said any improvement in our relations with Vietnam would depend on tangible progress in four specific areas: first, the recovery and return of remains of our POW's and MIA; second, the continued resolution of discrepancy cases, cases in which there is reason to believe individuals could have survived the incident in which they were lost; third, further assistance from Vietnam and Laos on investigations along their common border, an area where many U.S. servicemen were lost and pilots downed; and fourth, accelerated efforts to provide all relevant POW/MIA-related documents.

Today, I can report that significant, tangible progress has been made in all these four areas. Let me describe it. First, on remains: Since the beginning of this administration, we have recovered the remains of 67 American servicemen. In the 7 months since July, we've recovered 39 sets of remains, more than during all of 1992. Second, on the discrepancy cases: Since the beginning of the administration, we've reduced the number of these cases from 135 to 73. Since last July, we've confirmed the deaths of 19 servicemen who were on the list. A special United States team in Vietnam continues to investigate the remaining cases. Third, on cooperation with Laos: As a direct result of the conditions set out in July, the Governments of Vietnam and Laos agreed to work with us to investigate their common border. The first such investigation took place in December and located new remains as well as crash sites that will soon be excavated. Fourth, on the documents: Since July, we have received important wartime documents from Vietnam's military archives that provide leads on unresolved POW/MIA cases.

The progress achieved on unresolved questions is encouraging, but it must not end here. I remain personally committed to continuing the search for the answers and the peace of mind that families of the missing deserve.

There's been a substantial increase in Vietnamese cooperation on these matters over the past year. Everyone involved in the issue has affirmed that. I have carefully considered the question of how best to sustain that cooperation in securing the fullest possible accounting. I've consulted with my national security and veterans affairs advisers, with several outside experts, such as General John Vessey, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has been an emissary to Vietnam for three Presidents now. It was their view that the key to continued progress lies in expanding our contacts with Vietnam.

This was also the view of many distinguished Vietnam veterans and former POW's who now serve in the Congress, such as Senator Bob Kerrey and Congressman Pete Peterson, who are here. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator John Kerry—is he here? There he is. He just came in—and Senator John McCain, who had to go home on a family matter and could not be here. But I thank the two of you so much for your leadership and your steadfastness and all the rest of you, Senator Robb and so many others, especially those who served in Vietnam, for being counted on this issue and for taking all the care you have for such a long time.

I have made the judgment that the best way to ensure cooperation from Vietnam and to continue getting the information Americans want on POW's and MIA's is to end the trade embargo. I've also decided to establish a liaison office in Vietnam to provide services for Americans there and help us to pursue a human rights dialog with the Vietnamese Government.

I want to be clear: These actions do not constitute a normalization of our relationships. Before that happens, we must have more progress, more cooperation, and more answers. Toward that end, this spring I will send another high-level U.S. delegation to Vietnam to continue the search for remains and for documents.

Earlier today I met with the leaders of our Nation's veterans organizations. I deeply respect their views. Many of the families they represent have endured enormous suffering and uncertainty. And their opinions also deserve special

consideration. I talked with them about my decision. I explained the reasons for that decision. Some of them, in all candor, do not agree with the action I am taking today. But I believe we all agree on the ultimate goal: to secure the fullest possible accounting of those who remain missing. And I was pleased that they committed to continue working with us toward that goal.

Whatever the Vietnam war may have done in dividing our country in the past, today our Nation is one in honoring those who served and pressing for answers about all those who did not return. This decision today, I believe, renews that commitment and our constant, constant effort never to forget those until our job is done. Those who have sacrificed deserve a full and final accounting. I am absolutely convinced, as are so many in the Congress who served there and so many Americans who have studied this issue, that this decision today will help to ensure that fullest possible accounting.

Thank you very much.

Vietnam

Q. Mr. President, aren't you giving up some leverage, though? Could we ask about that? And what do you anticipate in terms of American trade? What's the size of the market? What do you think the opportunities are?

The President. I have no idea. I wanted to make sure that the trade questions did not enter into this decision. I never had a briefing on it, and we never had a discussion about it. I thought it was very important that that not be a part of this decision.

I don't think we're giving up anything. It was the consensus of all those who had been there, who had worked there that we had gotten so much more cooperation that we needed to keep moving the process forward and that we would lose leverage if there were no forward movement. Have we given up anything? I don't think so. Nothing we are doing today is irreversible if the cooperation ceases. So I am convinced we are moving in the right direction for the right reasons.

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned people who had been to Vietnam, had served; you did not. Did this have any role in your decision, and did it make it more difficult for you to reach this decision?

The President. No. I do think, however, everybody my age, whether they were in Vietnam or not, knew someone who died there, knew someone who was wounded there. And I think people in our generation are perhaps more insistent on trying to get a full accounting, more obsessed with it than perhaps people who are younger and people who are older, except those who had children there. I think that was the only thing.

I have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue. I got a personal briefing when I was in Hawaii last summer. I have talked to some of the young people who were there digging in the jungles for the remains. I have really thought about this, and I have tried to listen hard. When Senator Kerry and Senator McCain and their delegation came back, we had a long meeting here about it. I think the people, all the people my age just want to know we've done everything we can. And I think this is consistent with doing that.

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, on another subject, what do you hope to achieve with the immigration crackdown that was announced today? And do you have any concerns that people's rights will be violated?

The President. Well, we're going to do our best not to violate anybody's rights. What we hope to achieve is a continued environment in which America will be open for legal immigration—we are a nation of immigrants—but in which we can do our best to protect our borders.

Health Care Reform

Q. You've had, sir, two influential business groups say that they prefer other plans than yours for health care. Does that hurt you?

The President. [*Inaudible*]—what the Chamber of Commerce said.

Q. Does their stand, saying that other directions are the way to go, particularly the Business Roundtable, does that hurt you in negotiations as you move forward?

The President. I don't want to make too much of it, because the people who came in here to see me said it was a negotiating strategy. And I said, "Well, if all of you are providing health care coverage to your employees, I don't think you want to come out for a position against providing guaranteed health insurance to all American workers." So I don't know what to make of it, but I wouldn't read too much

into it. This is the beginning of what will be a protracted legislative discussion.

Former President Ronald Reagan

Q. Tonight, sir, Ronald Reagan is apparently going to take issue with some of your criticisms of him. Do you feel that you have been unfairly savaging his record in the 1980's?

The President. Gee, I don't think I've been very critical of him at all. You know, I disagreed with the economic policy, I said so. I think if you go back over the rhetoric of this last year, it's been fairly free of obsession with the past. I'm not much into that. I'm looking toward tomorrow.

Q. You hired Gergen, after all. [*Laughter*]

The President. What greater compliment could I pay President Reagan?

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:06 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Implementation of the Privacy Act

February 3, 1994

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

I am pleased to forward the enclosed report on the Federal agencies' implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a). The report covers calendar years 1990 and 1991.

In addition to the data required to be reported by the statute, the report also describes agencies' efforts in training their employees to carry out the provisions of the Privacy Act responsibly and reliably.

While agencies continue to meet their responsibilities under the Act, they are becoming increasingly concerned about how the Act's provisions will work in a computerized environment. A challenge for the years ahead will be to harmonize the provisions of the Privacy Act with the technologies that are now coming into play.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Great Egg Harbor Study

February 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report on the Great Egg Harbor River in the State of New Jersey. The report is in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90–542, as amended. The Great Egg Harbor Study was authorized by Public Law 99–590, approved on October 30, 1986.

The study of the Great Egg Harbor River was conducted by a task force made up of representatives of affected municipalities, State and Federal agencies, organizations with river-related interests, and local residents under the leadership of the National Park Service. The National Park Service, together with the task force, identified the outstandingly remarkable resources within the study area, analyzed existing levels of protection for these values, investigated major issues and public concerns, assessed the attitude of riparian landowners, reviewed and analyzed the impact of existing and potential development, and developed alternative plans and management strategies.

The National Park Service determined that 129 miles of the Great Egg Harbor River and its tributaries are eligible for inclusion in the

National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is based upon their free-flowing condition and fish, wildlife, botanic, and recreational values.

Eleven of the 12 affected local governing bodies endorsed designation of the eligible river segments. The lone exception, Upper Township on the Tuckahoe River tributary, did not take a position nor did the State of New Jersey.

Perhaps due to this overwhelming support, the 102d Congress proceeded to designation without waiting for submittal of the required report and Presidential recommendation. While a Presidential recommendation is now moot, I am submitting the report to fulfill the requirements of sections 4(a) and 5(a)(93) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Maurice and Manumuskin River and Menantico Creek Study

February 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report on the Maurice and Manumuskin River and Menantico Creek in the State of New Jersey. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90–542, as amended. The study of the Maurice River and these two tributaries was authorized by Public Law 100–33, approved on May 7, 1987.

The study of the Maurice River and tributaries was conducted by a task force composed of representatives of affected municipalities, State and Federal agencies, organizations with river-related interests, and local residents under the leadership of the National Park Service (NPS). The NPS, together with the task force, identified the outstandingly remarkable resources within the study area, analyzed existing levels of protection for these values, investigated major issues and public concerns, assessed the attitude of riparian landowners, reviewed and analyzed the impact of existing and potential development, and developed alternative plans and management strategies.

The NPS determined that 42.4 miles of the Maurice River and its tributaries are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is based upon their free-flowing condition and fish, wildlife, and vegetative values. There are also important cultural values and surface water quality of the Manumuskin and Menantico is very good.

In accordance with the wishes of local government, the NPS did not consider Federal land acquisition or management as an alternative for protecting river resources. Instead, the study focused on assisting the political subdivisions in developing and adopting local measures for providing resource protection where existing protection had been inadequate.

Due to strong local and congressional support, the 103d Congress proceeded to designation without waiting for submittal of the required report and Presidential recommendation. While a Presidential recommendation is now moot, I am submitting the report to fulfill the requirements of section 4(a) and sections 5(a)(96) through 5(a)(98) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 3, 1994.

Nomination for the National Labor Relations Board
February 3, 1994

The President announced his intention today to nominate Charles I. Cohen to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

"Charles Cohen is a respected attorney with years of experience on the NLRB staff. I believe he will be an effective member of the Board," said the President.

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

Memorandum on Lifting the Trade Embargo on Vietnam
February 3, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce

Subject: Lifting of the Embargo Against Vietnam

I hereby direct the Secretary of the Treasury to take all appropriate actions to authorize prospectively all trade and financial dealings with Vietnam, and the Secretary of Commerce to exempt Vietnam from existing controls implementing the embargo. Vietnamese assets in the United States or within the possession or control of persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction and that are now blocked should remain blocked until further notice.

In discharging these responsibilities, you are directed to consult with the heads of other Executive departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on February 4.

Statement on the Observance of National African-American History Month
February 4, 1994

I want to extend my greetings to all of you who are celebrating African-American History Month during this important time of renewal and reflection for our country.

America was founded on the principle that we're all created equal, and this solemn commitment to tolerance and freedom must continue to bind us as a nation. Our diverse culture enriches and broadens the American experience of which African-American heritage is an inseparable part. It weaves throughout our country's history, profoundly influencing every aspect of our national life.

We've come a long way since the days when white-only and colored-only signs disfigured our country's landscape and demeaned too many of our citizens. African-Americans have made great strides in recent years, commanding leadership positions in the public and private sectors in record numbers. Opportunities for education advancement, election, and mobility continue to expand among black Americans, and our country's moving ever closer to fulfilling its fundamental promise of equality for all.

Yet the truth is, many problems continue to plague our communities, tarnishing that ideal of equality because they affect African-Americans more adversely than the rest of us. The poverty, the drugs, the violence that afflict too many of our people in our communities, of all races and backgrounds, have severely harmed black children, women, and men, threatening our vision of a better world.

Throughout this month, we look to the lessons of our past for solutions to these crises, in the hope of building a brighter world for the future.

Many such solutions can be found in the rich history of the African-American people. The speeches of Martin Luther King and Malcolm X, the writings of W.E.B. Du Bois, Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, the powerful literature of Toni Morrison, Richard Wright, Alice Walker, and so many others explore the difficulties and the joys that pervade the African-American experience.

By rediscovering and celebrating this wealth of history, we can draw strength from the successes of these great leaders and determination from their example for the hard work in the days ahead to forge a new era of healing and hope. As we continually strive to embrace the talent and creativity of all our Nation's people, I want to give my best wishes to all of you for an exciting, productive, and renewing month.

Nomination for Posts at the Department of Justice
February 4, 1994

The President announced today that he intends to nominate Michael R. Bromwich to be the Inspector General of the Justice Department and Lois Jane Schiffer to be the Assistant Attorney General for Environment and Natural Resources.

"Michael Bromwich and Lois Jane Schiffer are respected attorneys with long records of achievement," said the President. "They will be strong additions to the Department of Justice."

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

The President's Radio Address
February 5, 1994

Good morning. This morning I want to talk with you about jobs, how more Americans can find new jobs and better ones, how we can help business to create those jobs, and how we can prepare our people to hold them.

I became President committed to growing the economy, cutting the deficit, and creating new jobs. A year later, we've made real progress toward all those goals. We brought down next year's projected deficit by $126 billion, about 40 percent less than it was predicted to be. And in the past 12 months, the economy has created 1.9 million new jobs, 90 percent of them in private industry. In fact, more private sector jobs were created in the past year than in the previous 4 years. So together we've accomplished a lot. But we've got a lot more to do to achieve a lasting recovery that benefits every region of our country and every sector of our society. We must maintain budget discipline, continue our comprehensive strategy to create more growth and more opportunity for more Americans, and make sure our workers and our young people especially have the new skills for the jobs that will be created.

On Monday, I'll submit the next installment of our plan for deficit reduction and economic growth. The budget cuts spending for more than 300 Government programs, completely eliminates more than 100 programs, and reduces the Federal work force by more than 100,000 and gives 7 to 14 Cabinet Departments less money than last year.

Meanwhile, we invest more in developing new technologies to create new jobs, in educating our children and training our workers for those jobs, and fighting crime and protecting the environment, and in giving our children a healthy start in life. We have to cut spending on yesterday's outmoded programs so we can bring down the deficit and still invest more in tomorrow's most urgent priorities.

This morning, I want to tell you more about one of our most important priorities: helping people from unemployment to work, from welfare to work, from school to work, and from

lower paying work to better paying work. For all our success at creating new jobs, too many people are still looking for work, too many workers' wages are still stagnant and have been for two decades, and too many young people are not on track for good paying jobs.

Because the global economy and new technologies have changed the rules of the game, the only ticket to good jobs with growing incomes are real skills and the ability to keep learning new ones. That's why I've called for a revolution in education and training, from our schools to our unemployment offices to our job training programs. Our American workers must be the best educated, best trained, and most highly skilled in the world.

With our Goals 2000 program, we'll improve our schools, linking world-class standards to grassroots reforms all over America. With our school-to-work initiative, we're linking schools with workplaces and providing improved training for young people who want to go from high school to work. These initiatives have been approved by the House of Representatives and will be considered this week by the Senate.

Just as we need to train our young people, we must retrain millions of workers who have been displaced by technological change, by international trade, by corporate restructuring, and by reducing defense spending. Later this month, we'll introduce the "Reemployment Act of 1994" to consolidate dozens of different job training programs and convert the unemployment system into a reemployment system. We have to do this because the unemployment system and the patchwork of job training programs have been trapped in a time warp, frozen in bygone days when most laid-off workers could expect to be called back to their old jobs. Now we need one source of job training, counseling, and income support that workers can call upon as soon as they know they're losing their jobs because most workers won't be called back to their old jobs and because most younger workers can look forward to changing work seven or eight times in a lifetime.

The reemployment act will create one-stop job centers where every unemployed worker will be able to learn new skills, find out about new opportunities, and get help for themselves and their families. The plan works hand in hand with our plans for welfare reform and health care reform. We need to make every welfare office a work office where people will be encouraged to seize opportunities for training and jobs. And when we guarantee health security for every American, guaranteed private insurance that can never be taken away, then people will no longer be afraid that they'll lose their medical coverage when they move from welfare to work or from their old jobs to new ones.

Last week, I met with hundreds of workers, business people, and job trainers who told me how their communities have met the challenges of offering new skills and new opportunities. I was inspired by the drive and dedication of people like Deb Woodbury from Bangor, Maine, who lost a factory job and learned new skills as a marketing sales representative; Cynthia Scott of San Antonio, who went from welfare to a training program in nursing and a job in a hospital; Donald Hutchinson, a high school graduate from Detroit, who learned new skills as a machinist; and John Hahn of Niagara County, New York, who was laid off from a job he had for 28 years and learned new skills for a new career as a biomedical technician.

Our economic plan is based on this simple but powerful truth: When you give ordinary people new opportunities, they'll do extraordinary things. The only way we can offer those new opportunities for education and training for new jobs and better jobs is to do the same things with the Federal budget that you do with your family budget, make tough choices, provide for the future, and make distinctions between luxuries and necessities.

In the weeks ahead, you'll hear the voices of those with a vested interest in the programs and policies of the past. I ask you to join me in fighting for the future. Together we've created almost 2 million jobs in just 12 months. We can create 2 million more in 1994, and we can prepare our working people and our young people for the jobs of the future. Together we can finish the job we began just one year ago if we keep working at it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Statement on the Sarajevo Marketplace Attack
February 5, 1994

I am outraged by this deliberate attack on the people of Sarajevo. There can be no possible military justification for an attack against a marketplace where women, men, and children of the city were pursuing their everyday lives. The United Nations should urgently investigate this incident and clearly identify those who are guilty.

I have directed that Secretary Christopher engage our allies in Europe and the United Nations on the situation and on appropriate next steps. As he and Secretary of Defense Perry have stated, we rule nothing out.

I have also directed the Department of Defense to offer its assistance in evacuating, hospitalizing, and treating those injured in this savage attack.

I know I speak for all Americans in expressing our revulsion and anger at this cowardly act.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
February 6, 1994

The President. I have just completed a meeting with advisers discussing the terrible and outrageous incident in Sarajevo yesterday. I'm glad to report that the United States has been able to evacuate several of the wounded and their family members and they're on their way to a hospital in Germany. We'll be continuing to work on that.

I have asked Ambassador Albright to urge the United Nations to accelerate the efforts to try to confirm responsibility for the strike in the market yesterday. And I have approved having the Secretary of State and Ambassador Albright continue their consultations with our allies about what next steps should be taken in response to this particular incident and to make an effort to try to reach a settlement, hoping that the shock of this incident will perhaps make all parties more willing to bring this matter to a close.

The ultimate answer to all this killing is for the three parties to reach an agreement that they can live with and honor. There have been several times over the last couple of months when it didn't seem that they were all that far apart, and I hope that the shock of these deaths will reinforce to them, as it does to the entire world, that they ought to go on and reach a settlement. And we will do what we can to push that.

Q. Have you decided against air strikes, Mr. President?

The President. No, but it's not a decision—first of all, I want to give the U.N. a chance to confirm responsibility for this. Obviously, it seems highly likely that the Serbs are responsible, but there ought to be some effort to confirm it since their leader has denied it. And also, as you know, the authority under which air strikes can proceed, NATO acting out of area pursuant to U.N. authority, requires the common agreement of our NATO allies. So I cautioned them on this at our NATO meeting. Many of them remain concerned that because they have soldiers on the ground—something we don't have—that their soldiers will be retaliated against if we take action from the air. That's not to say that there won't be retaliation, because we certainly discussed it in considerable length today, and I discussed it yesterday. But I just want to try to explain why there's more reluctance on the part of some of the Europeans than there is on the part of the United States, because they do have troops on the ground, and they are worried about some retaliation coming to those troops.

Q. What are your thoughts now on lifting the arms embargo?

The President. I've always been for it. I haven't changed my position on that. I do believe, however, that the appropriate thing to do now is to see if this horrible incident can be the spur to a vigorous effort to achieve a peace agreement. And that's what we ought to focus

on now. If we continue to fail in the face of these kinds of incidents—I think that the United States position on the arms embargo is only reinforced by the kind of thing that happened yesterday. But I want to try to work with our allies now to take a shot at hoping we can bring this matter to a conclusion.

Q. Yesterday you said in your statement that you called the massacre a cowardly act. But some Members of Congress are saying that the U.S. is acting cowardly by repeatedly saying that they will consider air strikes without making good on those threats.

The President. Well, the United States, I will say again, under international law, in the absence of an attack on our people, does not have the authority to unilaterally undertake air strikes. And every time we discuss it, the other countries who have troops on the ground—and we don't. It's very well for these Members of Congress to say that; they don't have any constituents on the ground there. And the people who have constituents on the ground say, "Well, we have to think about whether our soldiers are going to be killed in large numbers in retaliation for this if you do it."

Now, as you know, I have long believed that we should have standby air strike authority and that there are circumstances under which we should use it. In this case, again I want to say, the United Nations has not finished their confirmation process. And until they do, I think it would be inappropriate for me to make a final decision. But I do think you have to give some credence to the position of our European allies. They do have soldiers on the ground there who can be shot at and shelled long after our planes are gone, that is what is animating their position. That does not mean it won't happen this time. I have discussed it yesterday; I discussed it today. We are discussing it with our allies. But they are in a fundamentally different position, and they have been as long as they have had troops there.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:37 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Houston, TX.

Remarks at the American Cancer Society's Cattlebarons Children's Party in Houston, Texas

February 6, 1994

The President. Well, hello, everybody.

Audience members. Hello.

The President. Have you had a good time at the party?

Audience members. Yes.

The President. Did you play some games?

Audience members. Yes.

The President. Some of you win?

Audience members. Yes.

The President. Well, that's good. I'm so glad to see all of you. I just came in from Washington on an airplane, and it was raining at the airport. And I'm glad to be here where it's dry. And I came in with your Mayor, Mayor Lanier, and Congressman Green. Who else is here? Is Congressman Washington here? Is anybody else here? Well, we're glad to see you, and I'm glad to be in Houston for a little while.

Audience members. That's all right.

The President. Yes, that's all right, isn't it? You know, I—what's this? Is it for me? What's on that ring? What do you think?

Do you all want to ask me any questions? You do? What's your question?

The Presidency

Q. What's it like being President?

The President. What's it like being President? Well, depending on what kind of humor they're in, it can be a lot of fun. [*Laughter*] Listen, you want to know what's fun about it, what's good about it? What's good about it is I get to go all over America and meet all different kinds of people and know that I have to work for all of them, people of all ages and all races.

It's good because I get to do things that help people and help solve problems. One of the things that we are doing more of this year is putting more money into medical research, something that you support, right? [*Applause*]

And another thing that I'm trying to do is to figure out how to put more money into medical research and, at the same time, make sure that health care is available to every child in this country, every child, including a lot of people who don't have it today.

So I get to see all different kinds of people and work on different problems and try to make life better. It's a wonderful job. Sometimes it's hard, but it's always a good job.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Well, you really get right to it, don't you? [*Laughter*] His question was—where are they? Here's the head of my detail—do I like having Secret Service agents around me all the time? The answer to that is, the true answer is, yes and no. Yes, I like it because their job is to protect me and my family, and they do a wonderful job of it. And no I don't, sometimes I just like to be an ordinary citizen. I just wish that I could take my wife and daughter and walk down the street and go to a movie or go to a restaurant or go in a shop and go shopping and just be alone. But it's not going to happen for a few years.

Who else had their hand up over here? Yes, ma'am, what's your question? Your name is Danielle? You've got a great nose, Danielle. [*Laughter*] What's your question?

Q. How does it feel to live in——

The President. In the White House?

Q. Yes.

The President. How does it feel to live in the White House? Well, it's a great honor. Do you know, every President since 1800 has lived in the White House. Every President except for George Washington has lived there. So it's wonderful to live there because I carry all this history around. I go in rooms all the time, and I know every other President's been there.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. How old am I? [*Laughter*] I am very old. How old do you think I am?

Q. How old are you?

The President. How old do you think I am?

Q. Forty.

The President. Forty—oh, bless you. [*Laughter*] Bless you. Hey, hold on. Forty-six? Close.

Q. Forty-eight.

The President. I'm 47, 47.

Q. A hundred.

The President. One hundred—no. [*Laughter*] Listen, one at a time. What's your question? Stand up—what's your question? I've got you—yes, hold on. What's your question?

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. What do I do? I've been asking myself that lately. [*Laughter*] Well, first of all, I try to pass laws in the Congress that take care of the needs of the American people. I speak for the United States in the rest of the world. And I command the Armed Forces of the United States. Those are some of the things I do.

What?

Q. How do you like being President?

The President. I like it a lot. You'd like it, too, I think.

Q. What are your plans for the future?

The President. You mean for your future or for mine? For my future? You mean, what am I going to do when I grow up? [*Laughter*]

Q. When you're older.

The President. When I'm older.

Q. Yes.

The President. I'm just going to keep—I'm going to be the very best President I can be, and I'm not going to think about the future until I'm not President anymore.

Do you want to get down? Here, hold on, I've got your hand. Do you want to get down, or do you want to sit with me? Nice boots. Hey, look at these boots. Let's give him a hand on these boots. I love them. [*Applause*] Better than mine. Do you like them better than mine?

Do you want to get down? You want to go down? Okay, I've got you.

Do you want to get up? Okay, you get up. You're next.

Okay, who's got another—go ahead, in the back.

Sh-h-h, I can't hear. Please be quiet so I can hear a question. Go ahead.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Yes, sometimes it's hard having a lot of responsibilities. Most of the time I like it, actually. I like being responsible for people and for their interests. But sometimes it's hard. Sometimes you just want to get up and not go to work and not have those responsibilities. But most days I really like it. It's a great honor to be responsible for other people.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Well, as President, I'm not supposed to express a preference, but I can tell you this: They earned it, didn't they? They did it by being good at what they did.

President's Activities

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. What do I drive? Believe it or not, one of the things that happens to you is when you're President, they don't let you drive anymore. Some people think that I got hundreds of thousands of votes so I wouldn't be able to drive anymore. [*Laughter*] The Secret Service drives me, but normally, they drive me in either a Cadillac or a Lincoln limousine that's bulletproof, where the doors and the windows are real thick like that.

Q. Did you ever have to wash dishes? [*Laughter*]

The President. Did I ever have to wash dishes? You bet. I bet I've washed more dishes than most people in this room. [*Laughter*] But I even wash dishes now every now and then, but not often. But I don't mind that. I've washed a lot of dishes in my life, though.

Q. Why do you jog?

The President. Why do I jog? Because if I didn't, I'd get fat—ter than I am. [*Laughter*] And because I like it.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Do I get worn out traveling? When I travel a whole lot, I get tired. But I like to travel because it's the only way I get to see people in the country.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Am I going to run in 1996? Don't bet against it. But I haven't decided yet.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Why are they so thick? Why are they so thick? So the bullets don't break through. That's right. Good for you.

Yes, ma'am, what's your question? How does it feel when you're flying? Have you ever been in an airplane? Well, the truth is, most of the time it feels like it does on the ground. It's calm and nice and fun. But when you take off, it's real exciting because you're going up like that. And then sometime when you fly through a storm and it jumps up and down, it's kind of scary. But most of the time it's just normal.

Q. I thought you were 51.

The President. I'm not 51. Sometimes I feel like I'm 151, but I'm only 47.

That's the first person I shook hands with. Let's get a question there. Listen.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. What's my bowling average? I don't bowl enough to have one, but I think it's like about 135, about 135 for the last 8 games I've bowled. But when I was in high school, I had a 168 average. And I'm starting to bowl again, so I'm trying to—I bowled 149 this morning. But I'm not very good. But I want to be good again. I like it.

Okay, anybody who hasn't had a question?

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. My favorite sport? For me, personally, I like golf because that's the one I play the most. But I like watching basketball.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. My favorite movie of all time, ever? My favorite movie of all time is "High Noon." My second favorite movie of all time is a movie called "Casablanca." And the best movie I've seen this year is "Schindler's List"; that's what I think, in my opinion, closely followed by "Shadowlands."

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Do I exercise? Yes, I go jogging five or six times a week, normally. And I have some weights I work out on, and I play golf as often as I can. The Secret Service jogs with me every day. And most of them are in better shape than I am and can run me to death. But sometimes I find one who is not in as good a shape as I am, and I enjoy that very much. [*Laughter*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Yes, I want all of you who haven't shaken my hand before I leave, you come up here and shake hands with me. You certainly can.

Okay, one more question. What is it? Is this for me? What am I going to do with all these rings? You all are killing me with rings here.

The Presidency

Q. How did you feel when you knew you became President?

The President. I was so happy, because I had worked very hard and because there were so many things I wanted to do. And I was really grateful, too. I just felt so grateful that people had given me that chance.

Q. What did you feel like when you weren't President, before?

The President. When I wasn't President? I was happy, too. I was happy then, too.

President's Health

Q. How is your health?

The President. My health is good, I think. I just went to the doctor, and I had tests for 6 hours. And they said that my blood pressure was good, my heart was strong. I lost 15 pounds since last year, so I'm doing pretty good. I've got 15 more to go.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I'm going to go look at the quilt. But look, I shook hands with some of you coming up, so if you shook hands with me, back up and let all the kids who didn't get to shake hands come up, and I'll shake hands with all the kids who didn't.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:51 p.m. at the Four Seasons Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston.

Remarks at the Texas Presidential Dinner and Gala in Houston
February 6, 1994

Thank you very much. My longtime friend Garry Mauro, and Chairman and Mrs. Wilhelm, Mayor and Mrs. Lanier, Secretary and Mrs. Bentsen. I want to say that I have a lot to be grateful to Texas for, big victory in the primaries here, an enormous amount of support, a lot of friends. But I think I probably owe you most for Lloyd Bentsen and Henry Cisneros. I want to say also how much I appreciate two other Texans in my administration, one of whom is here and one is not, the Secretary of the Navy, John Dalton, from San Antonio, and my good friend, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Bob Armstrong, who has done a wonderful job for you and for us in America.

When we had that terrible earthquake recently in California, Henry Cisneros was there before the aftershocks stopped. And people told me over and over again, "The last time this happened to us we had to go to Washington to find the Cabinet. Now you've got a Secretary who came to us, who's committed to us." That's the kind of job he's doing up there.

It's been a long time since an American Treasury Secretary has enjoyed anything approaching the prestige that Lloyd Bentsen has earned all over the world, in Asia, in Europe, in Latin America, and of course, here in the United States and in the Congress. I cannot say enough about him in front of you, his constituents, for all the advice he's given, all the leadership he's shown, and all the trouble he's kept me out of. [*Laughter*] I want to thank him so much.

I also want to say a special word of acknowledgement to your State Democratic Chairman, Bob Slagle, and to Governor Ann Richards, who I just left, and to all these Members of Congress who are here and those who aren't here.

I want to say, too, that there are several points I want to make tonight without giving much of a speech. I just want to talk to you as one American to another.

When I became President, people had pretty much given up on the Government doing anything right. The economy was going in the wrong direction, and the country was coming apart when we needed to be coming together. And a lot of people, frankly, including probably a majority of people in this State, had all these preconceptions—Lloyd Bentsen referred to them in his introduction—about what Democrats were for. And you know, I looked for 12 years—I listened to Republicans talk about reducing the deficit, and it just went up; we quadrupled the debt.

Well, we didn't just talk about it, we did something about it. Last week it was estimated that the deficit would be 40 percent lower next year than it was going to be when I took office, 40 percent lower. And because of that, interest rates are down, inflation is down, home sales are up, car sales are up, and we got more new jobs in one year than we had in the previous 4 years. Now, that's not Republican rhetoric, that's Democratic record, performance, and work.

I heard them talk about family values and about how people should not be on welfare, they ought to work, but I never saw much happen. And one year, after 7 years of trying, we passed the Family and Medical Leave Act so that people could take a little time off when their children were born or their parents were

sick without losing their jobs. We took the first big step toward welfare reform by giving income tax relief to 15 million families that hover right around the poverty line, even though the people work full-time, so that there would never be any more incentive to leave work and go on welfare, so that all the incentives would be the other way around and we would reward work and family. So it wasn't just the other party's rhetoric, it was our reality. And we've just begun.

And I heard them for years talk about being tough on crime, and after 7 years of flailing around, we finally passed the Brady bill. And now we've got a tough crime bill before the Congress which says no to the things we ought to say no to and begins to say yes to the things we ought to say yes to. That is, it does provide for tougher penalties, especially for repeat violent offenders. But it also puts another 100,000 police officers on the street because we learned from Mayor Lanier that if you have more police in the right place, you'll lower the crime rate. And it provides drug treatment and education and alternative imprisonment for young people to give them a chance to put their lives back together. You can't just say no to people; you also have to say yes to the people that are going to be on your streets, in your neighborhoods, and a part of your future. It's time to stop turning away from them and start giving them a way to be a part of our common future. That is what it also does.

I heard all this talk for years about how the other party was for business and for trade and for small business, but it was our administration that passed an economic plan that gave, as they'll find this April 15th, 90 percent of the small businesses in this country a chance to get a tax cut if they invest more in their businesses, 90 percent; they gave incentives for people to invest in new business. This year we had the biggest increase in entrepreneurial investments in new business in American history, number one. That is the record of this administration, not rhetoric.

And yes, we have taken on health care. You know why? Because we're the only country in the advanced world that doesn't provide a basic package of health care to all of its citizens. And as a result, some of the people of the families I saw—you know, I went to a party tonight of children with cancer and their families. And I looked out there, and I said, I know I'm looking at people who now can never change their job because they had a sick child. I know I'm looking at people who run up against those lifetime limits on insurance, so now that their kids really need the health care, they've blown it out, and they can't get any more. I know I'm looking at people who may lose their coverage or lose their jobs and never get health insurance again.

Now, I don't believe we can't do that and help our economy, not hurt it. Why? Because today in America, businesses that are small are paying insurance premiums 35 percent above the national average. I think we can do better than that.

I don't believe that we can't do better. They talk about choice. Do you know that today only one in three, only one in three workers with health insurance from their employer has any real choice in their doctors? Under our plan, every American will have at least three different choices of health care plans at a minimum. There will be more choice, not less. And it will all be private, private health care and private insurance, in spite of the rhetoric of our opponents in the other party.

Do I think we can do it? Is it easy? No. If it's easy, somebody would have done it already. Is it free of complexity? No. I know one thing: You cannot justify a system in this country, in the shape a lot of people are in, where we spend 10 cents on a dollar more on paperwork, insurance premiums, and bureaucracy, more than any other country in the world, and we still can't figure out how to cover people. And another 100,000 Americans a month are losing their health insurance for good. I believe we can do better, and we are going to.

Finally, let me say this: I heard the other side talk about free trade and economic growth and, especially in Texas, being good to Texas. I heard all that. But this administration fought for NAFTA, and we were 100 votes down, and we came back and we passed it. This administration fought to get rid of export controls that are allowing Texas businesses to do business all around the world today. I had a man in a meeting that I came to before I came down here, he said, "Your administration has done more in one year to promote international business opportunities for American business people than the previous administration did in the last 12 years." That is the rhetoric of success. That is

reality. That's not just something we're talking about.

Let me tell you something else. I know I didn't carry Texas in the last election. I know that. Some think I may not carry it again. But I'll tell you one thing: When the space station was going down, we fought for it, and we lifted it up, and we saved it. We now have a project that is at the core of our partnership with Russia and our hope for a better world.

There is example after example after example. In our new energy policy, Garry Mauro's alternative fleet conversion policy to use more natural gas to burn in Federal cars, and all the things we have done that show that this administration is not just talking about Texas and telling people things they want to hear, we're actually doing things to help this State move into the 21st century.

One of the people I neglected to introduce earlier, that I'd be remiss if I didn't, is the Deputy Secretary of Energy, who is from here in Houston, Bill White. Where is he? Bill's here somewhere. We have an energy policy that really is pro-natural gas, pro-American producer, good for America, and good for Texas.

I say these things because we're going to have some elections in 1994, and we're going to have all that old rhetoric again. And the Republicans are going to tell you exactly what they think you want to hear. I saw them the other day, they were complaining that I had stolen their themes, as if they own fiscal responsibility. What they own was quadrupling the deficit. What we own is a budget this year that eliminates 100 programs and cuts 300 more. That's our issue, not theirs. They act like they own the crime issue. But what they did was to fiddle around with crime for years while it got worse. And what we did was to pass the Brady bill and put a crime bill on the floor of the Congress that offers the promise of lowering the crime rate.

I say that because I want you here in Texas to remember that if you want something done, instead of to be told what you want to hear, you need to help us. You need to keep these seats in Congress, go after that Senate seat, keep Ann Richards in the Governor's office. Give us a partnership to move America forward.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 p.m. at the Wortham Center. In his remarks, he referred to Garry Mauro, Texas land commissioner, and David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks to the Greater Houston Partnership in Houston
February 7, 1994

Thank you very much. Secretary Bentsen, you said if I had been in any danger, I would have sent you to give this speech. You notice how quickly he got off the stage when it came my turn to talk? [*Laughter*]

I want to thank all those who preceded me: Ken Lay for his kind remarks. He and I had an unusual and, for would-be golfers, a lifetime opportunity. We got to play golf with Jack Nicklaus in Colorado last summer. Nicklaus won. [*Laughter*] It was good for both of our humility quotients.

I'm glad to see Mayor Lanier again. You know, I'll tell you a story about Mayor Lanier. He's the only person I know who actually turned down a personal tour of the Oval Office. It's a true story. He was up there one night, he and Mrs. Lanier were there, and we watched a movie, as I remember, in the White House movie theater. And I said, "If you want to go see the Office before you leave, I'll take you over there." And it was about midnight, and he said, "I don't do tours at midnight." And he went on to bed. [*Laughter*] And I thought, that was the kind of common sense that carried him to the mayoralty, wasn't it? People ought to be safe in Houston. I believe we ought to have more police officers and put them in the right places. And I didn't take it personally. I'm going to invite him back in 1997. [*Laughter*] I thought it was great.

And let me say about Lloyd Bentsen that I believe he'll go down in the history books as one of the great Treasury Secretaries in this

century, not only because of his iron will in steering through the biggest deficit reduction package in history last year but because of the way he has worked with the private sector, with the Federal Reserve, with the other power centers in our country and the influence that he's exerted overseas from Russia to China to Latin America. It's a real source of comfort and reassurance to me to know that whenever I'm in a kind of a tough bind, I can call him on the phone and ask him for his advice. Sometimes I call him on the phone and ask him for advice about problems that have nothing to do with the Treasury Department. And sometimes he smiles, and he says, "Gosh, I'm glad I don't have to make that decision." [*Laughter*] But most of the time he gives me good advice, and most of the time I follow it.

Let me also say, I know there are several Members of Congress here today, and I may miss some of them, but I see in the audience Gene Green, Craig Washington, Mike Andrews, and Jack Brooks. I don't know if I missed anybody else, but I thank you all for being here. They have to listen to me talk all the time. It's remarkable that they have the forbearance to come all the way home and listen to it again.

We're a little bit late today because I spent a good part of the morning dealing with the crisis in Bosnia. And I am sorry we're a little bit late, but I do want to just tell you what has happened before I go into my remarks, just briefly.

As you know, there was an outrageous attack on innocent civilians in Sarajevo on Saturday. And our Government is talking with our allies about what steps ought to be taken in response not only to this outrage but to the possibility of future attacks on innocent civilians in the future. We're also talking about whether there's something more we can do to help the parties agree to solve the conflict. Until those folks get tired of killing each other over there, bad things will continue to happen. And sooner or later they're going to have to decide that it's in their interest to let their children grow up in a world free of war.

The United Nations Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali has asked the North Atlantic Council to take the necessary decisions which would enable NATO's military forces to respond to requests for air strikes directed against artillery and mortar positions around the city of Sarajevo that can do the kind of horrible things you saw on Saturday. If the United Nations mission there determines who is responsible for the attacks—in other words, the Secretary-General has now asked that authority be given to our commanders there on the ground to take appropriate action. I very much welcome that request. I have hoped that that would be the case for some time. I have directed our representatives at NATO to support the Secretary-General's request when it is discussed there in the next couple of days.

That is all I have to report at this time except to say that, once again, I hope very much that the horror of all these innocent people dying will sober all those who are responsible and lead to a renewed effort to get a peace agreement there.

Now, having said that, I'd like to go back a little bit to talking about what I hoped to come to Houston to discuss today, which is how our Nation reconciles the need to bring the deficit down and be tough on the budget with our responsibilities to invest in the future and to work with you to grow the economy. If you take the position that Mayor Lanier took in 1991, you see a microcosm of what I think I should be trying to do as your President. He came here on a promise to put 655 more police officers on the street either by hiring new ones or working the present force overtime and to deploy them in the appropriate places with the goal of lowering the crime rate and making the people here feel more secure.

Since that time, the crime rate's dropped 22 percent, murders are down by 27 percent, and he's given America its best reason to have Congress pass a crime bill this year—[*applause*]—thank you—because we know that this is an issue without a party or a racial or an economic label and we know that the more vulnerable you are to other forces in society, the more vulnerable you also are to being a victim of crime.

So we're going to have a debate over the next couple of months, and these Members of Congress here will be a part of it, about what that crime bill ought to be. But one thing we know is if you have more police on the street and they are properly trained and they're properly deployed and they know the neighbors and they know the kids, they will not only catch criminals quicker, they will actually deter crime, which is, after all, what we ought to be trying to do, to reduce crime in the first place. Why?

By taking a practical approach to a human problem and asking what is best for the people involved.

I want to thank the Greater Houston Partnership for your leadership on the NAFTA battle. And I want to say some things about that that I think I'm entitled to say since I fought so hard for its ratification, some of which not all of you may agree with. But to me, the way that battle took shape is the way this country ought to work. And let me explain why. First of all, to pass it there was really a partnership required between Government and people in private business and a not insignificant number of working people who knew it was in their personal interest for it to pass. Secondly, to pass it there was a partnership between Democrats and Republicans, something which unfortunately is all too rare in Washington, even though it's more common in Houston, I would imagine. Thirdly, there was an honest debate about important issues. And even though I strongly disagreed with those who voted against it, there was a real core of legitimate concern. I thought the remedy, that is, beating NAFTA, was the wrong remedy. But the core of concern was real; that is, that in a global economy, people who control the flow of money and technology and production may or may not have interests that are always identical to the working people who live where they are located.

So there were honest debates that led to the first environmental side agreement in the history of any trade agreement—a good one—a labor standards agreement, a commitment that the Congress had to do more to retrain the American work force, dislocated not only by trade with our neighbors to the south but generally dislocated by the changing of the economy; an agreement to establish a North American development bank to try to help finance new businesses and small businesses in places where they need to grow in order to participate in what we hope will be a vibrant and growing two-way trade not only with Mexico but with all of our neighbors to the south. So the debate was about real issues and produced, in my view, the right result, the trade agreement that I believe so strongly in and a lot of other things that point the way toward making sure that it benefits all the people of the country.

And finally, I liked it because it was focused on the future. It required us all to imagine what we wanted Houston, Texas, and the United States to look like in the 21st century, what things are inevitable that we need to—these changes that are happening that we need to make our friends instead of our enemies. How could we shape the future?

Now to me, that's what public life ought to be about. Whoever you vote for and whatever you say, people get together like this and they argue and talk about real issues in the spirit of partnership, thinking about the future, focusing on how it affects ordinary people. And I liked it a lot. In the environment in which I operate now, as opposed to the one in which I operated when I was a Governor, there tends to be too little partnership and too much partisanship. There tends to be too little focus on the future and an absolute obsession about the past. There tends to be too little action and a world of talk.

Now, we have some big challenges as a country. Make no mistake about it, we have enormous strengths. A lot of things are going well in America. We have underlying strengths which are beginning to benefit us now that have always been there. But the way we continue to move into the future is to cherish our strengths, but to honestly face our problems and our challenges.

Now, for the 4 years before I became President, for all kinds of reasons, we had the slowest economic growth in half a century and very low job growth. For the 12 years before I took office, the national debt quadrupled in only 12 years after 200 years of history in which it was more or less constant, except during wartime when it went up. In those 12 years, the cost of health care exploded at 2 and 3 times, sometimes more, the rate of inflation. And yet every year a smaller percentage of our people were covered with health insurance, with consequences, I might add, that were dramatically, I thought, put forward by a very articulate letter to the editor in one of your newspapers today by a local physician, which I commend to you.

For 20 years, for 20 years, since about 1974, after the last big energy crisis then and globalization of our financial system, the wages of most American hourly wage earners have been stagnant. It's not a partisan issue, this is something that's happened through 20 years. And for about 30 years, the American family unit has been under great stress, particularly in areas of economic distress, so that now millions and millions of young Americans are being

born into families where there was never a marriage; in a community where the local community institutions that used to shore up kids in trouble, the churches, the businesses, and the other things, are weaker than ever before; and where there is no business investment to give people economic hope and where very often only the churches and a few nonprofit organizations are like the proverbial kid with their thumb in the dike holding back the deluge. And often they come in contact with the rest of us when we catch them breaking the law and we're telling them not to do something, instead of earlier in their lives when we could have given them a chance to be a part of this partnership represented in this room today. Now, those are the challenges we face in a world that is changing very rapidly, where the economy is increasingly globalized.

I ran for this job because I wanted this country to roar into the 21st century still the greatest nation on Earth, with the kids in this country looking forward to the brightest future any generation of young Americans ever had, and because I believed that to do that we had to restore the economy, rebuild a sense of community in an increasingly diverse America—look around this room—and make the Government work for ordinary people again. Make it make sense instead of having people so alienated from it.

Now to do that, it seems to me that we have to stop focusing so much on yesterday's labels and focus more on tomorrow's goals. The issue isn't whether we go left or right, it's whether we can go forward. And if we don't go forward, it doesn't matter whether we're stuck left or right.

Historically, if you look at the whole history of this country, we have done well because we had strong shared values and we were increasingly, when we needed to be, pragmatic and progressive at the same time. We were philosophically conservative in the sense that we never thought we ought to change our values and operationally progressive in the sense that we were always ready to look at a changed set of circumstances and move into the breach. And I would argue to you that that's what we face today.

Our administration took office with a clear economic strategy that was first premised on getting the deficit down, to get lower interest rates, lower inflation, higher investments, and more jobs.

Second, on increasing trade, because it's perfectly obvious if you look at the stagnant employment situation in Europe, in Japan, or in the United States, that no great wealthy nation can grow wealthier and create jobs unless you have more customers for your goods and services. That's what NAFTA was about. That's what the GATT agreement was about. That's what meeting with the Asian leaders was about. That's what this hemispheric summit next year with all the leaders—or this year—with all the leaders of Latin America is about. That's what lifting billions of dollars of controls on exports of high technology goods, so that we can now sell them in the aftermath of the cold war, is about. We've got to have more customers for our goods and services.

Third, on trying to stake out an American position in the new technologies of the 21st century, that means maintaining the technologies we have to have to keep our defense the strongest in the world, some of them being maintained by work being done in this State. It means as we downsize defense, having an aggressive defense conversion strategy so we can make the most of all the work that has been done and all we've already paid for, through the development of dual-use technologies. It means keeping our undisputed leadership in space, which is what the fight for the space station was all about. It means doing more in areas that are critically important where we have an undisputed lead like medical research, something you know more about here in Houston then virtually any other place in the country. It means building the information superhighway that the Vice President is so strongly advocating. It means making the environment a job creator instead of job loser. And it means having a sensible energy policy. The administration's oil and gas initiative was complimented recently by Dennis Hendricks, one of your distinguished leaders in this organization. And I thanked him before I came in for saying that it was a positive direction, nonintrusive but seeking to improve the environment in which we operate. That's the way we're trying to approach this.

The next thing we've got to do is to focus on specific things we can afford to do to help generate new business and small business. The Secretary of the Treasury and I were talking while Mayor Lanier was giving his speech. In

our economic plan last year, one of the things that wasn't noticed is the huge increase in the expensing provision for small business, which made 90 percent of the small businesses in this country eligible for a tax cut on April 15th if they invested more in their businesses, a new small business capital gains tax that Ventura Capital Association had asked for for years, and an extension of the research and development tax credit. This last year, we had a record increase in venture capitalizations of small companies in this country. That's what's going to generate the jobs of the 21st century and keep us ahead. We have to continue to focus on it.

Finally, the economic strategy has a strong education and training component. And I'll talk a little more about that in a moment. But the first thing we had to do was to cut the deficit, to reduce spending, to increase some taxes, to put the money in a rigorous system which would bring the deficit down over 5 years, and to reduce the size of the Federal Government.

Now, before this plan took effect last year, the 1995 deficit was projected to be $302 billion. Now, it's expected to be $176 billion, a 40 percent reduction. That's why interest rates are down and inflation is low and investment is up. And if we keep doing it, we'll have 3 straight years in a row where the deficit has gone down for the first time since Harry Truman was President. I was stunned, by the way, when my researchers gave me that. I made them go back and check three times. I said, that can't be true. It turns out it is.

Now, if you look what's happened, we've had millions of Americans refinance their homes and businesses. You've got core inflation at its lowest rate in 20 years. You've got long-term interest rates at historic lows. If we can keep this going, you will bring the economy back, the private sector will. And it is the most important thing.

Last year, this country created almost 2 million new jobs; 90 percent of them were in the private sector. For years we've had an enormous percentage of our jobs created primarily by State and local government. Last year 90 percent of the new jobs came in the private sector. This country is enjoying strong economic growth in spite of the continuing problems in Europe and Japan. And we can continue to do it if we have the discipline to keep the deficit coming down.

And I want to say something in defense of the people who voted for that economic program last year. Any Member of the Congress will tell you that if that budget had not passed when it did, NAFTA would never have passed, because we would have spent all of August, all of September, and all of October wallowing around Washington, fighting with each other about the nickels and dimes around the edges of the budget instead of focusing on NAFTA. We were about 100 votes down when the NAFTA fight started. It would not have passed if the budget hadn't passed first. The two things went together, and if that would have happened, we'd never had the GATT agreement. So it is very important, it seems to me, to recognize now that what we have to say is the thing worked, and we have to build on it.

Today, our second budget is being presented in Washington, and the Budget Director Leon Panetta will deliver it to Congress and talk about its details. I just want you to know what the second budget does. It continues to cut spending because these budget caps are very tight. It's the toughest budget on spending cuts the Congress has yet seen.

Listen to this: More than 60 percent of the major accounts in the Federal budget are cut. That means more than 350 specific nondefense programs are being cut, and over 100 of them are being eliminated outright. It's been a long time since that's been done. If the Congress adopts it, it will keep the deficit coming down, it will keep interest rates down, it will send a clear signal to the Fed and to the rest of the world that we mean business and that the investment climate will continue.

These lower interest rates, if they can be maintained, will save over $20 billion in deficit in next year's budget alone and over $150 billion in the next 5 years. Seven of the 14 major Cabinet departments are taking budget cuts. The Federal bureaucracy is slashed by 118,000 under this plan. That puts us ahead of the goals set by the Vice President's reinventing Government task force, which had us at 100,000 this year. And by the way, when we go through this thing in 5 years, we will have reduced Federal Government by attrition and management by 252,000 so that by 1998 the Federal Government will be smaller than it has been in over 30 years. Why? Because if we don't do it, we can't keep the economy going in the right direction, and we won't have any money to spend on the things that 90 percent of you think we should spend more money on.

So most people read mysteries and not budgets. Most people think the budget is a mystery. [*Laughter*] But I hope that you will encourage the members of your delegation, especially this year when we're not having this contentious fight over the tax issue, to vote for this budget. Because if we don't do it, we cannot keep the economic recovery going. And if we do it, we can keep the recovery going.

We can also find the money we need to invest in some things that I think are important. If we didn't reduce spending, if we don't reduce spending in some of yesterday's programs, we won't have the money to spend on the crime bill. Those things cost money, too. That crime bill has 100,000 more police officers, has more money to help the States build penitentiary beds, which you know a lot about in Texas, has funds for boot camps for first-time nonviolent offenders, and funds for drug treatment so that a lot of these young people who get out don't come back.

If we don't do it, we won't have money for what's called the technology reinvestment project. Texas has gotten $25 million in it so far, to help develop dual uses, commercial uses for defense technology. If we don't do it, we can't do the information superhighway. If we don't do it, we'll have a very tough time holding on to the space station, because we have to slash other things to keep the space program going. If we don't do it, we won't be able to fully fund the highway program. And if we don't do it, I'm afraid some people will come back at defense, and I am unalterably opposed to cutting the defense budget any more. We have cut it a great deal, and I don't believe we can responsibly cut it more. I mean, we're cutting it, but I don't want deeper cuts in it.

If we don't do it, we can't pay to redesign the unemployment system in the country. It's a big deal. A lot of you work a lot of people. This unemployment system that you're paying taxes into was designed for a time in the 1950's and sixties when the average person lost a job, was laid off, and eventually was called back to his or her old job. Now, most people who are laid off never get called back to their old job. The average person will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime, and the only cure for the fear of being unemployable is to be able to constantly learn new skills.

Therefore, we believe that the present crazy-quilt patch of 150 Government training programs and an unemployment system that is essentially passive until the benefits run out is wrong. We think when people lose work they should immediately start training for the next job and that your tax money shouldn't be squandered, essentially, paying people to live while they pursue a vain hope at a lower standard of living. And instead, we ought to have a reemployment system where people really can immediately and always be retraining if they lose the job they have. But we can't do it, if we don't cut the rest of the budget.

This budget provides for the beginning of a national apprenticeship program for kids that don't go to college. Most of the new jobs won't require a college education. But you've got a chance of doubling your income when you get out of high school if you just get 2 years of further training. Our school-to-work initiative makes a big start on that. This budget will pay to implement the Goals 2000 program, which started back in 1989 when President Bush and the Governors negotiated some national education goals that I helped to draft then in my former life. This bill gives us a chance to achieve those goals by having national standards that are world-class and supporting local reforms of all kinds around the country. We can't fund this bill if we don't cut the rest of the budget. This budget dramatically increases the Head Start program. A young lady said to me today, if we could start all these kids in Head Start we'd have fewer of them getting in trouble later on. It dramatically increases Head Start. If we don't cut the budget, we can't increase Head Start.

So I say to all of you, I hope you will support this process. It is not easy to eliminate 100 Government programs, because somebody likes them. It's not easy to cut 350; somebody likes them. Henry Cisneros has done a brilliant job at HUD. His budget increases funding for homelessness in a way that actually gets people off of the homeless rolls permanently. His budget gives more housing vouchers to people who are eligible, to let them go out into the private sector and make their own decisions about where to live and let the markets work.

Do we cut some other programs? You bet we do. Why? There's $8 billion in the HUD pipeline that should have been spent 2 or 3 years ago that can't be spent because of Government redtape. So Secretary Cisneros says we've got a homeless problem in this country. We

have people out there, working people, who are eligible for help. Give them the vouchers, get them out there, let the system work, and cut something else.

If you want us to follow some of these energy initiatives that we're doing through the national labs—you've got one of your own, Bill White's sitting over there, is the Deputy Secretary of Energy. We've got to cut the rest of the budget if you want us to do the things that will enable us to explore the new technologies which may revive the energy sector in this country. So I implore you to tell the folks that represent you, it's okay to cut to get the deficit down and to spend more where we need to spend it.

Now, let me just make this one final remark. You might say, "Well, that's fine you're going to really cut the deficit, but it's still going to be really big in 1998." And you would be right. And I want you to know here in Houston why that is. How can you cut defense, freeze domestic spending, hold Social Security within inflation, have revenues growing, and have the deficit going up? Answer—there is only one answer now, especially if this budget passes, there will only be one answer. The answer is: When I took office the Medicaid budget, health care for poor folks, was supposed to increase by an annual rate of between 16 and 11 percent a year over the next 5 years, and the Medicare budget, health care for the elderly, was going to increase by a rate of between 11 and 9 percent a year over the next 5 years. And if we do not reform our health care system, in 10 years we will be spending all your Federal tax money, all your new Federal tax money, on health care and nothing else. And we'll be spending it for the same health care, not for new health care.

Now, let me drive this home. We estimate the Medicare budget will go up, let's say, 10 percent this year, when the case load's going up and general inflation is 3.5 percent, that the Medicaid budget would go up 12 percent with the case load going up 2 percent and inflation where I said.

Now, the only thing I want to say about the health care debate today is this, because I know you have to go, but I want you to think about this. I had a doctor in my office Saturday, a Republican from another State who has mobilized hundreds and hundreds of doctors in a professional unit. He came in and said, "I am one of the few people in America who has actually read your bill. And I like it." But he said, "You see, I don't understand what is going on out there." He said, "I read all this stuff, people that are for you, the people that are against you, and they're saying all this that doesn't have anything to do with what's going on out there in the real world." So without going into the details, let me just ask you to focus on this: Every plan proposed by anybody is a private plan. It keeps health care providers private and keeps insurance private, every one, including ours.

The issue then—let's talk about this. Which plan would give more choice to consumers than the others? The answer is ours would, but you can check that out. Consumers are rapidly losing choice in the present system. Only about one in three workers today insured at work has any choice at all over who the medical provider is. Which plan would do the most to keep some funding for the academic health centers, the kind of centers that have made Houston the medical capital of the United States? Of the three major plans, ours is the only one that attempts to do anything for these academic health centers. Now, we have representatives here in the audience, they'll tell you we haven't done enough. We can fix that. That's peanuts in the context of the larger budget if that's a problem. But this is a big issue that never even gets raised.

Which plan would cover more primary and preventive services? You talk to anyone that runs a hospital and they'll tell you that all of us are paying too much for our health insurance because the people who don't have any coverage only get health care when they're too sick, it's too late, they show up in an emergency room, and it costs out the wazoo, and then the hospital has to pass the cost along to someone else.

Can you achieve the real goals for the health care system and ever get the deficit under control—two things at once—if everybody doesn't have to assume some responsibility for providing health care for themselves and for employees? This is a tough question, not free of difficulty. What about all the people who have part-time workers? What about small businesses? The problem is 70 percent of small businesses do provide health insurance for their employees, and their rates are 35 to 40 percent higher than big business and Government rates. Anybody that's in a Federal health care plan, let me tell you, folks, is getting a good deal now.

Now again, I say this in the context of this budget so that you can remember that I said it 4 years from now. There will be no ultimate solution to the Federal deficit until we reform the Medicare-Medicaid expenses and get them closer to the rate of inflation. That cannot be done, in my opinion, having studied this for years as a Governor who used to have to break our budget every year on it, until there is some system by which all Americans have access to basic primary and preventive health care. But we have to do it in a way that preserves what is best about health care, which is the system of private providers that is a shining monument here in Houston, and to do it in a way that overall helps the American business economy, not hurts it.

Now, is it easy to do? No. If it was easy, somebody would have done it already. It's the most complicated thing in the world. How could it not be, it's 14.5 percent of our gross national product. But we must address it if you wish to solve the Federal Government's budgetary problems. Otherwise, you mark my words, within a couple of years, you'll have to give up the space program and everything else just to pay more for the same health care. And we cannot do that.

So I look forward to this health care debate in the spirit of excitement. This is important. This is the way I felt about NAFTA. If we can just be honest with one another and focus on the future and work through this thing, this is going to be one of the most exhilarating experiences this country ever went through because we're facing up to our challenges. But first we have to keep the deficit coming down, and we have to pass this budget. It ought not to be a partisan issue, and I need your help to do it.

Thank you, and bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:50 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Ken Lay, chairman, Greater Houston Partnership, and professional golfer Jack Nicklaus.

Telephone Conversation With the Space Shuttle *Discovery* Astronauts From Houston

February 7, 1994

The President. This is the President.

Cmdr. Charles Bolden. Yes, sir. We can hear you very much. Welcome aboard.

The President. How are you, Commander Bolden?

Commander Bolden. I'm doing very fine. Our crew is hanging in there, and we're having a good time, enjoying it.

The President. Well, you seem to be having a good time. You've had a perfect launch and an exciting mission. And I want to congratulate you.

I've just been in the simulator, and I've applied to be an astronaut, but I haven't been accepted yet. [*Laughter*]

Commander Bolden. I'm certain if you pull a few strings there, you might be able to make it. [*Laughter*]

The President. You're the only person who has invited me to abuse my power since I've been President. [*Laughter*] I want to——

Commander Bolden. While we have a second, may I introduce you to my crew?

The President. Please do.

Commander Bolden. At my right is my pilot, Ken Reightler, who is in the United States Navy. Behind him is Dr. Ron Sega, who is mission specialist number two on the crew, like our flight engineer, and he's also one of the coprincipal investigators for the Wake Shield, one of the experiments we have on board.

Right over my head here is our guest from Russia, Sergei Krikalev, who right now is the second longest person to ever be in space and has spent 5 months and 10 months on two different flights on *Mir*.

To Sergei's left is Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, originally from Costa Rica and now a full-fledged citizen of the United States, who is on his fourth flight.

To my left is Dr. N. Jan Davis, who has been a prime op, our mess operator working

the arm for this flight. I'm really fortunate to have a great crew with me here, sir.

The President. I want to say especially how proud we are to have Sergei up there, the first Russian cosmonaut on the space shuttle. You ought to know that Yuri Koptev, who is the head of the Russian Space Agency, is here with me at Mission Control as we're speaking. So we're all looking at all of you, Russians and Americans together, and we like what we see.

Commander Bolden. Well, we appreciate that, sir. And we've had a great time. In fact, I think many of the things that we've done have given us an opportunity to demonstrate that if people decide to put their minds toward a common goal there's no limit to what can be done. And we've done a little bit of that on this flight, although it's been frustrating to people on the ground and up here. I think we've done a very good job, and everybody on the ground and here is really benefiting from what we're doing.

The President. Well, I agree with that. And I think we'll look back on this as the first step toward the kind of international cooperation we need to build the whole space station, with Russia and Canada and Europe and Japan.

I keep coming in and out. Can you hear me now? Can you hear me?

Commander Bolden. Yes, sir. It keeps going in and out, but we are getting the gist of your conversation.

The President. The American people would be happy if they only had to listen to every third word, too, I think. [*Laughter*] Sometimes the truth is funnier than fiction, huh?

I love Dr. Davis' hairdo. I think it will be a rage back in America when she comes—[*Laughter*].

Commander Bolden. Well, let me allow Sergei to say a few words to you, first in Russian, and then he'll do the translating after that.

The President. Thank you.

[*At this point, Cosmonaut Sergei Krikalev spoke in Russian.*]

The President. Somebody has got to translate.

Cosmonaut Sergei Krikalev. I just am glad for the program. I said, "I welcome aboard space shuttle."

The President. Thank you very much. You know, I have here—he just gave me the translation. He translated his own Russian. One of my goals is to have someday most Americans be able to do that in another language, too. I hope we can do that.

I want to say, you know, we have the head of NASA, Dan Goldin, here. We have Congressman Brooks, Congressman Brown, Congressman Walker here. And we're all watching you with great pride.

And I also want to say, we followed a lot of the scientific purposes that are associated with your mission. And I'm especially interested in the whole issue of superconductivity, which I think has enormous potential for drastically changing the way we do things down here on Earth, and a lot of the other things you're doing.

I just want to congratulate you for being up there and for—as I said, I think this is the first step in what will become the norm of global cooperation in space. And when we get this space station finished, with the contributions of Russia, Canada, Japan, Europe, and the United States, it's going to be a force for peace and progress that will be truly historic, and you will have played a major role in that.

Commander Bolden. Mr. President, we just want to thank you again for joining us here on *Discovery*. And we're really proud to be able to serve the American people up here and show what happens when you can work peacefully together.

The President. Thank you very much. I also want to say before I sign off how much I appreciate all the crew down here, the men and women who have worked to make your mission a success. And again, I think I can speak for all of us, we're going to do everything we can to keep supporting the space program and the space station. And I hope what America is seeing of you today, particularly the cooperation between the United States and Russia in space, which is a reflection of what we're trying to do here on Earth, I hope that will strengthen the support among the American people for the space program and the space station in particular.

Thank you so much. We're all very, very proud of you.

Jack, do you want to say anything?

Representative Jack Brooks. I want to just tell them that we're awfully grateful to have them——

The President. You can only talk on this one? Here.

Representative Brooks. Well, as a Congressman from this district, I'm just delighted to wel-

come you all and congratulate you on your achievements up there and wish you a safe return home.

The President. George, do you want to say anything?

Commander Bolden. We thank you very much.

The President. I want George Brown from California to talk. He's been working for this space program for years.

Representative George Brown. Hi. It's a great pleasure for me to be able to personally communicate with you. I told the President that I had communicated with Russian astronauts several years ago and I wanted a chance to talk to some American astronauts in space. And this is the opportunity. We'll keep working for you.

The President. Do you want to say anything?

Commander Bolden. Well, thank you very much, sir. And we appreciate all of your support and hope that all of you will—[*inaudible*]—just by showing your interest by being there, I'm certain that that sends a very strong message. We appreciate it.

The President. Well, we want this to be bipartisan so I've got to get Congressman Walker on the phone here. We can prove that Republicans can talk in space. [*Laughter*]

Representative Robert Walker. Well, thank you, Mr. President, I think.

I'm delighted, too, to congratulate you on your mission. You're helping us as a nation to understand what we can achieve in space, and I think that that's going to do well for the space program in the future. So thanks very much for all you are doing.

Administrator Daniel Goldin. Hello. I just want to tell how proud I am. I mean, this is the best day of my life, having the President of the United States in our control room. Mr. President, on behalf of NASA, its employees, the people in space, we love you to be here, and we're so proud.

The President. Thank you.

Goodbye, folks. Come home to us. Bring that hairdo home, Jan. I love it.

Mission Specialist N. Jan Davis. I'll do my best.

The President. You're being in a photo-op now. You can't see that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:06 p.m. from Mission Control at the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center.

Message to the Congress Reporting Budget Rescissions and Deferrals
February 7, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling $1.6 billion, three revised rescission proposals, and 27 new proposed rescissions of budget authority. The total of the rescission proposals included in this special messages is $1.6 billion. When combined with rescissions that went to the Congress on November 1, 1993, there are $3.2 billion in rescissions pending before the Congress.

The details of the revised deferral, which affects International Security Assistance, are contained in the attached report. The proposed rescissions affect International Security Assistance Programs; the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, Housing and Urban Development, State, Transportation, and the Treasury; the General Services Administration; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Board for International Broadcasting; the National Science Foundation; and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 7, 1994.

NOTE: The report detailing the proposed rescissions and deferral was published in the *Federal Register* on February 14.

Remarks to General Motors Employees in Shreveport, Louisiana
February 8, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Jack, thank you for the introduction, even from such a distance. You look good on this movie screen, although it's cut up in 16 parts. It looks like a lot of the bills I have to deal with in Congress. [*Laughter*] But you still look like a whole person. I want to thank Jack Smith and my good friend Owen Bieber. I want to thank Guy Briggs and Steve Yokich for being here with me today. And I want to thank all of you for welcoming me to this plant and to the world of General Motors.

I was delighted that people all over the country will be able to watch this in other plants. I want to say a special word of thanks to the people at the GM plant in Baltimore, Maryland. I was supposed to visit them last week, and I lost my voice after the State of the Union. So if I had come, they might have loved it. I couldn't have said a word, I just would have had to listen to them. [*Laughter*] But anyway, I didn't. I also want to thank the Grambling band for the music today. That was great, and I thank you. What? What high school?

Audience members. Airline.

The President. Airline High School.

I'd also like to say that I've been trying to think of a diplomatic way to ask for one of these pickups behind me. [*Laughter*] I owned, when I was a younger man and had a life, I owned an El Camino pickup in the seventies. It was a real sort of southern deal. I had Astroturf in the back. [*Laughter*] You don't want to know why, but I did. And I drove it literally until the blocks broke. I drove it until it just wouldn't go anymore. And you know, when I retire maybe I can have another pickup.

I want to say a special word of thanks for the presence here with me of some people that are going to have to help make these health care decisions and other decisions we're making this year: Senator Breaux and Senator Johnston from Louisiana, Congressman Jimmy Hayes, Congressman Cleo Fields, Congressman Bill Jefferson, and Mrs. Johnette McCrery, the wife of Congressman McCrery; they're all here. And I also want to thank Lieutenant Governor Melinda Schwegmann for joining us today. All of them have come to be with me, and I thank them for that.

I want to begin by talking about a few things besides health care just real quickly. I listened to what was said up here on this platform before I got here, the way that people talked about the teamwork that you have here at this plant, the product that you produce, the fact that you're going to be able to sell them not only in America but beyond America's borders.

You know, when I was the Governor of your neighboring State to the north, that's what I thought public life was about. I thought my job was to get people together and to get things done. I thought it was pretty simple, and I was supposed to get people together and get things done. And I ran for President because I looked at Washington and I saw 12 years in which we were coming apart when we ought to be coming together, when I didn't think anything was getting done, when we quadrupled the deficit, had low job growth, nobody's income was going up, and the middle class was getting socked. That's what I thought was going on, and I still believe that was what was going on. And I ran for President because I wanted to try to help bring the economy back, bring the country together, and make the Government work for ordinary people again, because I have always believed that if you give ordinary Americans the ability to succeed, they'll do extraordinary things. I don't think this is very complicated. I think if you give people a fair shot at the American dream, they will do extraordinary things.

Thanks to the UAW and others, we made a good beginning on that. Last year we passed the family and medical leave law, so that workers all over America could be successful workers and good parents. They could take a little time off if a baby was born or a parent was sick without losing their job. In the economic plan, we rewrote the student loan bill so that the children of working class people can borrow money to go to college at lower interest rates and have longer repayment terms tied to the jobs they have, so they won't ever be discouraged from going to college for fear they won't be able to repay their loans. And we passed

the national service bill to give 100,000 young people, year after next, the chance to pay off their college education by working for their communities to solve problems here at home, things that help ordinary people to deal with their lives.

We passed a bill that begins to reduce the deficit. Next year the deficit is going to be 40 percent less than it was projected to be when I came into office. I heard all this talk from others about it; we did something about it. We did it by cutting spending and by asking only the top 1.2 percent of American earners to pay an increase in their income tax to bring the debt down. But look what we got for it: low interest rates, low inflation, high investment, car sales up, home sales up. Millions of Americans, including people in this room, I bet, have refinanced their homes in the last year. We had 1.9 million new jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, not in the government, which had provided a lot of the job growth in the eighties—State and local government. We have begun to turn this thing around. Now, I know a lot of people still haven't felt it, but we are moving in the right direction basically by putting the people of this country first.

Yesterday I offered another budget. It eliminates over 100 Government programs entirely, cuts over 300 Government programs so we can save the money to bring the deficit down and to spend more on the things that count.

What are we going to spend more on? Redoing the unemployment system to make it a reemployment system, so people can be trained for the jobs of the 21st century. We're going to spend more helping States set up systems to move young people who don't go to college into jobs with 1 or 2 years of further training, so they will be well-trained and they can get good jobs, not dead-end jobs. That's worth more money.

We're going to spend more to help our schools meet world-class standards and support local reforms, to meet the standards that will guarantee that when young people get out of high school they'll actually know enough to learn the skills they need to know to work in places like this. These are things that it is worth spending some more money on.

This year we're also going to move forward on a crime bill. Most Americans, I think, have finally become aroused at the level of violence in this country, and they're ready to do something about it. Last year, after 7 years of fooling around, we finally passed the Brady bill, which at least gives us a chance to check into the criminal records of people who seek to buy guns.

Let me tell you what this crime bill does. This crime bill will say, number one, if you commit three violent crimes, you shouldn't be paroled ever; "three strikes and you're out". Number two, this crime bill acknowledges the fact that we actually know how to reduce the crime rate. I came from Houston yesterday. The crime rate in Houston today is 22 percent lower than it was a year and a half ago; the murder rate is 27 percent lower than it was a year and a half ago. You know why? They put another 655 police officers on the street, in the high crime areas, working with the law-abiding citizens who live there. They know their neighbors; they know the kids. They help get the kids out of trouble; they help get them out of gangs and into good, productive activities. And they are working not only to catch criminals but to lower the crime rate. This bill would put another 100,000 police officers on the street, and I hope you will support it.

The last thing we're going to do in addition to health care this year, I hope, is to continue the work of reforming the welfare system. There are millions of Americans trapped in welfare who want to go to work, who want to be good parents and good workers. Most of them are young women with little children. Most of them have almost no education. Most of them are part of a 30-year decline in the American family and in the communities they live in and the loss of jobs. You know it as well as I do. And many of them live and raise these children in neighborhoods where, because the families are weak, the communities are weak, and there aren't any jobs, gangs and guns and drugs and violence have moved into the vacuum. We have got to help them turn their lives around.

We took a big step this year. This April 15th, when the taxes come due, 15 million working Americans with children, who are hovering right around the poverty line even though they work full-time, will get a tax cut so that they will never be encouraged to choose welfare over work. They will choose work over welfare. The welfare reform bill will say: We're going to give you education and training and child support and health care. But after 2 years, if you don't have a job, you've got to go to work once you

get these services. You do it, and others should, too.

But so many of these things we want to do—bringing back the economy, bringing down the deficit, reforming the health care system—require reforming the welfare system, require addressing the health care problem. And I want to explain to you how all these things are related.

First of all, you know you've got great health care benefits and good security, but do you know most working people in the last several years who have good health care benefits have had to give up wages to keep the health care benefits? And one reason is that General Motors and people like you all over the country are paying too much for your health care because other people don't pay anything for their health care. So when they get it, they get it when it's too late, too expensive, at the emergency room. They pass the cost on to you. You know that.

One reason people don't leave welfare is, if you're really poor, your children get health care through the Medicaid program. If you take work at an entry-level job with no health care, you've got to stick it to your kids. You've got to give up the health care to go to work. So you've got this crazy system in America where you've got working people paying income taxes who don't have health care for their children, and they're paying income taxes to pay for health care for people who don't work. It's a crazy system.

We're working to bring this deficit down. You've got a base here in this area. I'm telling you, we have cut defense a lot, but we can't cut defense any more and take care of this country. We are cutting it a lot. We shouldn't cut it any more. We have frozen domestic spending, which means I have to cut things in order to increase the job training programs I talked to you about. The only thing that is increasing in this budget is the cost of health care.

Why is it going up so much? Because we don't have a system in America in which everybody is covered, in which people get primary and preventive health care, and in which there is some limit on how much the insurance companies can do to decide who's got insurance and who doesn't. It's a terrible, terrible problem.

So all of these things we want to do. Seventy percent of the small businesses—you will hear a lot of talk about how my health care plan is unfair to small business—70 percent of the small businesses in this country do offer health care to their employees. And you know what? Their premiums are 35 to 40 percent higher than people in big business and the Government pay because they are so small. And more of them every month either go bankrupt or have to give up covering their employees. One hundred thousand people a month lose their health insurance for good. Thirty-nine million Americans every month now have no health care. And sometime during every year, 58 million Americans, out of a country of 250 million, 58 million have no health care.

So all of these things are related. And I say to you, it is time for us to listen to the enlightened business leaders like Jack Smith and the enlightened labor leaders like Owen Bieber who say that the time has come for everybody to take some responsibility for health care. Everyone should have health care security that can never be taken away, so we can control the costs, people pay their fair share, and every family and every child in this country has got health care.

Let me tell you, I'm going to do something today that violates every political poll you ever take. Politicians in both parties have been taking polls for years. And you know what one thing we always find out when we take a poll is that most Americans don't give a riff what they are doing in other countries. They don't want to hear what's going on in other countries; they don't believe it. But I think General Motors does, because you have to compete in a global economy. It matters to you whether Japan has a fair trade policy. It matters to you how much health care goes in every car in Germany or Japan, doesn't it? So you know we have to think about this.

Now, let me tell you something. In America, we spent 14.5 percent of our income on health care. In Canada they spend 10 percent. In Germany and Japan, they spend under 9. There is no evidence that we get better health outcomes. Now, I think all of us would say, if all that money was going to the health care of our families and our children, to have access to our doctors and our health care system, we would all gladly pay it, if that's what it was going to. But it isn't.

We're paying more than anybody else, and most of the difference is going to pay for paperwork, bureaucracy, and rulemaking, because this

is the only country in the world with an advanced economy that doesn't provide some health care for everybody and permits itself to spend another dime on the dollar for paperwork, bureaucracy, and rulemaking; because we've got 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands and thousands of different policies, charging old people more than young people, and saying who cannot get health insurance. We ought to stop it.

Let me tell you something. If you work here and you've got a kid with asthma, you've still got a health insurance policy because your company gives you a health insurance policy that doesn't eliminate you for what's called preexisting conditions. But I got a letter from Jeanette Windham of Shreveport, and I had her come to the airport to meet me last night, a woman who works for an insurance company, who had a brain aneurism. Her doctor said she was totally healed, she was just fine, everything was all right, and she works for a company that allegedly has no preexisting conditions, and they still won't give her health insurance. There are people like that all over the country.

What if you had a dream of starting a small business and you were willing to risk giving up working here with all the security that it has? If you had a sick kid and you did that, you couldn't insure your family. There are millions of Americans today—listen to this—there are 81 million Americans, in a country of 250 million, who either have the worker or somebody in the family has once been sick. And as a result of that, they're either paying higher insurance premiums, or they don't have health insurance, or they can never change the job they have. They can't hope to move up because if they move up, they'll lose their health insurance. I'm telling you, we can do better than that. All these other countries we compete with, that put less money in health care in a car than we have to, are still solving those problems. I'm tired of hearing we can't solve those problems. I believe we can, and the time has come to do it.

On Monday I was in Houston, and I went to a party of children with cancer and their parents, little kids fighting for their lives. And I looked out there in that sea of parents, so grateful to be in Houston, which is the largest medical center in America, having access to wonderful care. But a bunch of them were scared to death because they were part of the three out of four of American families that have lifetime limits on their policies. You don't have that, thank goodness. But what if you did? They're sitting there thinking, "My kid's got care today, but what's going to happen when I hit the lifetime limits? Will I go bankrupt? Will something happen to the care?" Other countries don't do that. I think we can do better.

I could give you so many examples of this. And most of the propaganda you're going to hear—I had a doctor in my office Saturday who said to me, he said, "Mr. President," he said, "I'm a Republican. I have organized hundreds of doctors in a group to practice medicine. I have made more money than I ever dreamed. And I showed up here to tell you, I want to try to pass health care reform. I hear all these attacks on your program. Why, the people who are saying it don't have any idea what they're talking about, what medicine's really like out there in America. Most workers don't have a choice of doctors anymore."

You know, you've got three choices in your health care plan. My plan gives people three choices. You know, more than half the Americans don't have those choices anymore in their health care plan. I'm telling you, folks, when we go back to work in the Congress, I want you to help us pass this health care reform plan. I want you to urge the Members of Congress to debate all the tough issues. There are some hard questions, and I'll tell you what they are in a minute. There are some hard questions. But we have got to stop making excuses for ourselves and why we can't do it. If we don't do something to control health care costs, it's going to cost every American working family another $600 a year by the end of this decade. We cannot continue to do what we are doing.

I got a letter from a woman from Louisiana that came to see me yesterday at the airport whose husband came down with lung cancer, and they wouldn't even treat him because he didn't have health insurance. They wouldn't even treat him. And he died in 5 weeks. How would you feel if that was one of your family? How would you feel?

You know, I got a letter from a man from Shreveport who came out to meet me named Don Marks. He's a sales representative. He pays for his own health insurance. His wife got sick. His deductible went from $250 to $2,500, $2,500. He had a $120 a month drug bill that wasn't covered.

Other countries cover prescription medicine for everybody. And if you have it, you know that a lot of people stay out of the hospital and cost the system less if they can get proper medication, especially true for older people. If our seniors had access to properly prescribed prescription drugs, their hospital bills would be lower. It would cost you less in maintaining the health system. But people don't want to put up the up-front cost because the way it works now, it doesn't come out of insurance premiums. The Government picks up the tab, or somebody else picks up the tab. It gets bumped along. We can do better than this. We can do better than this.

You know, here I am at this plant, a world-class plant, the world's biggest company. Do you believe for a minute that you would be as productive as you are if you had a lousy health care policy and you had to worry about your kids every day on the job?

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. You wouldn't, would you? Yes, it costs some money, but you wouldn't do as good a job as you do.

All over America, we are paying today for the fact that we can't figure out what every other advanced country's figured out how to do: how to provide basic health care security that can never be taken away. And I think it's time to do it.

Our plan does it by building on what works now. One of the things that you'll be hearing about—I get tickled; I read these ads of these folks that are so desperate to keep the system we have now, and they say, "Oh, the President wants to have the Government take over the health care system." It isn't true. What the President wants to do is to keep the system we've got now and give it to everybody: guaranteed private health insurance, private doctors, private providers, a private system. That's what I want, and that's what our bill would require. Our approach guarantees people the right to choose their health care plan. Like I said, you've got three choices in your plan. That's what our plan does. Most American workers don't have three choices anymore, and you know it as well as I do.

So what is this big myth that we're doing? And a lot of the plans competing with us would drive workers down to one choice, the least expensive HMO. That may be a good plan. A lot of these HMO's give great care at low cost, but one of the reasons is they have some competition, they have an incentive to do it. So if you have a choice, you will be more likely to choose that and have good quality health care. Our approach protects the early retirees and finds a way to help companies pay for it to spread the cost of that, to make General Motors, our steel companies, a lot of our other companies far more competitive.

Our approach reinvests savings from the Medicare program into drug benefits and long-term care benefits for elderly people. It doesn't just take them away the way some others do. And our approach completely outlaws insurance company discrimination. Others say, "Well, we make insurance companies cover everybody." Yes, well, you can get insurance now; we have universal access now if you've got $10,000 or $15,000. There's universal access to this truck, but only people with the money can pay it, right? There's universal access to the truck right now, right? So don't fall for all this rhetoric about universal access. Everybody in America has access to this truck right here. But they can't make it.

Our approach says it is wrong to charge old people more than young people for health care just because they're older. Look, the number of young people is going down; the number of old people is going up. People are going to want to work longer. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80—[*inaudible*]. We cannot afford to set up a system where people can't afford to hire older workers. We can't do it. We need it for America's productivity. We have got to have that.

So this is really not about whether we're going to put the Government in charge of health care. The Government is involved in health care. That's what the Medicare program is all about, and most of you would hang me from the highest tree if you thought we were going to repeal it, wouldn't you? I mean, right? It's not about that. The Government is involved in health care. Our plan does not put the Government in control of health care. What it does is to reduce the control of the insurance companies and give more influence to workers and businesses. That's what our plan does. And that's what I think we ought to do.

Now, let's face facts. There are some tough choices. If you have 39 million people without any health insurance and you're going to require people who are working who have no health

insurance and their businesses to pay, well, they're going to be paying something they weren't paying. And then if you have to find a way to cover the people who aren't working but who aren't poor enough to be on Medicaid, we have to find some money for that. So it's not easy.

How do we propose to pay for it? We believe the fairest way is to ask every employer and every employee without health insurance to make some contribution. We think that's fair. We know that small businesses have a tougher time, and there are limits on how much small businesses can pay under our plan. We understand that. That is the most controversial issue. But I don't see how you can possibly cover everyone unless you are going to tax people who are already paying too much for their health care to pay for people who ought to be paying something, or unless you require them to cover themselves.

Now, I think that's the fairest way to do it. And if you don't cover everybody—you heard Mr. Smith say it—if you don't find a way to cover everybody, General Motors will repeatedly be paying too much because the people that don't have health insurance will get health care when it's too late and too expensive. They'll show up at the emergency room, they'll show up at the hospital, and then the cost will be passed on to you. And meanwhile, untold misery will be reaped in the lives of people all across the country. But now, that is a tough issue. And that is the toughest issue.

What should the benefits be? Our bill prescribes the benefits. And they are similar to the ones you have. We emphasize preventive care so people can get annual checkups and things like that. Other approaches say, well, let somebody else decide the benefits. I don't believe the only choice in this country for workers who have no health care should be the least expensive HMO because if that's true, they won't have the competition necessary to maintain high-quality care. So I think we should have choices in the benefit package.

I don't think that we can do it without limiting the payroll contributions that some small businesses have to pay and that others should pay. And I don't believe we can do it without giving small business the power to band together so they can buy insurance on terms as good as General Motors or the Federal Government can buy it. They've got a legitimate gripe there. And we're trying to address that.

But what I want you to know most of all is, most of what you hear in this debate is about a world that doesn't exist. They say, "Oh, Bill Clinton is going to take choices away." That's not true. We're going to guarantee more choices to most workers. You've got three choices today. Most workers don't, and you know it. So don't let people put that kind of smoke out there. They are saying we are getting the Government into health care. That's not true. We're moving the insurance companies out of the driver's seat and letting the people and the businesses have more influence. And that's what we ought to do.

Look, I know there's a lot of money in this. And there are a lot of good people who work for those companies. But you just have to ask yourself whether we can afford to continue to spend 40 percent more than everybody else and not cover everybody. You're going to hear how, well, inflation in health care costs has gone way down because of the competition. It has; it goes down every time there's a serious threat to reform the health care system. And you let them kill my bill and you watch what happens to medical inflation for the rest of this century. It will go right back up again, just like it has every time in the last 50 years as soon as the interest groups could kill a serious plan at health care reform.

Folks, we have involved hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of doctors and nurses and business people and even folks from the insurance industry in trying to put this plan together. Is it perfect? Of course not. Is it complicated? It has to be; this is 14 percent of our income. How many of you have complicated health care circumstances? This is a complicated issue. But the basic issue is simple: Should every family have health insurance that can never be taken away? Should we keep the great American system of private health care providers and even private insurance? Should we make sure that we do what we can to emphasize primary and preventive care? And should we pay for it by asking people who don't pay anything to pay something for their own health care?

You know how other plans pay for covering people without insurance? They want to tax the benefits of people with good health care plans and their companies. You're already paying too much for health care. Why should you pay more

in taxes to pay for people who haven't paid anything for their own health care? I don't get that, and I don't think it makes sense.

Now, we're going to go back to Washington, and we're going to have a debate on this. We're going to pass the crime bill. But don't forget, crime is also a health care issue. That's what's filling the emergency rooms on the weekends. We're going to work on welfare reform. But don't forget, if you want people to stay off welfare, they've got to be able to have health care for their children. We're going to keep bringing the deficit down. But don't forget, someday we'll be spending money we ought to be spending on education and training on health care because inflation is destroying the Federal budget all in health care costs.

I am telling you, if you want us to do what you do here, if you want us to get together and get things done, if you want partnership not partisanship, if you want progress not petty politics, if you want us oriented on the future and not the past, we have got to deal with the health care crisis in America. And we're going to have to have your help to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the General Motors plant. In his remarks, he referred to Jack Smith, chief executive officer, and Guy Briggs, vice president, General Motors Co.; and Owen Bieber, president, and Steve Yokich, vice president, United Auto Workers.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on Science, Technology, and American Diplomacy

February 8, 1994

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

In accordance with Title V of the Foreign Relations Act of Fiscal Year 1979, as amended (Public Law 95–426; 22 U.S.C. 2656c(b)), I am pleased to transmit this annual report on Science, Technology and American Diplomacy for fiscal year 1993.

Redefining U.S. foreign policy and consolidating the dramatic changes of the last few years represents a significant challenge. In the post-Cold War world, we seek to support democracy and peace, promote sustainable economic growth, and address global problems such as rapid rates of population growth, environmentally unsound energy production and consumption, global climate change, loss of biodiversity, and the spread of AIDS. This report clearly indicates that these problems can be addressed effectively through international cooperation in science and technology.

The 1993 Title V report describes the role of international science and technology cooperation in the implementation of our foreign policy, highlighting a series of themes relevant to important issues affecting U.S. interests overseas, including emerging infections; energy, environment, and economics; and natural disaster reduction. In addition, the report examines science and technology cooperation in two geographic regions, Latin America and Asia, on which the Administration has placed a renewed emphasis.

For the first time the Title V report provides a detailed examination of science and technology in our foreign assistance programs, emphasizing our focus on sustainable development. The United States is well positioned to shape the international agenda for promoting sustainable development, and to leverage other donors and multilateral institutions, through cooperative research programs and assistance in the fields of science and technology.

The report also describes the significant potential for post-Cold War defense cooperation. Research of dual-use technologies has the potential to enhance our economic well-being through the development of new manufacturing processes or marketable products that improve the global competitiveness of American businesses. We face the challenge of seeking deeper collaborative opportunities with our allies that strengthen our technical flexibility and collective security, while securing foreign technologies with distinct advantages for domestic application.

I will ensure that our Federal science and technology investments are at the forefront of our national agenda, that our country maintains

its world leadership in science and technology, and that international cooperation in science and technology advances our domestic agenda, while also supporting the objectives of U.S. foreign policy in the post-Cold War era.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and John Glenn, chairman, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on Progress Toward Regional Nonproliferation in South Asia

February 8, 1994

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

As required under section 620F(c) of the Foreign Operations Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2376(c)), I am transmitting a report entitled "Progress Toward Regional Nonproliferation in South Asia." This report is unclassified, with a classified annex. It covers developments between April 1, 1993, and October 31, 1993.

A previous report on this subject was transmitted to the Congress on April 28, 1993.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; William H. Natcher, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and Robert C. Byrd, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Statement on Senate Action on Education Legislation

February 8, 1994

I would like to congratulate the United States Senate today for moving toward a national framework for lifelong learning by passing both the "Goals 2000 Act" and the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act" on strong bipartisan votes. By approving these bills, the Senate gets an "A" in education.

Since my days as Governor, I have been committed to education reform based on world-class standards and accountability for results. Only if we demand more of our schools and students will we see expanded educational opportunity and nationwide excellence. From the time I helped draft the national education goals on behalf of the National Governors' Association, I looked forward to the day when the Federal Government would finally take the lead on education. Today's Senate action brings us closer to that day.

In today's global economy, what you earn depends on what you learn. The Senate has now opened opportunity for our children during school and as they begin their careers. Goals 2000 will write the national education goals into law and will give States and local schools new tools to meet them. The school-to-work bill will significantly enhance our effort to create an effective apprenticeship system for those who don't go to college.

These steps are vital not only for the education of our children but for the health of our economy as a whole. Our workers will only be able to cope with a world of rapid economic change if they are fully trained and equipped to compete. We will only master new technologies if this training continues throughout a lifetime. World-class education is an investment in a world-leading economy. By its action today, the U.S. Senate has moved us a step closer

to setting national standards that will challenge our students, encourage partnerships between parents, schools, and communities, and guarantee that our young people have the skills they need to compete in the global marketplace.

I look forward to swift agreement between the House and Senate on these critical investments in our Nation's future.

Statement by the Press Secretary on House Banking Committee Access to Iraq-Related Documents

February 8, 1994

President Clinton on February 4 restored the access of the House Banking Committee to classified material and ordered relevant Federal agencies to declassify certain Iraq-related documents requested by the committee.

In a letter to Banking Committee Chairman Henry Gonzalez, the President said, "I am very pleased to tell you that in view of your October 28 letter and your pledge to protect the confidentiality of classified information provided by the administration, we have decided, effective immediately, to restore fully your committee's access to classified information. This action will resolve an unfortunate and long-standing difficulty that has severely interfered in the committee's relations with the executive branch."

Accordingly, the President has directed relevant agencies of the Federal Government to provide the committee access to the classified information it has requested in connection with its investigation of BNL and pre-war policy toward Iraq. Consistent with past practice and policy, access will be subject to arrangements to protect intelligence sources and methods as well as ongoing law enforcement investigations.

The President also ordered relevant Federal agencies to declassify and disclose to the public Iraq-related documents requested by the committee concerning the Banca Nazionale del Lavoro (BNL), Cardoen, Matrix-Churchill, Gerald Bull, and U.S. policy toward Iraq immediately preceding the Persian Gulf war. The President also indicated that agencies will review for declassification other specific documents identified by the committee as necessary to carry out the purposes of its investigation. The administration will declassify these documents to the maximum extent possible, excluding from public release only: (1) material that must remain classified; (2) material whose disclosure would compromise privacy rights; and (3) material that reveals executive branch deliberations.

Remarks at Prince Georges County Correctional Center in Upper Marlboro, Maryland

February 9, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. And Dr. Brown, thank you for all the work you have done to develop the drug strategy. Thank you, Adele Hayes, for this fine program we came here to celebrate today. And thank you, Mr. Saxton, for having us here.

I was a little uncomfortable about how hard you all laughed at the—[*laughter*]—it occurred to me that this could be one of the great moments in American history for people who hate politicians. You've got the President, the Vice President, half the Cabinet, and a substantial portion of the Congress all in jail at the same time. [*Laughter*]

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to Joseph Mundo, because I know how hard it was for him to stand up here and give that talk. And I thank you, sir, for doing it.

We have introduced a lot of people here today, and I don't want to lengthen that. But there are two people that I think it's very, very important to recognize as I get into what our

administration's approach to the drug issue will be, because it is clear to me and has been for some time from personal experience that we have to have, in order to succeed here, an enormous effort across this country that goes way beyond the Federal Government and way beyond law enforcement, that involves citizens supporting our common efforts, and that involves some pretty sweeping cultural changes, and there are two Americans here who have done as much to try to fight the drug problem in that way as any people who live in our country. I'd like to ask them to stand and be recognized: the former Secretary of what was then the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the director of the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, Joe Califano, thank you, Joe; and one of our country's most distinguished leaders and the chairman of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, Mr. Jim Burke, is also here.

Ladies and gentlemen, we came here for a real purpose, to announce our antidrug strategy. I do believe it is the most comprehensive one ever, but we wanted to come here to illustrate that this is an issue which must be dealt with person by person, one at a time—it's a very human problem—and that it requires those of us who are trying to deal with it to take certain steps and those who have already suffered from alcohol or drug abuse to take even stronger steps.

I believe very much in what we are doing today from two angles. One is, the first job I ever had, courtesy of the voters, was the job of attorney general; I started out in a law enforcement job. Second is that I have had the questionable privilege of living in a family that has dealt with both alcoholism and drug abuse. I know treatment works. I also know that it is important to be tough as well as caring.

What we are trying to do today is to start our Government on a course that offers the promise of real results to the American people. When I asked Lee Brown to come and be head of the Office of Drug Policy, I told him that for the first time ever I would make the Director a member of my Cabinet, that I recognized that it was folly to believe that 100 or 125 or, for that matter, 1,000 people working in a Federal office in Washington could change the habits and the policies of the American people, that we had to enlist the entire Government.

I daresay this is probably the first time that we've ever had seven Cabinet members on a stage at the same time all manifesting their commitment to dealing with this issue. And there are many others. We'll have a total of 10 just in the next 2 days who will be announcing their part of this battle to implement this strategy. We also have here the Director of our AIDS effort, the head of the Internal Revenue Service, the head of the Secret Service. We have an enormous number of Federal officials here who are not on this stage who have a big part of this endeavor. I say this to illustrate the fact that we have really tried to be very realistic, very hardheaded to try to take some time to think about what it is we can do and what it is the rest of America has to do to reinvigorate this Nation's fight against the scourge of drugs.

We know we have to build on the works of parents and community leaders who did so much to bring down casual drug use in the 1980's. We know we have to add to the success of law enforcement authorities who have proved there are things you can do that work. We know that where energies have been deployed effectively, whether it was cracking down on pushers, cracking down on drug networks, or building up people like this man who spoke so eloquently today, that they can make progress.

We also know some pretty tough facts. We know that hardcore drug abuse in America has continued unabated. We know that its persistence represents the threat to the stability of our society and the economic future of our country. We know that no nation can fight crime and drugs without dealing honestly and forthrightly with the problem of drug addiction. As I said in my State of the Union Address, we need an approach to crime and drugs that is both tough and smart. We very often have one without the other, and we paid a price for that, as well.

The crime bill and this strategy we announced today puts more into law enforcement than we've ever put before. It does more to keep drugs off the street. It does more than ever before to help hard-core drug users into treatment programs where they belong. It is a new national attack on drug addictions.

The craving for drugs is an enormous factor in a lot of our problems: the rise of violence, the spread of AIDS, the spiraling costs of health care. Every time I have one of my town meetings on health care, I tell the American people

we have to do some things to provide health care to all Americans and bring down the cost, but we have to be honest. No health care proposal can solve all the problems that lead American health care to be more expensive than any other country. And one big one health care cannot solve is the fact that we pay more for violence because we've got our emergency rooms full of people who have been cut up and shot. We pay more to deal with AIDS. And both those things are the direct result, in large measure, of our very high rate of drug abuse. You know it, and I know it. So if we want to deal with this problem, we have to face it.

You also heard Mr. Mundo say in such powerful terms that he lost everything. We know that drug abuse is a big factor in the breakdown of families, in the increase in joblessness, in the increase in homelessness. How many people—every day when I go out for my run at the White House, I see what seems like an ever-increasing number of people who are living homeless within three or four blocks of the White House. And you know every one of them has a personal life story, many of them, a story that involves drugs.

We know if you go to any children's hospital in any sizable city today and you go to the ward where the little babies are, you'll see baby after baby after baby born with an addiction to drugs. We know that now many of our streets are too dangerous to walk and our schools even dangerous to attend. I met a young man about a year ago from Chicago, who was a big, strapping, handsome young fellow who wanted to really make something of his life. And he said that he knew he had to get an education to do it, but he was scared to walk from home to school to get the ticket out of his neighborhood. I've had that scene replayed many times just in the last year with other people.

If we want to, therefore, reduce crime and cut health care costs and reform our welfare system, if we want to rebuild our families and our communities, all these things require a serious effort to curb the use of drugs. Part of it is enforcement. The crime bill now before the Congress is part of that strategy. It would put another 100,000 police officers on the street. It would provide boot camps for juvenile offenders. It would provide dramatic increases in support for drug courts, very successful drug courts, like the ones in Florida, New York, California, and the District, where court-ordered rehabilitation programs have cleaned people up and freed prison cells for truly violent criminals. The Miami drug court has treated 4,500 first offenders since 1987, with a rearrest rate of only 11 percent.

We know these kinds of initiatives will support the efforts of community grassroots efforts, like the one sponsored by Monsignor East and his parishioners in Washington who started an orange-hat brigade, where community leaders patrol streets in bright orange hats, sending a message that drugs and drug trade won't be tolerated. There are thousands of groups like this all across America who work with police to shut down crack houses and take their neighborhoods back.

Last Friday, the Vice President and the Cabinet outlined our new plan to help residents of public housing rid themselves of crime and drugs. We can't do that unless people at the grassroots participate and take the lead. But we have to also do our part. The most effective things mobilize all the resources of a community. And that's what our strategy seeks to support.

We also seek to support a new, more drug-free America through prevention. We need to reach people before they get started through prevention and early intervention, especially among our young people before they enter middle school, much less high school or college. The latest statistics show an increase in drug use among the young. Our children need a constant drum beat reminder that drugs are not safe; drugs are not good; drugs are illegal; there will be consequences for using them.

I know a lot of these programs work. I saw them work in the schools where my child attended when she was very, very young. I saw the impact that a law enforcement officer in a uniform, talking to children who had never before had a positive human personal relationship with an authority figure, could have in these schools. I know we can do it. And our proposal provides a substantial increase in funds to support those kinds of activities.

We also know we have to do more in the workplace. Drug-free programs at work can be every bit as important and effective as drug-free programs at school. Our strategy supports programs like these and calls on everyone in a position of influence to do their part.

Finally, we have to have some more effort at treatment. This strategy recognizes that drug

addiction is a disease, that it can and should be treated, and that treatment can work, as Adele said. We're letting hardcore drug users know that if you're an addict caught in the cycle of drug abuse, we can help you to get the help you need. Our goal is to get 140,000 more hardcore users into treatment in the next year, 140,000 more, targeting chronic hardcore users, including adults and juveniles under the supervision of criminal authorities, along with pregnant women and children.

Every dollar we spend on treatment will save seven dollars America is losing today. It will make up for lost productivity. It will save money we are using now to fight the problem instead of to prevent it. This target is a significant start that allows us to expand programs as the effectiveness of service and research findings grow.

One of the most important parts from your perspective of our health care proposal is that it would include drug treatment as part of health care coverage. This is a very important thing. We have to recognize that until we have the appropriate level of treatment on demand without delay, we will continue to pay for a problem that we can reduce. You know treatment works. It's time for the Congress to recognize it in the form of the budgets we have presented and for America to aggressively embrace it in the way you have at this institution.

We also recognize we need to try to do something to control the supply. Strategy calls for what we strongly believe is an improvement of our international drug control programs, shifting away from a policy that was focused largely on interdiction—that is stopping the drugs when they were on the way to the United States—to a three-pronged approach: working with countries in which drugs are grown that have the political will to go after the kingpins in those countries; destroying the cartels that grow rich from supplying our people with drugs; and continuing our interdiction effort, hopefully with better technology and smarter efforts that allow us to interdict even more drugs. That is very important. We should not stop it, but we must supplement those efforts so that we can be more successful.

Dr. Brown has said, yes, we want to continue our presence at the border to interdict drugs, but we don't want to wait for people at the border anymore. He says he's tired of swatting hornets, he'd rather go after the hornet's nest. And that's a pretty good line.

I might say our friends and neighbors beyond our borders should welcome this. We have seen in nation after nation how international drug trafficking is a threat to democratic institutions. It fuels human rights abuses and terrorism against the innocent. It undermines legitimate, broadbased economic development. It contributes to regional instability. Many of the countries that deal with this problem will never become what they want to be until they're able to be rid of it. We ought to help them, for ourselves and for their own people as well.

This is an important part of our foreign policy toward major source countries and major transit countries. We have to make it an important part of our commitment to promoting democracy, economic reform, and human rights. None of that's going to happen in countries dominated by people who dictate events because of the profits of the drug trade.

Finally, let me end where I began. From my own personal experience, in my family as well as my work in law enforcement as an attorney general and a Governor, I believe still that once it occurs, drug addiction has to be overcome one person at a time. In the past year as President, I've spoken about drugs on 85 separate occasions. And I can keep talking about this until I, once again, lose my voice, but you and I know that we're not going to make a dent in this problem except by having it happen, one person at a time. If this man had not chosen to take some responsibility for his own life, then this fine program would still be just another expenditure of taxpayer money.

The newly inaugurated mayor of Detroit, Dennis Archer, offered a challenge to his city when he was sworn into office. I'd like to quote it for you now because it equals what I think we're facing. He said, and I quote, "To the people of Detroit, stand with me when I tell the dope man to get off our streets, to leave our children alone, to get out of our way. We're taking back our streets, and we're taking back our children."

Well, Mayor Archer can't do it alone. Monsignor East can't do it alone. But this administration and the entire weight of State and local government can't do it alone either. The people of this country have got to take responsibility for themselves, their children, and their neighbors. If we work with them, if we say we know hardcore drug users can't do it alone, the help they need is treatment, the help they need is

support, then I think we can make a real profound difference.

I want every American, every Member of Congress, every State official, everybody who works for a mayor or a city government to join me in putting this strategy to work. This is a national strategy, not a Federal strategy. I don't want it to become partisan in any way, shape, or form. This should unite us in America: people in the private sector, people in Government, people at the local level, people at the national level, Republicans and Democrats, people who are inside this institution, and people who are beyond its walls. We have a common interest in saving our country. And all of us have a personal responsibility to pursue. This drug strategy we announce today is our attempt to be your partner and pursue our personal responsibility. And together, together we can do it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:22 p.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Adele Hayes, human services coordinator, Awakening; Sam Saxton, director, Prince Georges County Correctional Center; Joseph Del Mundo, former drug treatment client; and Monsignor Raymond G. East, pastor, St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church, Washington, DC.

Teleconference With Mayors and an Exchange With Reporters

February 9, 1994

The President. Hello. Mayor Daley, Mayor White, Mayor Rice, Mayor Minor, welcome to the telephone conversation. I'm here with the Attorney General and with our Director of Drug Policy, Lee Brown. And we're glad to visit with you.

Today I'm happy to announce that the four cities you represent and 30 others and towns across our country will receive the second round of grants to put more police on the street and to expand community policing.

The Justice Department has now received applications from 3,000 communities across the country and awarded grants in more than 100 cities and towns. It's obvious that every community in our country is coming to the same conclusion, that more police officers on the street, properly trained and properly placed, will reduce the crime rate. And these grants today are another downpayment on our pledge to put 100,000 new officers on the streets.

I've asked Congress, as I think all of you know, to send me a comprehensive crime bill as soon as possible that does that, that puts 100,000 police officers on the street, bans assault weapons, expands boot camps, prisons, and drug courts, and says to violent offenders, "Three strikes and you're out."

I've also provided funding for that crime bill in this budget through the 5-year, $22 billion violent crime reduction trust fund that takes the money we're going to save from reducing the Federal bureaucracy by 250,000 over 5 years and pays for the police officers.

Earlier today, Lee Brown and I announced our new drug control strategy, which expands drug treatment programs as well as provides more police officers on the street. These two items in our budget got bigger increases than almost anything else. Community policing went up $1.7 billion. The drug budget went up $1 billion, even though we were cutting half the Government Departments and 60 percent of the line items in the budget.

So I am very encouraged that at least we're beginning to make our contribution to this effort. I want to thank all of you for what you're doing to fight crime in your communities. I want to give you a chance to be heard today. And as I said, Lee Brown and Janet Reno and I are here, we want to support you, and we want to do everything we can to help you succeed.

Mayor Daley.

[*At this point, Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL, and Mayor Michael White of Cleveland, OH, spoke in support of community policing, and Mayor White expressed support for the President's crime bill.*]

The President. Thank you very much. We need your support for the crime bill. We need you up here going door to door. And we also need your support for the drug budget because the two things go together.

[*Mayor Norman Rice of Seattle, WA; Mayor Tom Minor of San Bernardino, CA; Attorney General Janet Reno; and Director of National Drug Control Policy Lee Brown made brief remarks.*]

The President. One thing I want to say as I sign off is that to all of those hundreds of communities who applied for these grants who haven't been given funds, that's why we need to pass the crime bill. If we do that, then we'll be able to help cities all over America. We'll be able to meet the demand, and we'll be able to lower the crime rate. And I appreciate the support that all of you have given to that. And thank you for your example. We'll just keep working together.

Thank you, and goodbye.

[*At this point, the teleconference ended, and the President took questions from reporters.*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, have you had any up-date on the situation in Bosnia?

Q. Mr. President, are the allies on board on a new Bosnia strategy?

The President. Well, we've made a lot of progress, but I don't have a final word from Brussels yet. They're meeting and they're talking. So far we've got a good report back, but they haven't finalized their discussions. I expect, oh, in a couple of hours, later this afternoon I'll have more to say about it.

Q. Does the Serbian agreement to pull back their guns from the hills of Sarajevo meet the conditions that you are hoping to lay out at the end of this meeting?

The President. I can't say. I want to wait until I get the final report from Brussels. I should be able to give you a clearer answer on that. It's a good thing that they have—a good beginning, but it shows—again, every time NATO shows a little resolve there, we get some results.

Q. What's different about the proposals that you and the French have put forward than with previous threats? There have been lots of threats to launch air strikes.

The President. Well, let's wait and see what action is taken. Again, I'll try to give you some good comments before your deadlines this evening, but I think I should wait until the meeting is concluded.

Q. Can you tell us, are you backing off in your support for the Bosnian Moslems at all?

The President. Oh, no. That's not what this is about at all.

Health Care Reform

Q. Now that you've had a chance to reflect a little bit on what the CBO said about your health care numbers, do you have any other comments?

The President. No, I feel even better about it. I mean, the CBO said that we could have guaranteed private health insurance for all Americans, that it would reduce the Government deficit and reduce Government spending over the long run, that it wouldn't cost jobs for the American economy. I mean, I think the big-picture message is absolutely right.

I think in terms of the differences, I'm studying now the differences in their calculations and ours in the next 5 or 6 years, and basically, they agree with us about how much it will cost. They think there will be more savings on the business side and fewer savings for the taxpayers in the short run. That's really the only difference as nearly as I can see.

But those are all things that we can work out. Those are relatively minor budgetary considerations and other things that we can work through to get our numbers in harmony with theirs. So I'm not at all concerned.

And I don't have anything else to say to what I said yesterday. I just think that to say that a private insurance payment from one private party to another should be on the Government budget—I just don't agree with that. I mean, otherwise every State in the country would have to put workers' compensation payments on their budget, and every State would have to put their mandatory drivers liability insurance on their budget. I just don't agree with—I mean, I understand the argument, but again, I think that's something we can fix with the drafting of the bill. So I'm not concerned about it.

Q. You're not worried about the short-term—impact?

The President. Oh, but when I had a chance to study it further, I felt even better about their analysis because if you look at their analysis, they basically agree with us about how much the program will cost and how it will impact. They think in the short run more savings will flow to private sector—to businesses and purchases, direct purchases of health care—and less

savings to the Government. And over a 5-year period, Senator Moynihan at the beginning of the day said the Government will spend $7.5 trillion or something in the next 5 years. This $70 billion, it's a big number, but spread out over 5 years we can easily work through it. I think we can reconcile that. I'm not worried about it.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Have you spoken to President Yeltsin on the Bosnia situation, Mr. President?

The President. Not yet. We're trying to set up telephone calls sometime today, and I think we'll talk today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:54 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. The exchange portion of this item could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks to the World Jewish Congress
February 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Edgar Bronfman and Mr. Vice President and ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to be here with you today. It's a great honor for us to have you here at the White House. For 55 years, you have struggled in behalf of the Jewish people but also in behalf of all humanity. I thank you for that, and I thank you for your presence.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation for the example, for the vision, and the leadership of Edgar Bronfman. I know you know this, but I would also like to point out in this crowd that I am especially proud of the partnership I have enjoyed with the Vice President who has spoken out against bigotry and anti-Semitism not only in the United States but all over the world in the last year.

For all the good things that have happened in the last 10 years that the Vice President mentioned, we know a lot of very painful things have occurred also. We are everywhere reminded of the fragility of civilized life, of how easily people can fall back into the kinds of hatreds that lead to the blind actions that dehumanize all of us. That was brought home to me on my trip to Europe last month in many ways, perhaps most poignantly when I visited the Jewish cemetery in Prague.

I wish that bigotry were not all around us. I wish people still did not prefer killing and hating each other based on religious and ethnic differences anywhere, but it is a fact. It is also a fact that the insecurity and intolerance that we see tends to feed on itself so that after a while we look at places of conflict in the world and we wonder why people are still killing each other over what may seem to be a very small piece of ground or a principle not worth the life of a single child. I think it is clear it is because of the accumulated impact of intolerance and hatred. Somehow all of us have to find a way in this world after the cold war, when we are not burdened by but also not as disciplined by conflicting ideologies, to get people to realize that they must move beyond these ancient, indeed antiquated, intolerances.

The Vice President told me a fascinating story today. We rode out to a place to announce the new drug policy of the administration, and we were talking about a lot of scientific subjects, which means that he mostly talked and I mostly listened, since he knows so much more about it than I do. But we started talking about the disappearance of Neanderthals and the various theories that exist about how Neanderthals disappeared and Homo sapiens emerged. And there are some who believe that, according to the Vice President, that the Neanderthals disappeared in what may be history's first instance of genocide.

There is something about human nature which causes us to hold fast to people we think are like us and sometimes be afraid of and want to be separate from people who are not. If it means a religious community living together in harmony with one another and respect for our neighbors, then it is a very positive and good and wholesome thing. If it gives cultures the chance to keep their families together and raise their children with strong values and with the

opportunity to be what God meant for them to be, then it is a good and strong thing. But how easily these differences spill over into hatreds that lead to bloodshed, and how difficult it is to put the world back together again once these things begin.

Since I have been President, we have tried to do what we could, consistent with our first obligation to rebuild the fabric of life in this country and the sense of harmony and community and respect for diversity in this country, to also deal with those problems around the world.

We have worked very hard to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, one that enhances Israel's security and offers the acceptance of normal life which has been too long denied to the citizens of that troubled region.

The first pillar of that approach is strengthening the relationship between the United States and Israel. When I first met Prime Minister Rabin last year, almost a year ago this week, he said that he would be willing to take risks for peace, and certainly he has been. Sometimes the opposition that he faces at home reminds me of the opposition I face from time to time. But clearly, he has been willing to take risks for peace. I told him if he should be willing to take those risks, then it was my responsibility as the President of the United States to minimize those risks. And I have tried to do that. The Prime Minister is fulfilling his commitment, and we are keeping ours. Our commitment to maintaining and enhancing the security of Israel is ironclad. And it is the precondition of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The second pillar of our approach is to ensure the successful implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles. Both sides now have to begin to implement the agreement on the ground, and we are working hard to support that without interfering with it. Implementing the agreement on the ground is the only way to show the Israelis the agreement can enhance their security while providing a more normal life of more self-government for their Palestinian neighbors.

The third pillar of our approach is to get other negotiations back on track. The biggest challenge this year is to help Israel and Syria make peace. My meeting in Geneva with President Asad was designed to help to achieve that goal. As he said after the meeting, Syria has made a strategic decision for peace and wants now, for the first time, normal, peaceful relations with Israel.

We have welcomed these statements, for they break new ground. We've also welcomed the Syrian decision to grant exit permits to all Syrian Jews who wish to leave. I understand the process of issuing visas is now virtually completed. But more will be required. Syria must demonstrate that it wants a full and meaningful peace to achieve the confidence of the people of Israel to make such a peace possible.

Finally, to achieve our goal of a comprehensive settlement, we are insisting that the Arab boycott of Israel end now. There must be a commitment to a new era of peace and prosperity which sees in the Middle East partnership with Israel. Israel must be the partner of these nations, no longer a pariah. And we are making progress on that.

Let me, if I might, speak briefly about the tragedy in Bosnia. I have been meeting with my national security team, and as I am sure most of you know, we have had urgent consultations which continue at this moment with our NATO allies in the wake of the atrocities last Saturday in Sarajevo.

Before I go forward, let me, as the Vice President did, note the presence of the president of the Jewish community of Sarajevo here, Mr. Ivan Ceresnjes, with whom I had a brief moment of conversation. We're glad to have you here, sir.

I expect that today, momentarily, NATO will agree on a firm response to the shelling of Sarajevo by the Serbs. But I also think that today we will begin to reinvigorate the negotiations to try to help to bring a permanent end to the bloodshed and aggression. Somehow the people of Bosnia must decide that it is not worth the continuation of killing each other. We are quite close, if you listen to what the parties say they want, to an agreement that all might be able to live with. Surely, surely in the wake of the horror last weekend, the parties will be able to, with a little support from the rest of us, reach an agreement that all can live with and honor.

Finally, let me say that here at home we need to retain our religious faith and our religious freedom as a source of our common community and strength and not as a source of division. The spiritual richness of our society was visible to many Americans and perhaps some of you in this room who attended a cere-

mony at the White House in November in which I signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. It was a very important bill for Americans because it restored what the law was in our country before a decision of the Supreme Court. The law now says that in our country, the presumption is that people of any religious faith should be able to practice their faith and that the law should bend over backwards to let them do it, unless there is some serious and substantial damage to the public interest in so doing.

We had Jewish leaders here, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Islamic Prison Foundation. You wouldn't have believed all these people would stand together, arm in arm, to support a law. I hope that those groups in our country will not only support that law but will support its spirit. That is, we can't bend over backwards to respect each other's religious practices unless we actually do it in fact as well as in law. And we cannot use this power of political argument to beat down other people's religious convictions just because on occasion they conflict with our own. We are trying to do that in this country. I hope you will wish us well.

One of our counties, just one of our counties, Los Angeles County, has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. We believe this diversity can make America the greatest country in the world into the 21st century. But we have to find a way to take the guns out of the hands of our children, to restore peace and security to our streets and to our schools, to meet the basic needs of our people so that they will be able to live with security and in comfort, not physical comfort but emotional comfort, the comfort that comes from believing you live in a just society where you are respected not only for your shared values but for the differences you have embraced.

That is the world we are working for. It may be that we will never achieve it, but it is certain that if we work together we will get much closer to our common goal.

Thank you very much.

Middle East and Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, will there be air strikes against the Serbs?

The President. Just a moment, I have an announcement.

I just was informed—I was hoping to announce this before we talked—that as I was speaking, in Cairo Foreign Minister Peres and Yasser Arafat announced an agreement on self-rule and on the terms of withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho. So I think another big milestone has been achieved today.

Thank you.

And from the questions in the back on Bosnia, we simply have not completed the NATO meeting yet. I thought we would have by now, but as soon as we have I will be glad to comment on that also. But the meeting is not over.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:07 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Edgar Bronfman, president, World Jewish Congress.

Remarks Announcing the NATO Decision on Air Strikes in Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters

February 9, 1994

The President. Good evening. Over the past year, our administration has been working to do what we could to help to end the tragic conflict in Bosnia and to ease the suffering it has caused. Like people everywhere, I was outraged by the brutal killing of innocent civilians in the Sarajevo market last Saturday. The events of the past year and the events of the past few days reinforce the belief that I have that more must be done to stop the shelling of Sarajevo and the murder of innocents.

Therefore, the United States, working with our allies, has developed a series of proposals to address the situation in Sarajevo and to reinvigorate the negotiations to bring the bloodshed and the aggression in Bosnia to an end. As a

result, just now in Brussels NATO has decided that if any Bosnian Serb heavy weapons are found within 20 kilometers of Sarajevo within 10 days—or after 10 days—or if there is any further shelling of Sarajevo, NATO commanders stand ready to conduct air strikes against Serb artillery positions. NATO would carry out such strikes in accord with procedures it agreed on last August.

There are reports that as a result of NATO's impending action, Bosnian Serbs have already agreed to withdraw their heavy guns. If these reports are true, I welcome them. We hope that the Bosnian Serb actions will make air strikes unnecessary. But no one should doubt NATO's resolve. NATO is now set to act. Anyone, anyone shelling Sarajevo must recognize this fact and be prepared to deal with the consequences.

Our Nation has clear interests at stake in this conflict. We have an interest in helping to prevent a broader conflict in Europe that is most compelling. We have an interest in showing that NATO, history's greatest military alliance, remains a credible force for peace in post-cold-war Europe. We have an interest in stemming the destabilizing flows of refugees that this horrible conflict is creating. And we clearly have a humanitarian interest in helping to prevent the strangulation of Sarajevo and the continuing slaughter of innocents in Bosnia. These interests do not justify unilateral American intervention in the crisis, but they do justify the involvement of America and the exercise of our leadership.

I have been meeting over the last hour with leaders of both parties in Congress, and I stressed to them that our contribution to resolving the Bosnian conflict will be proportionate to our interests, no more and no less. We have also insisted that NATO not commit itself to any objectives it cannot achieve. Important as these NATO actions are, we must understand that in the end this conflict must be settled at the negotiating table by the parties themselves. In short, they must want to stop killing each other and to settle, to resume a peaceful life before that will occur.

I have directed the Secretary of State to have the United States play a more active role in the negotiations. These efforts are well underway. We hope that our efforts and the efforts of other NATO countries and the efforts of perhaps other nations as well can help to reinvigorate the process of peace and bring these parties to an agreement.

The ongoing tragedy in Sarajevo and Bosnia should catalyze all of our efforts to seek negotiated solutions. The actions that I have proposed and that NATO has approved today demonstrate that our Nation and the international community cannot and will not stand idly by in the face of a conflict that affects our interests, offends our consciences, and disrupts the peace.

Q. Mr. President?

The President. Yes?

Q. Did you talk to President Yeltsin today about this, and what is Russia's reaction to this ultimatum?

The President. I did not talk to him today, although I tried to for a couple of hours and there were technical problems that we couldn't get through. So I expect to talk to him—well, you know it's several hours ahead of us now, so I expect to talk to him either late tonight before I go to bed or maybe even sometime in the middle of the night. I am trying to get in touch with him, and he knows that I will take the call whenever we can put it together.

I think when President Yeltsin understands that the action taken by NATO today applies to anyone who violates the safe zone around Sarajevo, and not only to Serbs, and understands that the United States is going to put new energy into its own efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement and that we would welcome the Russians' involvement in bringing about a negotiated settlement, that he will, if not agree with our action, at least understand it more.

Q. Mr. President, now that this warning has been given, what's your understanding of exactly what it takes to trigger an air strike?

The President. Well, keep in mind now, I have not seen the language; I was just informed that the agreement was finally reached. But if the position presented to NATO this morning is, in fact, what emerges—and I believe it was—then you have the same situation here that we had last August when the first NATO out-of-area action was proposed, which is that the first air strike must be approved by the Secretary-General.

He has asked us, by the way, to do this, so that we now have no reason to believe that he would ask NATO to take a meaningless action. In fact, we think he's clearly in sync with us on this. After which all subsequent air strikes would be the result of coordinated decisions by

the commander of the United Nations troops on the ground there and the NATO commander in that area, Admiral Boorda, the American admiral.

Q. Given the difficulty of the terrain, can you give us some sense of what you think the risk is for the pilots involved, for the other personnel involved, what the level of American involvement will be in this NATO action?

The President. Well, the level of American involvement in this NATO action, I again will say, there is no expectation—in fact, we have made it quite clear that this will not involve American ground forces. From the beginning of the administration, we have said that the American forces could only be used, if at all, in the implementation of an agreement that had been freely reached as a part of a broader united force in which, since the problem is in Europe, the American forces would be in the minority. So there will be no American ground troops involved in this action.

I can only say to you what General Shalikashvili has said to me and to the leaders of Congress, which is, there is no such thing as a risk-free air operation. I don't want to mislead the American people on that. We have, regrettably, fine young American pilots who die every year in training operations. So there is no such thing as a risk-free operation. However, we believe that the air defenses are sufficiently rudimentary that the risks are minimal. That is the conclusion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Q. Don't they have to fly very low, given this terrain?

The President. Well, I don't want to reveal what we would do and how we would do it. All I can tell you is that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has told me he considers the risks to be small. But you can never tell anybody, when you get in a high-speed airplane with weapons and when people can at least shoot rockets on shoulder weapons against you, that there is absolutely no risk. I can't say that to the American people. But the risks are small.

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us more about the diplomatic track? Do you have any new initiatives going into the Geneva meetings tomorrow? There have also been reports that you are going to pressure the Bosnian Moslems to back off some of their demands in order to make peace easier.

The President. No—well, that's not exactly true. First of all, I don't think we or anybody else can impose a peace. What the United States has agreed to do as a result of the new energy brought to this whole matter by our European allies is to talk again to the Bosnian Moslems—as you know, I have been very sympathetic with their position and have made no secret of it—to ascertain what their legitimate bedrock requirements are and to share with them as clearly and honestly as we can what we think both the political and the military situation is and then, using that as a basis, to go back to do what we can to facilitate an end to this conflict and an agreement. I think that we have a lot of interest in doing the same thing by the Germans, by the French, by the British, really new interest in making a committed effort to persuade these parties that the time has come to quit killing each other. But ultimately, they will have to decide that.

I think we all believe, those of us who have been following this closely, that there is an awful lot of fighting and an awful lot of dying going on now over relatively small patches of land and issues, like a path to the sea for the Moslems and where would it be, that ought to be able to be resolved without a huge amount of further bloodshed. And we hope that they too have been sufficiently affected by the carnage involving innocent civilians in the last few days that they will see that as well.

And as I said to you, I wish that I could report to you on my conversation with President Yeltsin. There were just problems that it didn't work out because of where he was and where I was. But I think I will talk to him soon, and I hope that he will also want to weigh in on the peace process. He has expressed a willingness to do that before and has encouraged me in that regard before, so I'm hopeful.

Q. Can you tell us a little bit about your conversations with some of the other leaders who were reluctant to do this? Did you convince them to come along, or did you say, "This is what we're going to do"?

The President. I wouldn't say they were reluctant. Let me say again, look at the position of the Canadians with their soldiers in Srebrenica surrounded by Serbs. They're in a different position. The French, the British, the Spaniards, the Dutch—there are Europeans who have soldiers on the ground in relatively small numbers for the purpose of carrying out the United Nations missions. They are all legitimately concerned with the prospect of retaliation against

their armed forces. And one of the things that we have really given a lot of thought to is what we can do to provide maximum protection to those people. They have bravely carried on in very difficult circumstances, as you know, for some time. And so we have talked about that.

I think it's a real tribute to those who have forces there that they were so determined finally to try to stop the deterioration of conditions. I think they began to be worried that their forces would be perhaps at more risk if nothing was done. So I am grateful to them for their agreement for this position. And we're going to do the very best we can to make it work.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:05 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Adm. J.M. Boorda, USN, commander in chief, U.S Naval Forces Europe.

Appointment for Director of the Office of Cuba Broadcasting
February 9, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Richard M. Lobo to be Director of the U.S. Information Agency's Office of Cuba Broadcasting, which manages Radio and TV Marti. The two services provide a mix of Spanish-language news, feature, cultural, and entertainment programming to the people of Cuba.

"Richard Lobo's 35 years of experience in journalism, broadcast management, and community affairs make him very well suited for this job," said the President. "Our administration honors the memory of Jose Marti, whose birthday we marked last week, and will continue our efforts in support of freedom and democracy for the Cuban people. Radio and TV Marti are an integral part of those efforts."

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

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
February 9, 1994

The President today nominated four individuals to serve on the Federal bench. To the U.S. Court of Appeals, he nominated Guido Calabresi for the Second Circuit and Robert H. Henry for the Tenth Circuit. The President also named Frank M. Hull to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and W. Louis Sands to the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia.

"I am proud to nominate these distinguished individuals to serve in our Federal judiciary," the President said today. "Their commitment to public service and equal justice for all Americans is outstanding."

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

Remarks to Ukrainian-Americans
February 10, 1994

First of all, I think, Julian, you and Orest met with the Vice President in Milwaukee when I was unable to come, and I'm sorry I missed the meeting, but I'm glad to have all of you here now.

I think the relationships between the United States and Ukraine are at their strongest point since 1991. I think all of you know that I had a very good meeting with President Kravchuk and other leaders of Ukraine when I was in Europe. We had a fine meeting and a good dinner at Boryspil Airport, didn't we, Tony? And I'm looking forward to President Kravchuk's trip here on March the 4th.

We're moving as quickly as we can to establish good relationships. The first and most important step was taken with the trilateral nuclear agreement, which was approved by the Rada just a few days ago. And I'm very pleased about that. It was very interesting because Mr. Kravchuk was confident it would be approved and yet all the press reports were that it probably wouldn't be. And he turned out to be right, so I'm very encouraged by that.

We have already approved and provided $175 million in assistance to facilitate the dismantling of the nuclear weapons, and we expect to almost double that amount when President Kravchuk is here. We're also going to work very closely to make sure that Ukraine receives fair compensation for the value of the nuclear materials, the highly enriched uranium, that are in the warheads. And we have a good strategy for that, and I'm confident that that will occur.

Once Ukraine accedes to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is the next big parliamentary fight, we will extend further security assurances to Ukraine, including our commitment to the sovereignty of the nation and its independence within its existing borders. And we have been very clear about that, and we hope that that will encourage the Rada and others in Ukraine to accede to the NPT.

We've also had some progress on our economic relations. Of course, the biggest problem, obviously, is the high rate of inflation and the problems with industrial productivity. But President Kravchuk has, I think, launched the beginnings, at least, of an economic reform program. And we had decided to double our bilateral economic assistance to Ukraine this year to more than $300 million, and we hope that will be helpful to them.

We also have encouraged the World Bank and the IMF to take a different look at Ukraine, and there will be delegations in Kiev, I think this week, sometime in the next few days; there will be delegations from the IMF and the World Bank there. And finally, we have agreed to an ambitious effort to increase American private investment with Ukraine. So I think we are moving forward on the economic issue.

I hope that all of you will play a big role in the development of our relations. I hope you will stay in close touch with the White House. I hope you will give us your best ideas about what can be done. But I have to say that I was immensely pleased that I was able to stop in Ukraine when I was in Europe, and I was pleased with the continuing development of the relationship. I know that the nation has many problems, but it's a difficult time for all the former Communist economies. And on balance, I would say we are doing rather well in our relationships with them, and I feel that they're strong, they're growing stronger. And I think the Kravchuk visit here will be a very positive thing.

One of the things that I'm quite sensitive to that I would maybe solicit your advice about is to make sure that when he comes here and when we meet, that it's actually a positive for him at home. Because when all these countries are going through difficult changes—not just Ukraine but others—their relationships with the United States are almost a mixed blessing, I think, with the people back home, because everybody wants us to help and be supportive but not to dictate unduly to them what the terms of their own development and future should be. So it's a little bit of a delicate thing, but we're trying to be sensitive to that. And I think the presence in the United States of a strong Ukrainian-American community can help to deal with that problem, can help to create a sense of identity with us among grassroots people and various political forces in Ukraine that perhaps will head off some of the tensions that we have experienced in other places.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:11 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Julian Kulas, chair, Chicago-Kiev Sister City Committee; Orest Baranyk, vice president, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; and Anthony Lake, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform and an Exchange With Reporters

February 10, 1994

The President. I want to thank all the members here for agreeing to serve on this Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform. If you look at the membership from the Congress and from the private sector, you see a wide variety of experience and understanding of this issue and a real willingness to work together in a bipartisan spirit for the interest of the United States. I particularly want to thank Senator Bob Kerrey, who proposed this idea, and extend my gratitude to him and to Senator Jack Danforth for agreeing to cochair the Commission.

The Commission will report directly to my National Economic Council later in the year, giving us an opportunity to consider its recommendations as part of the deliberations for preparing the fiscal year 1996 budget. I expect these results to be thought-provoking and significant.

This Commission will be asked to grapple with real issues of entitlement reforms, not caps or gimmicks that defer hard choices but specific and constructive proposals. And we will take very seriously proposals that have strong bipartisan support.

In the last budget, the one that is now in operation, I proposed and the Congress acted on a number of restrictions and cuts in entitlements. We all now, looking ahead, know that our number one entitlement problem is Medicare and Medicaid. They are growing much more rapidly than the rate of inflation plus population. We are committed to reforming these programs through a health security plan. And I was gratified that notwithstanding some of the disagreements we had with the CBO on the timing of the cuts, the CBO study clearly showed that the proposal we have put on the table will dramatically reduce health care spending in the next decade and beyond. It is clear that there are also other entitlement issues we have to look at, and the Commission will do that, too. We cannot let up on our reforms and our efforts to reduce the deficit and get this economy going again.

The Vice President has done some important work on reinventing Government, which has underscored our commitment to a Government that can do more with less. We are committed now to a plan that will reduce the Federal bureaucracy by 252,000 over the next 5 years. It will be at its lowest level in 30 years. But even if you do that, we can't bring the deficit down unless we deal with other problems.

This panel, I expect, will ask and answer the tough questions. This panel, I expect, will do the kind of work that—something like the balanced budget amendment can never do; it doesn't ask or answer any of the tough questions. But this panel has had the courage and the willingness to face them, and I thank them for that.

If I have learned one thing since I have been President, it is in the end we have to decide on specific matters and that rhetoric sooner or later always has to give way to reality.

I want to thank again all the citizens for agreeing to serve, and in particular I want to thank the Members of Congress in both parties for agreeing to undertake what many might regard as a thankless task. It will not be thankless if it gives us a strong and secure and healthy American economy and society moving into the 21st century. I appreciate your willingness to deal with it, and I assure you that I look forward to your deliberations eagerly.

Senator Kerrey, the floor is yours.

[*At this point, Senator Kerrey made brief remarks.*]

Russian Position on Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, it seems that in the aftermath of NATO's decision to issue this ultimatum to the Serbs, that you're having a very tough time talking to President Yeltsin. Is he deliberately snubbing you?

The President. I don't think so. I don't think so. And I expect to talk to him soon. I don't know—I can't say any more than you already know.

Q. Well, what is the problem?

The President. I don't know. You'll have to ask them. But we've had a lot of high-level consultations on it. Madeleine Albright has talked to her counterpart. Ambassador Collins is there, even though Ambassador Pickering is

here. We have no reason to believe at this point that there's a serious problem with our going forward.

I did receive a letter early yesterday from President Yeltsin that I wanted to be the basis of the telephone conversation. And he initiated this letter with me. And I think we can work through it so that we can go forward. And as you know, I said yesterday I was hoping he would agree to help get this peace process on track. So, I don't know what else to say.

Social Security

Q. Mr. President, you've appointed some people to the Commission who advocate deep cuts in Social Security benefits, means testing, and so forth. Does that mean that you could go along with that, or would you rule that out before the Commission starts its work?

The President. Well, I think Senator Kerrey said that nobody's really interested in cutting Social Security in terms of the social safety net that we have built up in this country. I want to wait and see what they have to say.

In my budget I recommended what amounted to a restriction on the unlimited benefits of very high income people by subjecting more Social Security income to taxation for the top 12 to 14 percent of Social Security earners. But no one that I know of has suggested actually cutting the benefits to people who have paid for them. That's not what's at issue here. So, let's see what the Commission recommends. They're just starting. I don't want to prejudge their deliberations.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, is NATO prepared to go ahead on Bosnia with air strikes or other measures without Russia's acquiescence, if necessary?

The President. Well, we have no reason, I'll say again, we have no reason to believe that—keep in mind, everything we have done with NATO is consistent with action the U.N. has already taken. It's within the umbrella of U.N. action, and Russia was on the Security Council when that happened. So, I don't think we're doing anything inconsistent. There may be people within Russia that don't agree with this at all, but the primary purpose of what we're trying to do is not to get in a fight with the Serbs but to have NATO protect the integrity of Sarajevo and the innocent civilians who live there while we make an effort, which I hope the Russians will participate in, to get the peace process back on track.

Q. Mr. President, why do you think after nearly 2 years and 200,000 deaths it took this last incident Saturday to get the NATO allies finally to issue this ultimatum to the Serbs?

The President. I can't answer that except to say that I think that there was a feeling—first of all, keep in mind, the people who were opposed to this have troops on the ground there in numbers too small to defend themselves from an overwhelming assault. So all along, I think they were sympathetic with the desire to try to use the muscle of NATO to save civilians. What they felt was that they were saving more lives doing what they were doing now.

And I think that just because the conflict has gone on, a lot of people lost sight of the fact that the United States has largely carried out and largely paid for the largest humanitarian airlift in history, now longer than the Berlin airlift, that the people with troops on the ground there have put thousands of people's lives at risk to try to keep those highways open and to keep people alive. And I think they just felt that the risks didn't outweigh the—or outweighed the benefits.

I think this last horrible incident, coming as it did after a pattern of shelling of Sarajevo, convinced them that, what I have always believed about this, that Sarajevo is sort of the Humpty Dumpty of Bosnia. If you ever want it to be put back together again, the country, you've got to keep Sarajevo from total collapse, and you've got to try to save those people if you can. And I think finally they agreed with that, and I applaud them for doing it. But let's not be sanctimonious here. It was harder for them than for us because they had their troops on the ground.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:34 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Madeleine K. Albright, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; James Collins, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large-designate to Russia and the New Independent States; and Thomas R. Pickering, U.S. Ambassador to Russia.

Remarks to the NCAA Football Champion Florida State University Seminoles

February 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Please be seated.

I told Coach Bowden that we're about the same size, and I asked why I wasn't invited to play. [*Laughter*]

Bobby Bowden. You've got to talk to that man right there.

The President. I think it's what you can't see under the suit. [*Laughter*] Either one of them.

It is a great honor for me as an ardent football fan to welcome the Florida State University football team and the entire FSU football family here today. I want to extend a special thanks to those who made this possible, including the Florida State University president and my longtime friend, Sandy D'Alemberte; interim president Dr. Bernard Sliger—where are you? Bernie, how are you?—who once got me in trouble several years ago by taking me to a music club and making me play with some of his friends; athletic director Bob Goin; and Senator Graham; Senator Mack; Congressman Bacchus; Congressman Hutto; Congressman Peterson; my longtime friend Bud Stack; and many others.

Let me first of all congratulate Florida State on a dream season: a 12-and-1 record, undefeated in its conference; a comeback victory in the Orange Bowl against a remarkable effort by Nebraska; and best of all, its first ever and much deserved national football championship.

I know Coach Bowden has been chasing that championship dream for a long time, and I know that he tells a story on the subject that, for the benefit of the national audience, I hope he won't mind my repeating.

It seems that sometime in the distant future, his sons, Terry and Tommy, arrive together at the Pearly Gates, and they're startled to find that their name is not on the register. So Saint Peter tells Terry and Tommy they'll have to take the elevator down to the other place. When the elevator opens at the bottom, instead of fire and flame, they're shocked to find bitter cold, icicles hanging from the ceiling, the whole place frozen over, at which point Tommy turns to Terry and says, "I guess Dad finally won a national championship." [*Laughter*]

There have been so many years when so many people thought that the Florida State Seminoles at the end of a given season were the best team in America. It was really rewarding for those of us who follow football year-in and year-out to see this day come. But what this season really teaches is a lesson that Coach Bowden and I both understand, the power of perseverance. You and your team didn't quit when the sportswriters said you couldn't win the big one. You didn't quit after you lost a tough game to a great Notre Dame team. You didn't quit when you were trailing Nebraska with a minute and 16 seconds left on the clock in the Orange Bowl. And in the end, when everything was on the line, you believed in yourselves, you stayed together as a team, and you got the job done.

One of your teammates who isn't here with us today but I'd like to recognize, Charlie Ward, of course, won the Heisman trophy. But right now he's balancing a different kind of ball as a point guard on your basketball team. I might say that I think my basketball team from Arkansas did a pretty good job last night. I hope some of you saw it. I wish he could have been here with all of you today because he certainly earned the right to also be at the White House.

Finally, let me honor the five starters who made this year's all-academic football team in your conference: Derrick Brooks, Ken Alexander, Clifton Abraham, Richard Coes, and again, Charlie Ward. I want to say that because to be a great athlete is very important, but to be a great student athlete is especially admirable. And these five young men should all be very proud.

You have won a national championship for the first time in the history of your school. I am proud of you all. I am proud to welcome you to the White House. I know that your friends, your fans, and your families back home are proud of you, too. I am awfully glad so many of you came up here to be with these young men on this day that they richly deserve. Thank you for the example you have set, and good luck next season. Congratulations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:16 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Florida attorney Charles R. "Bud" Stack.

Message to the Congress on Economic Sanctions Against Libya
February 10, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of July 12, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA"), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. On December 3, 1993, I announced new measures to tighten economic sanctions against Libya. These measures are taken pursuant to the imposition by the world community of new sanctions against Libya under Security Council ("UNSC") Resolution 883 of November 11, 1993, and are designed to bring to justice the perpetrators of terrorist attacks against Pan Am flight 103 and UTA flight 772. The actions signal that Libya cannot continue to defy justice and flout the will of the international community with impunity.

UNSC Resolution 883 freezes on a worldwide basis certain financial assets owned or controlled by the Government of Libya or certain Libyan entities and bans provision of equipment for refining and transporting oil. It tightens the international air embargo and other measures imposed in 1992 under UNSC Resolution 748. It is the result of close cooperation between the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, whose citizens were the principal victims of Libyan-sponsored terrorist attacks against Pam Am 103 and UTA 772, and of consultations with Russia and other friends and allies.

On December 2, 1993, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extends the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. In addition, I have instructed the Secretary of Commerce to reinforce our current trade embargo against Libya by prohibiting the re-export from foreign countries to Libya of U.S.-origin products, including equipment for refining and transporting oil.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on July 12, 1993. The amendment (58 *Fed. Reg.* 47643) requires U.S. financial institutions to provide written notification to FAC of any transfers into blocked accounts within 10 days of each transfer. It also standardizes registration and reporting requirements applicable to all persons holding blocked property and requires the annual designation of an individual contact responsible for maintaining the property in a blocked status. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 65 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (17) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent Libyan interest. One license involved export transactions from the United States to support a United Nations program in Libya. Six licenses were issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya. Two licenses were issued that permit U.S.

attorneys to provide legal representation under circumstances permitted by the Regulations. FAC has also issued one license authorizing U.S. landlords to liquidate the personalty of the People's Committee for Libyan Students, with the net proceeds from the sale paid into blocked accounts. Finally, FAC has issued three licenses to the Embassy of the United Arab Emirates, as Protecting Power for Libya, to manage Libyan property in the United States subject to stringent FAC reporting requirements.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC has continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 130 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than $20.7 million, were blocked.

Since my last report, FAC has collected 39 civil monetary penalties totaling nearly $277,000 for violations of U.S. sanctions against Libya. All but 8 of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks, with 5 of the remainder involving the U.S. companies that ordered the funds transfers. The balance involved one case each for violations involving a letter of credit, trademark registrations, and export transactions.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well as the utilization of international diversionary shipping routes to and from Libya. FAC continued to work closely with the Departments of State and Justice to identify U.S. persons who enter into contracts or agreements with the Government of Libya, or other third-country parties, to lobby U.S. Government officials and to engage in public relations work on behalf of the Government of Libya without FAC authorization.

FAC also continued its efforts under the Operation Roadblock initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

FAC has continued to pursue the investigation and identification of Libyan entities as Specially Designated Nationals of Libya. During the reporting period, those activities have resulted in the addition of one third-country Libyan bank to the Specially Designated Nationalists list; and FAC has intervened with respect to a Libyan takeover attempt of another foreign bank. FAC is also reviewing options for additional measures directed against Libyan assets in order to ensure strict implementation of UNSC Resolution 883 that has imposed international sanctions against Libyan financial assets.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from July 7, 1993, through January 6, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately $1 million. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The United States continues to believe that still stronger international measures than those mandated by UNSC Resolution 883, including a worldwide oil embargo, should be enacted if Libya continues to defy the international community. We remain determined to ensure the perpetrators of the terrorists acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 10, 1994.

Nomination for the Securities and Exchange Commission
February 10, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Washington attorney Steven M.H. Wallman to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"Steven Wallman has long been recognized as a leading expert on securities law and has been actively engaged in the fight for sensible regulation in that area," said the President. "He will make an excellent addition to the SEC."

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

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan
February 11, 1994

Russian Position on Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us about your phone call with Yeltsin, and did you have a big fight? [*Laughter*]

The President. No. We laughed a lot about the marvels of modern technology. Even today it was kind of a difficult connection, interestingly enough. But we had a very good talk, and we agreed that we had the same long-term objective, which was achieving a just peace agreement, and the same short-term objective, to relieve the shelling of Sarajevo. And we agreed that there would be further discussions today at the U.N. and that we would also keep in touch. But I thought it was a very good conversation, and I feel better having had it.

Q. Is he going to put pressure on the Serbs, Mr. President?

Q. Is he objecting to the ultimatum, the NATO ultimatum?

Q. Is he going to put pressure on the Serbs to force them to make concessions?

The President. Well, he agreed that the two of us should work to try to bring an agreement about. I'll let him characterize his remarks, but I was encouraged by them.

Q. Is he insisting on a U.N. veto right over the NATO action, or is he accepting of NATO action?

The President. No, no. I think he felt better when I emphasized the fact that the weapons that are left within the 20-kilometer area would be under the jurisdiction of the U.N., not NATO. I pointed out that the Secretary-General asked NATO to take action under its mandate of last year, to take necessary action to protect the civilians; that taking some jurisdiction over the weapons that are left within that 20-kilometer safety zone was a part of that, but that any jurisdiction would be taken not by NATO but by the U.N.

And so I said the Secretary-General had concluded that we, NATO, could do this under the existing resolutions and that we agreed.

Q. Are they now willing to consider lifting the sanctions piecemeal as possibly an incentive to the Serbs, lifting the sanctions incrementally?

The President. No, that was not—there was no discussion about that.

Q. So is the United States now willing to consider lifting the sanctions incrementally?

The President. There was no discussion about that.

Japan

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, do the——

Q. How important are these talks to U.S.-Japanese relations?

The President. We'll have more to say about that later.

Q. Do you think you can have a good conversation with such a difference on the trade issue?

The President. We'll have more to say about that later.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. It's hard for us to believe that you can't communicate with Yeltsin by telephone. That's a little scary, isn't it?

The President. That's what he said. He said we have to make sure it never happened again. He said, "What if we really had to talk about an emergency?" That's what he said, too.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Japan

Q. Mr. President, is there any possibility for you to have another meeting with Prime Minister Hosokawa this afternoon or evening or tomorrow morning?

The President. I don't know. We haven't started this one yet. I would like to spend a lot of time with him.

Q. Because you decided not to leave for Arkansas this evening. We heard that you decided not to leave for Arkansas this evening.

The President. The weather is bad there and here.

Q. Was it only the weather?

The President. Yes. But I mean, I'm always glad to see the Prime Minister. I wish we could go play golf today, but the weather won't permit that either.

Q. Mr. President, do you think that the relationship between the U.S. and Japan is now in rough water?

The President. No, I think it's very strong. I feel very strongly about what the Prime Minister is trying to do. I supported strongly his political reform package, and I support the economic efforts I think he is trying to make. So I think we have a good relationship. Just because we have some disagreements doesn't mean we don't have a good relationship.

Q. So you——

The President. More later. We'll have more later. We'll answer your questions at the end of the—at the press conference.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:35 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan

February 11, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to welcome Prime Minister Hosokawa to the White House. The Prime Minister and I met last in Seattle at the APEC conference. Our dialog there was based on a new honesty and respect that continued in our talks today.

Both of us were elected on a mandate for change, and the Prime Minister has shown real courage and commitment to making change occur by advocating and securing political reforms, by opening Japan's construction and rice markets, and by seeking to deregulate Japan's economy. He also ushered through a tax cut that is a step towards spurring growth. And I know the Prime Minister proposed an even larger budget stimulus. I commend all these steps which can move Japan toward greater openness.

The United States and Japan have a long, deep, and rich relationship. No relationship in the world is more important today. Our security alliance, which is stronger than ever, is essential to the Asian Pacific and elsewhere. Today we discussed our shared interest in the Asian Pacific and its stability, including developments in Russia, China, and elsewhere. And I look forward to continuing this discussion this summer at the G–7 summit in Naples.

Our shared interests are nowhere clearer than on the Korean Peninsula. North Korea's nuclear program poses a serious threat to regional stability and to international nonproliferation efforts. We agreed to continue our close cooperation in pursuing a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula.

Our nations today have also embraced a common agenda for cooperation on global issues such as population, transportation technology, and the environment. It includes a $12 billion joint initiative to address population and AIDS in developing nations and new environmental assistance to Central and Eastern Europe.

Our discussions today focused chiefly on economics. The central concern of my administration has been preparing our country for the new global economy in the 21st century. That

is why we've invested in our people, cut our deficits, and pursued more open markets through NAFTA, through the Uruguay round of GATT, through APEC.

As the world's second largest market, Japan must be our strategic partner in efforts to spur global growth. That is why I've attached as much importance to our economic alliance as to our political and security alliance. For our relationship to be strong, we must have a more mutually beneficial economic partnership. Such a partnership will benefit all our citizens with more jobs and opportunities for American workers and more choices and lower prices for Japanese consumers. Indeed, we seek to open Japan's economy not only for our own products but for those from the rest of the world as well.

Even though we have negotiated over 30 trade agreements with Japan since 1980, Japan still remains less open to imports than any other G–7 nation. Its regulations and practices screen out many of our products, even our most competitive products. To take one example, when our medical technology firms sell in Europe, they earn 40 percent of the market there. In Japan, they earn just 15 percent. The same holds in many other sectors.

Last July, our two Governments agreed on a framework to address a wide range of macroeconomic structural and sectoral trade issues. We focused on opening markets. We agreed to seek agreements containing, and I quote, "objective criteria" that would result in, quote, "tangible progress". We agreed to hold two summits each year to evaluate that progress. Today was the first such meeting. Unfortunately, we've not been able to reach agreement in any of the four areas we identified last July. Japan's offers made in these negotiations simply did not meet the standards agreed to in Tokyo.

Today we could have disguised our differences with cosmetic agreements. But the issues between us are so important for our own nations and for the rest of the world that it is better to have reached no agreement than to have reached an empty agreement. Of course, if Japan has further proposals, our door remains open. But ultimately, Japan's market must be open.

Over the past 40 years, the relationship between the United States and Japan has been the strongest when all three of its components, security, political, and economic, were seen by both our peoples as mutually beneficial. I am committed to improving our economic ties not only because doing so will mean more jobs and better standards of living in both nations but because it will strengthen every aspect of our relationship. I remain confident that we can work together to provide leadership in this new global economy. I have enormous confidence in the sincerity and the capacity and the vision of Prime Minister Hosokawa. And I am absolutely convinced that the relationship between the United States and Japan, founded on mutual respect and responsibility, ever growing in its maturity, will, as it must, remain vibrant and strong.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Hosokawa. Thank you, Mr. President. Today, President Clinton and I discussed wide-ranging issues from trade and economic matters, the current international situation, and to the future of the Asian-Pacific region and our cooperation on global issues. The list of these extensive issues reflects the matured relationship between Japan and the United States. And to be very candid, I think we had a very good meeting.

As to the framework talks, we have not yet come to agree on all the important issues, despite our intensive negotiations over the past 6 months. We are, however, in agreement that we should in no way allow this result to undermine the strong and friendly relationship between our two countries.

Since I assumed office, my administration has launched a series of measures for macroeconomic management in Japan. The other day I announced a comprehensive package of economic measures, the total amount of which is the largest scale ever. I am convinced that through these measures, reinforced by appropriate economic policies by other governments, we'll be able to achieve over the medium term a highly significant decrease in our current account surplus.

As to the sectoral issues of the framework talks, our respective positions regarding the relationship between the objective criteria and the numerical targets did not converge. As part of my inner-driven reform, I am determined to take initiatives on our government procurement. To this end, for example, the Government of Japan has already announced such measures as the action program on government procurement, and concrete efforts are being made in line with this program.

In addition, as to the insurance issue, I place particular emphasis on achieving greater transparency in administrative procedures and promoting deregulation, which will create a better business climate for foreign insurance companies in Japan. In the areas of autos and auto parts, positive effects of industrial cooperation between Japan and the U.S. are not steadily becoming apparent. The Government of Japan will continue to provide possible support to cooperation between our private sectors in this field.

There is no doubt that Japan-U.S. cooperation in the areas of political and security relations has expanded and intensified. The increasing possibility of the Asia-Pacific region evolving into a community would give our partnership a new task and a prospect for further development. The suspected development of nuclear weapons by North Korea is currently the highest concern for the security in northeast Asia. This issue also poses a great challenge into the international nuclear nonproliferation regime. Today the President and I had very meaningful discussion on this matter.

In this post-cold-war era, the possible areas of cooperation between Japan and the United States are enormous. In fact, under the framework talks the two countries have discussed such issues of mutual concern as global environment, population, and human immune deficiency virus, or AIDS. Japan will mobilize approximately $3 billion over the next 7 years to bear on urgent matters of growing global population and AIDS. The President and I are fully committed to cooperation in these areas.

In the past, Japan and the U.S. sometimes have reached ambiguous agreements which glossed over the problems of the time, only to find them become sources of later misunderstandings between our two countries from time to time. Now I firmly believe that our relationship in this new era is maturing to an extent each of us respects and has confidence in the judgments of the other, each of us makes utmost efforts to tackle the issues that each side responsibly understands and identifies but, at the same time, frankly admit what we can and what we cannot do despite such best efforts. I believe such is the relationship between grownups, as we two are.

Since I took office I've sought to realize a genuine reinstatement of politics in the management of the critical processes of politics, economics, and government administration. As a like-minded colleague trying to bring about reforms in the social and political processes, I highly appreciate and respect the leadership exercised by President Clinton and his administration on both the domestic and international front, including budget deficit reduction and on bringing NAFTA to a successful conclusion and in opening a new frontier for APEC. I am firmly convinced that the reform efforts that President Clinton and I are undertaking would reinforce the vital Japan-U.S. relationship and lead to further progresses in the world community.

Thank you.

The President. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

May I say one thing before we begin? I have agreed that I will call on an American journalist, and then the Prime Minister will recognize a Japanese journalist, and then we will alternate one after the other. That's not a numerical target. [*Laughter*]

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Do you think that you were misled last July by the Japanese in terms of their intent to really reach an agreement?

Mr. Prime Minister, do you agree with the President's allegation that you are the most closed of the G–7 nations? And if that's true, why is it so?

The President. Well, first of all, the G–7 agreement, the agreement we concluded with Japan last summer was, I think, a good framework. We all recognized that it had to be implemented. I can't say that the people who concluded the agreement last summer, who are not here to defend themselves, did not do it in good faith. I would not say that; I cannot say. All I can tell you is we haven't reached an agreement.

Q. Can you say why?

The President. Because we couldn't agree on what constituted evidence of market openings, and there are other reasons as well, but at least that is one.

Prime Minister Hosokawa. In the way we look at it, in the areas of government procurement, insurance business, and so on, in these areas we believe that to a large measure we've been able to boil down the issues. However, unfortunately, at the very end we were not able to clear the hurdle of numerical targets, and we regret that very much. As the President mentioned earlier, in the days ahead, we on each

side will try and sort out some problems that remain and do our best efforts in order to resolve the remaining problems and arrive at a good agreement.

Q. With regard to how you address the remaining issues, what is the time schedule for reaching an agreement?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. I don't know. We'd like to reach an agreement as early as possible. But I think there is a need for a little bit of cooling off.

Russian Position on Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia, how do you avoid a major breach with President Yeltsin? He's quoted today as saying that NATO lacks the authority to approve air strikes. You've taken the position that NATO has that authority. Is there any way to reconcile these differences?

The President. I think so. We talked about it a little on the phone today, and I reminded President Yeltsin it was the Secretary-General of the United Nations acting under the authority of last summer's U.N. Security resolution, that had asked NATO to develop a plan to stop the shelling of Sarajevo and the innocent killing of civilians, and that there would be no possession taken of weapons left within the 20-kilometer safe zone by NATO but by the U.N. troops. So I don't think, therefore, we have to go back to the Security Council.

They're discussing this in greater detail today in New York. But I think that the most encouraging thing to me was that he agreed we had the same long-term objective, which was a peace agreement, and the same short-term objective, which was to stop the shelling and killing of innocent civilians.

Q. But isn't there a difference on this other issue?

The President. I don't think so.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, now that the trade agreement has failed, how optimistic are you and the members of your administration for the future agreement?

The President. I just don't know. You know, the problem may be—it may be one of words; it may be one of the feelings behind the words. Japan has taken the position with which we on the surface do not disagree, that Japan does not wish to commit numerical targets that amount to managed trade. We understand that. We have taken the position that there have to be some objective standards by which to judge whether we are making progress or not, because if we just talk about improving processes, that is what we have done in the past without much progress. That is why last summer we used the words "objective criteria" to include quantitative measures or qualitative measures or both, as appropriate.

For example, I agree that it's not fair to disregard—let me give you some examples—let's suppose there's an area in which our trade is in great imbalance. You have to take into account, in addition to whether there has been progress from, let's say, 1992 to 1995, also what happened to the exchange rate, what happened to domestic demand and the economy in Japan, whether the American business in question produced a product competitive in price and quality and did the things necessary to pierce the Japanese market.

So, it's not for us—we don't think we're asking for numerical targets, we think we're asking for a set of objective criteria by which we can judge whether we're making progress in opening the market. That, I think, is a fair statement of the nub of our argument. And I have no idea what will happen from here on in. We just didn't make it.

Yes, go ahead.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia, there were reports that the United States, on the diplomatic front, is considering a piecemeal lifting of the sanctions if the Serbians will be cooperative at the peace talks, and that you have reconsidered your commitment to have 50 percent of the troops in any potential peacekeeping force be American, that in fact, it would only be a third of the ground forces be American if there were a peace agreement in place. Can you comment on that and on also the late reports that more F–15E's are now en route to Bosnia?

The President. Let me just say—I can only comment on two things. First of all, in terms of the troops, all we ever said about that was that we would expect to have less than half. We never specified a specific amount. Secondly, I have never even discussed any partial lifting of the Serbian embargo. No one has brought it to me. It has never been discussed in my presence. If it is an option being considered,

it's been considered by somebody other than me. It's just not been a part of our discussions.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—violated the cease-fire yesterday?

The President. No.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. With regard to objective criteria, you had an agreement with the previous administration. Would you say that the adjustment was wrong, or does this mean that the Hosokawa administration is going to make a judgment on a new basis?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. With regard to the things that have been subject to negotiations to date, I believe that we have seen some progress. So this does not mean that we're going to start something anew, but we'll pursue these matters further to build on the results that have been achieved so far.

Is that the point you were asking?

Q. Well, the previous administration—the outside cabinet agreed on the framework talks and on objective criteria. So would you say that the previous administration erred in their judgment?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. No, that's not the case.

The President. I get that kind of question all the time. Don't let it bother you. [*Laughter*]

Go ahead.

Prime Minister Hosokawa. With regard to the interpretation of numerical targets, I think there is a difference between the two sides, and we have not been able to clear that difference easily.

Q. What are the kinds of things that the United States can do to compel Japan to change its ways? And have you given any thought to making it just as hard for Japanese companies to do business over here as it is, as you say, for American companies to do business over there?

The President. Well, until 4 o'clock this morning we were working as hard as we could to reach an agreement, so I'm not prepared to say yet. We're going to have to think about that. I tried to characterize this as a period of reflection now. We just have to assess where we are.

Q. Mr. President, as you know, the Japanese public very strongly supports the Hosokawa government's policy calling for deregulation and less government intervention into the economic system. Against that background, how would you address the Japanese public's concern that accepting an American request for Japan to agree to predetermine the levels and the quantities of the American imports into the Japanese market would inevitably entail more government intervention into the whole economic system?

The President. We do not want that. I mean, I think this is the nub of the disagreement, and I think I understand the Japanese position in addition to the American position. We do not want Japan to commit to a specific volume of imports by a specific time. We do want to assess whether we are making progress toward opening markets with the use of objective criteria rather than just change processes.

One of those criteria would be, what is the difference in the level of imports; another might be, as I said earlier, the exchange rate changes; another might be the state of domestic demand in Japan; another might be the quality and price of the American product as evidenced by how well it's doing in our market or in Europe or somewhere else; another might be whether the American company or the American companies had made the necessary effort to do business in Japan.

In other words, we understand why Japan does not wish to put itself in the position of having to manage its trade in that way. And I think probably what the Japanese negotiators fear is if there is a number in there, even along with a lot of other criteria, that either under my administration or at some time in the future, it will be used as the only basis for evaluating whether America should impose some sort of trade sanctions. That is not our intent. But I think it's fair to say that that is the core of our disagreement. That is, when you put the question the way you did, I agree with your position. But that is not what we are asking to do.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned that you also discussed the situation on the Korean Peninsula. As you know, later this month the International Atomic Energy Agency has to certify that North Korea is or is not engaged in a nuclear weapons program, has developed a nuclear weapons program. How serious is the situation right now? And what do you and Prime Minister Hosokawa, what do you plan on doing if the IAEA certifies it can no longer say that

North Korea is not complying with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty?

The President. Well, we discussed that today, and obviously we discussed what our options were, including sanctions. We discussed also the fact that in this particular policy, Japan, China, South Korea, and the United States all want a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. All very much want North Korea to comply with our IAEA standards and therefore permitting it to resume some contact with the South. That has been the position of all four of our countries, and what we're doing now is consulting all of us among one another to try to see what our options are. But obviously, the sanctions option is one option.

Do you have anything to add?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. Well, we also have a very strong and deep concern of the issue. Within the coming 10 days or so, very soon, I would say, this issue is going to face a climax. And we very much hope that North Korea will move in the right direction. As President Clinton said, we shall, together with the United States, China, and South Korea, we would like to step up our approach vis-a-vis North Korea. At the U.N. Security Council, if a sanction is proposed, then Japan, to the extent Japanese laws allow, will put in place all possible measures.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. I have a question for both leaders. Looking at the past 6 months of negotiations, we could detect so much new mutual distrust from each side, from American side, a distrust of having been cheated, and from Japanese side, a distrust of this objective criteria could be for sanction. So do you have any idea of removing this distrust and changing the mood and course of coming discussions?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. Well, we said we'll just cool our head for a while.

The President. Well, let me say, in the last 6 months my personal trust and admiration for Prime Minister Hosokawa has only increased, and for the government, because of political reform, because Japan exercised leadership in the Uruguay round, because of the initiatives on construction and rice, because of the fight for tax reform and the stimulus, because of the deregulation effort. I think that Japan is moving in the right direction.

Both of us came to this office carrying, if you will, the accumulated either fears or experiences of years and years of trade negotiations and frustrations. So I would say that this trust issue, I would hope, can be worked out. But I don't want to minimize it. I think it's a very serious problem because the other approaches have still left us with such a huge trade deficit which causes consumer prices to be very high in Japan and which puts our people here and our economy in a very difficult situation.

So I would say that the rest of our relationship is in good shape, the security relationship, the political relationship. I would say that my level of personal trust in the Prime Minister and his government is very strong. But I would say this is a serious problem.

Q. I'd like to ask the Prime Minister if, after being here these days and having this longer-than-expected consultation today with President Clinton, that you are more prepared than you may have been to believe that when the United States side says, "Yes, we may want numerical progress indicators, but we don't want managed trade," that that is true?

Prime Minister Hosokawa. Well, as you've just said, rightly, we do not want managed trade, and I think I speak on behalf of everyone when I say that. Unfortunately, as the President mentioned in passing earlier, too, we don't want numerical targets to gain a life of its own and turn into another semiconductor case, because at the end of the day, we believe that will lead to managed trade. My administration is promoting deregulation, and so it runs right in the face of our basic tenet. This is what I've been telling the President during our meeting today.

The President. That, if we were asking for the semiconductor agreement, it would be right. But that's not what we're asking for. What we're asking for is what we agreed to last summer, which was a way of measuring by objective standards whether progress is being made in opening markets.

And I want to say, we've not sought anything for the United States we've not sought for other countries as well. We've sought no special access or special treatment. And we just seek a list, if you will, of those things by which you could determine whether progress is being made, or if progress is not being made, that there are reasons other than closed market policies for the lack of progress. There could be reasons other than that: no domestic demand, changes in the exchange rates, inadequate effort by Americans, not competitive products or services.

Q. I think that the opening of Japanese market is very important, and I think Japanese consumers and Japanese people believe in that. But I think the reason why you couldn't come up with an agreement today for the framework talks is that because Japanese people—or the numerical target approach is not really popular among the Japanese people or Japanese industry, including Japanese bureaucrats. So I wonder whether you think, Mr. President, whether you think that you would come up with any agreement or any result or outcome in the near future with this numerical target approach? Also, I wonder whether you think that is supported by the Japanese ordinary audience?

And also, I heard that Mr. Gore raised the question of Japanese bureaucrats in his talks with Mr. Hata. I wonder whether, Mr. President, if you think that the Japanese bureaucrat is a kind of burden or a barrier in opening up Japanese market? [*Laughter*]

The President. I thought you'd never ask. No.

First of all, I understand that the numerical target is not popular, as you said, among the Japanese people or the Japanese Government. America's trade deficit with Japan is not very popular among the American people or the American Government. It's hard to explain it, year-in and year-out always getting bigger.

I think in every society, the permanent government is more change-averse than the changing government. I think that is true in every society. In some societies it's more true than others. And the stronger the permanent civil service is, if you will, in the making of policy, the more likely they are to be change-averse. If you look at the history of Japan from where you started after the Second World War through the next 45-plus years, having a system in which you produce for your own market and the world, had high savings rates, low consumption rates, relatively closed markets, and relatively high value products, worked dramatically to improve the standard of living of your people. But at some point as your growth rates become more normal, as they have in the last 10 years, and as the capacity of your people alters and the aspirations of your people alter, you have to develop a more open economy and society.

I couldn't say it any more eloquently than the Prime Minister did in the book that he wrote that he gave me to read. So I don't want to pick a fight with any particular sector of Japanese society. I would just say that we know we're in a process of change. We're both committed to it. That's the good news. I also think it's good news that we didn't come up with an agreement today that didn't mean anything. And we're just going to have to keep dealing with this and try to find some way out of it, because we have to come to trust each other across systems that are still very different.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 46th news conference began at 2:41 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. Prime Minister Hosokawa spoke in Japanese, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Interview With California Newspaper Publishers
February 11, 1994

[*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*]

The President. ——workers who are helping the community, and their response has been one of the most timely, comprehensive, and effective in memory. And as I emphasized when I visited you a few weeks ago, while short-term disaster relief is absolutely necessary, I want to assure you that we'll be there over the long run as well.

The latest information on the status of the disaster assistance is this: The conference on the supplemental appropriation has just concluded. With luck, I'll be able to sign this legislation tomorrow morning. I was in Los Angeles within 48 hours of that quake, and your needs were clear to me and overwhelming. The following week, as soon as Congress returned from its recess, I transmitted to them a formal request for funds prepared by our OMB Director, Leon Panetta, from California. I'm pleased that Congress, led by the California delegation, has acted so quickly and so responsibly. In total,

this legislation will bring the entire amount of Federal disaster assistance to southern California to about $10 billion.

I know there's been a little public debate about whether States have an obligation to match 10 percent of these funds. I think they should; everyone must take some responsibility and do their share. It's what we did in the terrible 500-year floods in the Midwest, and it's what we should do here.

These funds will help meet the immediate need. But California and all America, as you know, face a larger challenge: creating jobs and creating growth in a tough global economy, restoring the American dream for middle class people, and bringing our whole country together as a nation again. That's why I came to office with a comprehensive economic strategy designed to get the deficit down, lower interest rates, keep inflation down, free up investments, and create jobs. It's working.

Of course, there are still too many who haven't benefited and too many regions that have not really felt movement yet. But before our plan took effect last year, the 1995 budget was projected to be $302 billion. Now it's expected to be $176 billion, a 40 percent reduction. Core inflation and long-term interests rates are at historic lows. Home sales are up, car sales are up, and last year this economy created almost 2 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector. That's more than in the previous 4 years combined.

But in creating a national strategy, we tried to be exceedingly mindful that California faces very serious problems different from and greater than any other State; especially southern California faces these problems. And as I have said repeatedly, in every region of the country we can't hope to rebuild the American economy until we also restore your economy, which accounts for one-eighth of all America's output. We've worked hard to do that.

Many of the elements of our economic plan will benefit California, including the national information superhighway, our efforts to develop new environmental technologies. NAFTA was a huge win for California and so was the GATT agreement and the reduction in export controls on communications equipment and computers. And nearly a quarter of the grants awarded for defense conversion and technology reinvestment have gone to California-led projects.

We are doing better, but our economic problems didn't come overnight, and they won't go away overnight. We need continued discipline, especially in the budget.

The budget I just introduced is the toughest budget Congress has seen yet. Adjusted for inflation, we'll cut more than 60 percent of the major accounts in the budget. We cut more than 300 specific nondefense programs, 115 of which we eliminate outright. Half the Cabinet departments take budget cuts. We slash the Federal bureaucracy by 118,000 people. If the Congress adopts this budget, it will keep the deficit coming down, interest rates coming down, the investment climate will continue to improve, we'll continue to create jobs, and we'll be able to invest in the things that make us strong and secure.

That includes investing over $350 million in new funds for border security to control illegal immigration, which will allow us to increase by 40 percent the number of border patrol officers on the San Diego border this year. These funds are in the new budget. The budget adds hundreds of millions of dollars in additional funds to offset California's cost of providing medical services to indigents and to providing educational services to disadvantaged children. Both will help you to respond to the needs of the immigrant population. We've added these funds and specifically redesigned spending formulas precisely because States like California have had special demands placed on them. And this budget includes $1.6 billion that are new for new highway and transit projects in California, above and beyond the emergency funds which are desperately needed in the wake of the earthquake.

All these are new funds. All are new investments in California's future. You need them, and I'll fight for them. In addition, continued budget discipline means that we can do things like lift the standards of every school in America and create a reemployment system to offer new skills for our displaced workers, replacing our old unemployment system which doesn't offer those skills.

If this budget passes, we'll be able to put 100,000 more police officers on the street including thousands and thousands in California, lock up career criminals for life, and we can get serious about drug treatment and prevention. We can begin to change the welfare system as we know it, and we can reform health care. Unless we do that and guarantee every Amer-

ican private health insurance that can never be taken away, we'll never be able to control this deficit in the long run, never have the money we need to invest in the future and our jobs, and never provide real security to America's working families.

The Congressional Budget Office pointed out last week that our health care plan saves an enormous amount of money over the next decade, will not cost jobs in the American economy, and can be done in the way we have proposed it. We can do this health care reform as our proposal does by simply building on what works best in the present system. Our current proposal retains private insurance, retains the freedom to choose plans and doctors, and retains the employer-based system that 9 out of 10 working people already use. We stress primary care and preventive care. We increase medical research and provide drug benefits and long-term care to the elderly. And our plan will save money in the long run.

As I said, if you review the Congressional Budget Office study just concluded, it says our plan reduces the projected growth of health care costs, reduces the deficit over time dramatically, improves wages, and could benefit all small businesses. Small businesses now are in a pickle. Seventy percent of the small businesses in this country cover their employees, but they pay 35 to 40 percent more for insurance premiums. The other 30 percent don't cover their employees, and when those folks get sick, the rest of us pay the bill because their costs are passed along through higher hospital and insurance costs.

Now, what will happen if we don't take these steps? We'll go on charging older people more than younger people just because they're older. Three out of four of us will continue to have lifetime limits on our coverage so that just when we need it most, we'll lose health insurance coverage. Small businesses will continue to spend 35 to 40 percent more for premiums than big business. One hundred thousand Americans a month will continue to lose their coverage permanently. Eighty-one million Americans with so-called preexisting conditions will continue to be denied coverage or charged more or feel that they can never change jobs without losing their coverage. And sometime every year, 58 million of our fellow citizens will have no insurance at all. And the cost of health care will keep destroying the Federal budget. There will be no money left for more police or better schools or newer technology or for any of the things we need to get your economy coming back.

Your nonpartisan legislative analysis recently estimated through its office that our plan will save California, and I quote, "hundreds of millions of dollars in the early years and more in later years." They concluded that our plan should enhance California's long-term economic prospects, encourage people to move off welfare, and save California approximately $700 million a year in care for the indigent.

I am enthusiastic about the health care debate. It's exciting because it's about the future, about facing up to our challenges. This ought not to be a partisan issue. We can differ over the specific prescriptions for what should be done, but this year proves that we can differ and still get the job done for America.

As I said in the State of the Union Address, our Nation is growing stronger, but it must be stronger still. We've begun to make it stronger. We've begun to solve our problems. But we must stay together and stay focused on the future so that we can move forward with the hopefulness that is at the core of the California spirit and at the heart of the American dream.

Thank you very much.

Public Libraries

Q. Mr. President, my question goes to the crisis in our library system. If my information is correct, during our recession we've been closing libraries in this country at the rate of one a day. And by contrast, during the Great Depression, I don't believe one library was closed. This is a natural question from a group of people that love the printed word more than most, and many of us are involved in private initiatives to help our city and country libraries. But I wonder what you might do, sir.

The President. Well, given the problems we have in the Federal budget and given the fact that we need to use as much money as we can for education and training and new technologies, I would think that any Federal help to libraries would have to come in the form of some initiative that we have in furtherance of that, like an adult literacy initiative.

I do think the library system in this country will be dramatically helped by being able to hook into the information superhighway, and we've already made that commitment. I think

that will make a difference. But I'm afraid that the lion's share of that work will have to be done at the State and local level.

I know when I was a Governor in my former life, we really worked hard to get more State help for libraries because we knew that local government simply could not afford to do it. In the 1980's, when so much Federal spending was cut back and so many new responsibilities were put on local governments, it was very tough. I have found that most voters, when given the chance, if they know they're dedicating the money to do it, will vote to save their local library. And what we did at home was to give them the opportunity to do that.

I will look into it. If you have any other specific ideas, I'd be glad to look into them. But I think the literacy mission of libraries and the information superhighway are the two main areas in which the Federal Government can probably be of help.

Q. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you. Thank you.

Information Superhighway

Q. Mr. President, as you might imagine, we've been spending a bit of time talking about technology and the future here in the last couple of days, and my question relates to that. Newspapers present issues with a certain amount of depth that other media don't often attempt. Is there something there that you'd like to see or think ought to be preserved in the new information superhighway?

The President. Absolutely. One of my staff aides, when we were coming over here, and I had a conversation about this very issue and about how the information superhighway needs to be both wide and deep, deep in the way that newspapers are. I can understand how you might have some concern that it might become a nationalized version of E-mail or something and be too narrow. Our view of it is that we ought to incorporate the kind of in-depth information that newspapers provide in the information superhighway.

Q. Thank you.

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, you referred to—with the obligation of the Federal Government to meet California—to match and pay for California's obligation—California's payments to and for care and service of illegal immigrants. You referred to that in your remarks about your budget. Will that fully cover that obligation?

The President. Well, it's hard to know exactly because it's hard to know what the figure is. The estimates vary rather dramatically. But I can tell you this: Last year, in our first round of budget cuts, we still included several hundred million dollars in more money to deal with the cost of immigration, especially immigrant health care and immigrant education. This year, we have much more money in there yet again. And this year we have in addition to that enough money, as I said, to drastically increase border patrols across the country, including a 40 percent increase along the San Diego border.

So we're getting closer; that's all I know. Frankly, we don't have a very good way of estimating what those costs are, and I agree that we need more. But because I have heard for years the Governors of California and Texas and Florida, particularly, talk to me about this problem, we made a commitment when I came in that each year we would try to do as much as we possibly could to help cover these costs that are imposed on States because of immigration. And we have certainly made more progress in the last 2 years, even with tough budgets, than have been made in a long time. And we'll continue to try to find more exact ways of measuring what the costs are, because I do think that if we had them measured, it would be easier to know whether we're meeting our target.

Defense Conversion

Q. Mr. President, I think you touched on my question in your remarks, but I'd like you to expand on it a bit if you could. Given the cuts in defense spending and the resulting impact on aerospace jobs in California, what plans do you have to help our State replace those jobs and regain economic viability?

The President. Well, we're doing a number of things. First of all, I have been very aggressively involved with our major aerospace companies in trying to increase exports of all kinds to try to build the job base. And I expect you'll be seeing a whole series of announcements about that over the coming year.

Secondly, we have worked hard with a lot of the aerospace companies to try to get them involved in dual-use technologies, to make sure they were engaged in the technology reinvestment project, where we take a significant por-

tion of the money by which we reduce defense spending and make it available for commercial research and development. Rockwell International, for example, which I visited in California recently, has been quite aggressive and active and successful in that regard in trying to find new ways to put people to work.

And thirdly, in our conversion plans we've been very aggressive at working with local communities to try to help them make the most of the facilities they have and the human resources they have to try to attract new investment for new jobs.

We believe that since we started doing this last year, and we spent over $500 million on this last year and will spend more money this year than we did last year, that we will be able to substantially accelerate the rate at which people either find new work in the same industry or find comparable jobs in other industries, if we can get the technology reinvestment going.

So that's my commitment. One of the things that we dramatically increased in this budget was the technology reinvestment. I'd also like to point out that last year, because of the combination of low interest rates and new incentives, we had an all-time high in venture capitalizations for new corporations in the high-tech area. And I hope we're going to break that record again this year. Those companies, as you know, are disproportionately located in California. And if we can keep those new companies starting, then they will begin to provide other totally different employment opportunities for a lot of those folks.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, I have to admit I'm a little confused, and I hope you can help me on this. You made your comments in your earlier remarks about your judgment of the impact of your health plan on businesses. And of course, the critics of your plan suggest that the costs of this expanded medical care will be borne largely on the shoulders of businesses. And I'm wondering if you could give us an idea of what your judgment is of what this impact will be on businesses, particularly relatively small employers like publishers represented in this room.

The President. Well, first of all, let's go back. If you look at all the studies, there was a study by the Lewin Group, which were mostly health care folks who had been in and out of Government, many of them were in the Reagan and Bush administrations. And the Lewin study said that a majority of American employers and employees would pay the same or less money for the same or greater health care, that people who do not have any health coverage at all or people who have very, very limited, like catastrophic policies with very high deductibles, would pay more. But under our plan, we put a ceiling of 7.9 percent of payroll for full-time employees on all employers and then lowered that all the way down as low as 3.9 for smaller businesses with average payroll below $24,000 a year. So there are a whole series of discounts available for private insurance there.

Let me just say, the flip side is that if you look at how much America as a nation is spending on health care, we spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. Canada spends 10; Germany and Japan spend less than 9. Now, about half of that gap is due to the fact that we spend more on medical technology and medical research than other countries, and we wouldn't change that for the world, I don't think. About half of it is due to the fact that we are more violent and have higher AIDS rates than other countries. We would change that if we could. But we can't in this health care bill.

Now, if you take that out of the way, the rest of this system's costs that are out of line with any other country in the world are solely due to the crazy way we finance health care and the fact that not everybody has coverage, so you've got massive cost shifting in it. So I just refuse to believe that we're the only advanced country in the world that can't figure out a way to provide health care for all of its citizens. Germany has absorbed Eastern Germany, taken that enormous burden, kept health care costs under 9 percent, and their unemployment rate is still almost exactly what ours is.

So we know that this can be done. And the congressional process is started now. There's been an awful lot of misinformation about this plan, but as I said, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office just issued a report which estimated that there would be no net loss in jobs, in fact, would probably be a net gain in jobs, if our plan passed.

So I would urge you to read it carefully, if you have suggestions about what you think is wrong with it, to let us know what you think is wrong with it. And we'll be glad to look at those things. The only bottom-line commitment I have is that the United States should

not go on being the only country in the world with an advanced economy that can't figure out how to give some form of guaranteed private health care to all of its working people. Poor people get it, and other people get it. Most people who don't have it are the working poor. And so I think that we have to find a way to do that. And I believe that our plan is the most cost-effective, most reasonable way to do it.

But we're going to have 4 or 5 months of congressional debate. And as I said, what I wish you would do if you have a concern about this is get someone to analyze it who particularly—maybe a doctor or someone who has no necessary ax to grind, tell us what you think is wrong with it or how you think it can be improved, and that can become part of the ongoing debate. I mean, California has an enormously large congressional delegation that will be in a position to have a big impact on how this ultimately comes out.

I don't want to do anything I thought would cost jobs. I think this will gain us jobs. I think that if we pass this bill, the percentage of our income going to health care 5 years from now will be markedly less than it will be if we don't. And I think, therefore, we will have more jobs in America as a result of controlling health care costs and providing guaranteed health care than we will if we don't do it. And my evidence is all the other countries in the world that have done it are spending less money on health care.

Q. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, I do have a couple of specifics on the health care plan I'd like to ask you about. I have had health care for my employees for 10 years, and I support your universal health care plan with two exceptions. One, when both parents work, both employers must pay 80 percent of the health care for the family. This overlap makes the plan onerous. Two, also with specific regard to the newspaper industry, we have many distribution people and freelancers who choose to work just a few hours a week. We can't make full-time jobs of those because the distribution has to be done in such a concentrated fashion. Paying the full employer's share of those people's health care really becomes quite staggering to the newspaper industry, specifically. What can be done about that?

The President. Well, first, for part-time workers who work over 10 hours a week, the full share would not be due unless people worked 30 hours a week. If it's between 10 and 30, it's less than the full share, but some contribution would be required.

This is a general problem, by the way. We had to find a way to cover part-time workers. But some employers, perhaps not in the newspaper industry, but some employers, let's say they have a permanent payroll of more or less 500, they may have 6,000 part-time employees coming in and out, and they're worried about the bookkeeping problems with this. So we're, frankly, looking for a way to deal with this that is fair, but we know we have to find some way, given how many part-time workers there are in this country, to find the coverage for part-time workers. And so we asked for a pro rata contribution from the employer but not a full contribution for the part-time workers.

On the other issue, we had a lot of debates about this because a lot of families have been in the situation over time—our family has been—where you have fairly decent health insurance policies that you can access at either place, but if you choose, you only buy one at one place. And I understand what you're saying there.

The problem that we run up against is if you require all employers to make a contribution and employees to match, or at least you give them the right to require their employees to pay the match, which most people do anyway, then will it be fair to one small business as compared to another if just by the luck of the draw the families always choose to use one plan over another? We're trying to work through that. And the reason we adopted the plan that the idea that everybody was paid we thought under those circumstances, one would pay as an individual so that the premiums would be quite a bit lower, but it would avoid putting some businesses at a dramatic competitive disadvantage to others.

Again, that was one of the tough issues in this whole debate. If you have an idea about it, I would urge you to get in touch with our health care task force. We tried to work through it in a way that wouldn't put any group of businesses or individual business at a disadvantage compared to others. And that's why we wound up with that approach, giving people the option to, in effect, pay lower rates at each place and pay something, than pay a much higher rate at one place and nothing at all at another.

Q. Mr. President, we appreciate you taking time out from your busy schedule to address us. You'll always have a special place in the history of this organization since you've, today, become the first President of the United States to ever address the leading State newspaper organization in the U.S.

Once again, thank you very much.

The President. Well, I've enjoyed it very much. And I thank you all very much. I just want to try to encourage you. You know, I know California has been through so much. You went through an earthquake in the north a couple of years ago, the fires, the earthquake in the south, the riots in L.A., and all the incredible economic problems because of the defense downsizing going back to the late eighties. But fundamentally, the health, the strength, the diversity of California is staggering. And the future is bright. And I am committed to doing everything I can to make sure you get fair treatment and a genuine partnership and a better chance at a tomorrow from our administration.

And I thank you, and I thank you for your probing questions. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:33 p.m. via satellite from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building. The press release issued by the Office of the Press Secretary did not include the complete opening remarks of the President. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Statement on the Executive Order on Environmental Justice
February 11, 1994

All Americans have a right to be protected from pollution—not just those who can afford to live in the cleanest, safest communities. Today we direct Federal agencies to make environmental justice a part of all that they do.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the signing of the Executive order, which is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Memorandum on Environmental Justice
February 11, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of All Departments and Agencies

Subject: Executive Order on Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

Today I have issued an Executive order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. That order is designed to focus Federal attention on the environmental and human health conditions in minority communities and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice. That order is also intended to promote nondiscrimination in Federal programs substantially affecting human health and the environment, and to provide minority communities and low-income communities access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment.

The purpose of this separate memorandum is to underscore certain provision of existing law that can help ensure that all communities and persons across this Nation live in a safe and healthful environment. Environmental and civil rights statutes provide many opportunities to address environmental hazards in minority communities and low-income communities. Application of these existing statutory provisions is an important part of this Administration's efforts to prevent those minority communities and low-income communities from being subject to dis-

proportionately high and adverse environmental effects.

I am therefore today directing that all department and agency heads take appropriate and necessary steps to ensure that the following specific directives are implemented immediately:

In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, each Federal agency shall ensure that all programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance that affect human health or the environment do not directly, or through contractual or other arrangements, use criteria, methods, or practices that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Each Federal agency shall analyze the environmental effects, including human health, economic and social effects, of Federal actions, including effects on minority communities and low-income communities, when such analysis is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. section 4321 *et seq.* Mitigation measures outlined or analyzed in an environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, or record of decision, whenever feasible, should address significant and adverse environmental effects of proposed Federal actions on minority communities and low-income communities.

Each Federal agency shall provide opportunities for community input in the NEPA process, including identifying potential effects and mitigation measures in consultation with affected communities and improving the accessibility of meetings, crucial documents, and notices.

The Environmental Protection Agency, when reviewing environmental effects of proposed action of other Federal agencies under section 309 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. section 7609, shall ensure that the involved agency has fully analyzed environmental effects on minority communities and low-income communities, including human health, social, and economic effects.

Each Federal agency shall ensure that the public, including minority communities and low-income communities, has adequate access to public information relating to human health or environmental planning, regulations, and enforcement when required under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. section 552, the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. section 552b, and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, 42 U.S.C. section 11044.

* * *

This memorandum is intended only to improve the internal management of the Executive Branch and is not intended to nor does it create, any right, benefit, or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Note: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks on Signing California Earthquake Relief Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

February 12, 1994

The President. Good morning. I'm glad to be here with the Speaker and members of the California delegation and one member of the Missouri delegation, Secretary Brown and Senator Hatfield and others, to sign this bill today.

This was legislation requested by our administration to provide the most comprehensive national response ever to a region experiencing a natural disaster, the earthquake which inflicted such damage in the Los Angeles area on January 17th. Many people had their lives shaken and transformed by the damage caused by the Northridge quake. They faced the human tragedy of 61 deaths, nearly 10,000 injuries requiring hospitalization, and many, many thousands of people who lost their homes, their jobs, or otherwise had their lives turned upside down.

We saw the fierce power of the shifting earth twist and break highways, uproot homes, ignite fires, and literally reshape parts of the Los Angeles landscape. More than 150 public schools were damaged. Five hospitals suffered destruction requiring as much as $700 million in repair. Much of the damage will take months if not

years. It is only the latest hardship that the people of that area have experienced.

The first line of defense was the spirit the people of Los Angeles brought to this tragedy. Before the tremors had a chance to subside, we saw all the moving stories of neighbors helping neighbors; police, fire, rescue, and medical people serving without rest; and dedicated public officials who put people above politics. Although the central highway throughout the region sustained enormous damage, imaginative means were immediately employed to permit a return to some semblance of normal life. Crime was down 21.5 percent in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake. Something good happened amidst all that tragedy as people pulled together and they stayed together.

The second line of defense against the quake was coordinated by FEMA under the leadership of James Lee Witt. FEMA has already accepted over 300,000 applications for disaster assistance. HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros led his Department's efforts to provide emergency housing aid. The SBA is processing nearly a quarter of a million applications from homeowners and businesses for disaster loans. Transportation Secretary Pena and Highway Administrator Slater are doing work to try to speed the highway repairs and to try to help provide alternative means of transportation. In each of these agencies, people are serving the way the taxpayers deserve to be treated, as customers, neighbors, and friends.

Today we put in motion the third line of defense: Federal disaster relief for California. It was the largest package of such aid in history, and as Congressman Volkmer's presence here reminds us, it also contains some aid for the people who suffered from the 500-year flood in the Middle West.

The bill provides $8.6 billion in housing assistance and home repairs, repairs to public facilities, transit and road reconstruction, school repairs, loans to get businesses back in business, plus funds I'll be able to use to respond to unanticipated needs. Congress considered and adopted this legislation very quickly. Democratic and Republican representatives from California in the affected region worked in close cooperation. Senators Boxer and Feinstein, the House delegation, Mayor Riordan, Governor Wilson represented the needs of the city and the States very well. And I want to compliment the legislators throughout the country for recognizing that this is a national problem and making it a national effort.

Ultimately, the reconstruction of Los Angles will depend upon the resilience and the patience of the people there. Their will has been tested often over the last several years. Their spirit has remained unbroken, and I'm confident it will continue to be. Secretary Brown is here to symbolize the ongoing effort we have had to work with the people of California under his coordinated leadership since the beginning of our administration. Just yesterday we had White House officials there working on the long-term repair work to make sure that the people of California did not believe that this was just a short-term effort on our part.

We have to continue to do this. The size of the appropriation and the speed with which Congress adopted it indicates the generosity of the American people when tragedy strikes. What we now have to demonstrate is that we have the consistency of commitment to stay until this matter is put back together. It's the same thing I said to the people in the Middle West who were affected by the floods; we know there's a short-term and a long-term problem. But I must compliment the Congress on this terrific response to the terrible tragedy of January 17th. And I'm glad to be signing it today, and I'm glad that the benefits will begin to flow tomorrow.

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

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, did you share with Prime Minister Hosokawa at your breakfast any of the measures the U.S. is now considering in light of the breakdown in talks?

The President. No, it was a totally social visit. Mrs. Hosokawa came, I gave them a tour of the upstairs at the White House, and we talked about other things. We did talk a little bit about Latin America and a little about China, but otherwise there was nothing that could even be remotely characterized as business.

Q. Where do you think the United States will go next?

The President. We'll have to examine what our next step should be, and I will be turning to that next week. As I said, we worked until 4 o'clock in the morning the night before last hoping to get an agreement, and part of it de-

pends upon whether the framework agreement is something that both countries will adhere to. If you go back and read the framework agreement, it plainly called for the development of objective measures, qualitative or quantitative or both—those were the words used in the agreement—to see whether we're making progress in reducing this trade deficit. So we'll just have to assess where we are and what happens. I don't really have anything else to say about it today.

Q. Thank you.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:07 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. H.R. 3759, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, approved February 12, was assigned Public Law No. 103–211.

The President's Radio Address
February 12, 1994

Good morning. Twenty-six days ago the people of Los Angeles suffered a devastating earthquake. Sixty-one people died; thousands of homes were destroyed; thousands of people were hospitalized. Highways were broken and twisted by the violent movement of the earth.

Because of the extent of the damage, I have just approved $8.6 billion in emergency disaster assistance for the people of California to help them rebuild roads and other public structures, to fix gas lines, provide small business loans, and help pay the expenses of people who have lost their homes. Many have lost everything. With $900 million in aid already on the way, the total payment nears $10 billion, the largest Federal disaster assistance ever. Our country's mission, as it is after every national disaster, is to help our people recover from this tragedy and to get on with the business of everyday life. Across much of our country, everyday life has been interrupted by heavy snow and harsh winter cold. So please take care of yourselves and your neighbors who may need help.

When we respond to others in need, we show that bad weather or earthquakes or floods can bring out, in the words of President Abraham Lincoln, "the better angels of our nature." By the way, Abraham Lincoln was born in a log cabin in Kentucky 185 years ago today. He became President just as our country was coming apart, and he lived in the White House during the 4 most troubled years in American history. From here he appealed to the best in the American people when they were going through their worst. Here his hand trembled as he set his pen to the proclamation that declared slaves thenceforth and forever free. In freeing the slaves, Lincoln freed America. A war to preserve the Union as it was became a struggle to redeem the promise of our Declaration of Independence, which holds that all men are created equal.

Lincoln went to Gettysburg, the bloodiest battlefield on our continent, to dedicate a cemetery for the war dead. There he asked America to "resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the Earth." We call Lincoln the Great Emancipator, but we might also call him the Great Conciliator because no person in our history ever did more to bring us together, this vast nation of great diversity, of many political and religious beliefs and all its ethnic backgrounds.

As the Civil War neared its close, many of the victors approached the vanquished with pride and with punishment. But Lincoln called for humility and forgiveness. His second Inaugural Address contained none of the bitterness toward others, none of the petty partisan attacks that had grown so frequent in those days. "With malice toward none; with charity for all," he said, "with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up that Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just

and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations." At that moment, it was as if Lincoln had stretched out his long arms to gather up the people from every region and every corner of the country to make our Nation whole, to shepherd it beyond the war and move it forward. Only one month later, he was gone, his life taken on Good Friday, 1865.

Lincoln's legacy has touched us all down through the ages. Few now remember that he signed the homestead law giving 160 acres of land to pioneer families in search of better lives. A son of a frontier family himself, he signed a law to create land-grant colleges, which have educated America's sons and daughters ever since. Lincoln's work allowed people from ordinary backgrounds like his own to rise in life and accomplish extraordinary things. Today that work goes on. Our job here is to build up and strengthen the great American middle class, to give opportunity to all, to help our communities rid themselves from crime and drugs, to help families protect themselves from bankruptcy due to spiraling health care costs, to move people away from lifetime welfare toward full-time work, and to allow everyone who works hard to get ahead and compete and win in the new global economy.

Still the question recurs, can we do better?—just as Lincoln asked us when he said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

"Fellow-citizens, *we* can not escape history," he said. "We . . . will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. . . . We, even *we here*, hold the power and bear the responsibility. . . . We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of Earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which if followed the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless." Those words from Abraham Lincoln should guide our path today.

Thanks for listening, and may God bless us all.

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

Statement on the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program
February 12, 1994

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 103–112, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994, I am making available an appropriation of $200 million in budget authority for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I designate the entire amount made available as an Emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 12, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Military Offensive in Sudan
February 12, 1994

The administration condemns the new military offensive by the armed forces of the Government of Sudan on populations in the south. These outrageous attacks on civilian and military targets demonstrate a callous lack of concern for the lives of innocent Sudanese and a disregard for efforts to promote peace. This offensive will only increase the suffering of the Sudanese people, create thousands of new refugees,

and undermine the ongoing international humanitarian relief effort.

In response, the President has directed a number of diplomatic and humanitarian actions to be taken. He has instructed Ambassador Donald Petterson in Khartoum to protest vigorously this military action to the Government of Sudan. The State Department called in the Sudanese Ambassador in Washington to underscore our concern over the military offensive and especially the indiscriminate bombing of civilians. Our Ambassador in Kenya is urging leaders in Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, and Eritrea to redouble their efforts, through the Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD), to stop the fighting and to bring about peace in Sudan. The President also intends to appoint a high-level Special Envoy to Sudan to assist efforts to achieve a cease-fire and permanent peace agreement there.

Since fiscal year 1993, we have provided more than $160 million in humanitarian assistance to the people of southern Sudan. In response to this latest tragedy, we are consulting with nongovernmental organizations in order to identify new ways to facilitate humanitarian assistance in Sudan. We are also conducting an assessment of anticipated needs in preparation for increased food aid to Sudanese refugees in Uganda, Kenya, and Zaire. We will consult with our Special Humanitarian Representative for Sudan, Ambassador John Burroughs, when he returns next week.

Despite the Government of Sudan's participation in regional humanitarian summits, it continues to violate humanitarian principles, causing further loss of life and hardship in the region. We call on the Government of Sudan to cease these actions and recognize that the future political and economic stability of Sudan depends upon all parties' respecting basic humanitarian principles.

Remarks on Signing the Economic Report of the President and an Exchange With Reporters

February 14, 1994

The President. Good morning, everybody. Before I say a few words about this year's economic report, I want to thank the Chair and the members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Laura Tyson, Dr. Alan Blinder, Dr. Joseph Stiglitz, and their very dedicated staff for putting this report together and for being so productive and persistent in fighting to change the conditions of economic life for ordinary Americans by helping me to implement a coherent strategy and changing the direction of economic policy in this country.

The American economy is once again on the path to renewal, the path of rising output, increasing employment, and falling deficits. This did not happen by accident. It is the result of a disciplined, unified, carefully thought-out strategy.

There have been many reports in addition to this report which have said essentially the same thing over the last few months, that we now have the best conditions for long-term sustained economic growth that we've had in two to three decades. Our steadfast commitment to deficit reduction is one reason. It's helped to produce the lowest core inflation and interest rates in 20 years. And that has led to increasing business investment, more auto sales, more home sales, and millions of Americans refinancing their homes.

With the passage of NAFTA and the completion of the GATT agreement, with our efforts in Asia and with the national export strategy, we've done more to open world markets for our country and our products than at any time in the last generation. Most important, last year our economy created almost 2 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than were created in the previous 4 years combined.

And so we have a good strong start on an economic recovery. Our task now is to keep it, to expand it, to sustain it so that Americans in all parts of the country will feel new opportunities and stronger incomes. We know that our work is not done because there are still too

many people who are unemployed and still too many regions that are in trouble.

So to build on our renewed strength at home and to take full advantage of greater trade opportunities abroad, we continue the process we began last year of reducing the deficit and investing more and more wisely in the foundations of growth. We're keeping faith with deficit reduction in the budget of 1995. In fact, the same experts who predicted that when I became President the deficit would be $300 billion next year, now say it will be 40 percent lower, under $180 billion.

We're leveraging our investment in dual-use defense technologies to keep ourselves commercially competitive and militarily strong. We're investing in new environmental technologies to create new jobs, in the new national information infrastructure which will help us to educate our children, raise productivity, provide better medical care, and reinvent the way our Government works. That's what the Vice President always tells me, and it happens to be true.

And we're investing this year more directly in the American people, in education and training and the skills they need to seize opportunities in a growing economy. And finally, we will further strengthen the foundations of our society and our economy by reforming our health care system, which is too expensive and does too little, and by working to make our welfare system a second chance, not a way of life.

In just one year, this economic team has accomplished a great deal. The initiatives I described comprise our economic strategy. The goal is clear: To secure more jobs and a high and rising standard of living for the American people in an increasingly tough global environment. Because this is a strategy for the long run, its full effects will not be felt overnight. But as we demonstrate in this report I'm about to sign, there are already many signs that the strategy is paying off.

Thank you very much.

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

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, are you going to impose sanctions on Japan?

The President. When our talks stalled last week and it was clear we were at an impasse, I agreed with Prime Minister Hosokawa that we would undertake a period of reflection and give them a chance to do the same thing. So we are now reviewing all of our options, but we haven't ruled anything out.

I might say that the news story that I saw on the cellular telephone today is really quite coincidental with this, although it's illustrative of the same problem. That is, we have been engaged in these talks on cellular telephones for a very long time, and the deadline, as I said, purely coincidentally ran out at this time. But it is a good illustration of the problem we face in entering the Japanese market.

Q. But if you take action in support of Motorola's bid to penetrate the Japanese market, won't that lead to retaliation by the Japanese, and couldn't that be the start of a trade war?

The President. It could be, but I think they would have to think long and hard about it. I mean, after all, with all the Japanese investment in this country and all the jobs that are here and with all the trade we have in Japan, they still have a built-in trade surplus of tens of billions of dollars, and not only with us but with many other countries. They have reached a point now in their gross and wealth and strength when it is simply no longer acceptable for, I think for their own consumers as well as for the rest of us, for them to follow a policy so radically different from the policy of every other advanced economy. It costs jobs and incomes in our country and Europe and other places and causes their people to have to pay almost 40 percent more for basic products. I just think it's an unsustainable policy. I said so last summer when I went there; I still believe it. And it's just not acceptable for the United States to continue on the same path.

Q. What about options other than trade sanctions?

The President. We're looking at several options, but I'm not ruling anything out.

Q. Isn't it a little dangerous now, on the eve of a major decision with North Korea's nuclear program, to enter into this politically difficult period with Japan? The United States will need Japan——

The President. Well, we will need Japan. But the United States, Japan, and China all agree with South Korea on this policy, that we should be pursuing a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. That is not going to change. I would call you back to the statements that both Prime Minister Hosokawa and I made when he was here. We have great common interests and a natural

friendship, and I don't think that's going to change. But the relationship has to change. There are elements in Japanese society and elements in the Japanese political system who very much want the relationship to change. So we're just going to have to see what our options are and proceed.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:42 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan

February 14, 1994

Bosnia

Q. President Nazarbayev, do you support NATO's decision to threaten the Bosnian Serbs with air strikes in case they don't remove all their artillery from the hills surrounding Sarajevo?

President Nazarbayev. Despite the fact that Kazakhstan is well removed from those events by a great distance, I still believe we all as members of the U.N. respect the decision taken by the Security Council.

Q. Mr. President, is there a gap between the U.N. and the United States on what steps need to be taken in order to launch air strikes?

President Clinton. I don't have any reason to believe that there is. Keep in mind the Secretary-General asked NATO to take the action we took and made it clear that—we made it clear that we do not want to take that action unless we could follow through on it, that is, unless the conditions were met that we would take the action we said. And he agreed with that. So I have no reason to believe that there is any difference of opinion.

Q. Do you sense that the Serbs are beginning to cooperate?

President Clinton. I think so. Again, let me say that the larger issue is whether we can move toward a reasonable peace agreement quickly after establishing a safe zone around Sarajevo. But we're just going to have to see. There's still a few more days left before the time runs out.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:35 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan

February 14, 1994

President Clinton. Good afternoon. I'm delighted to welcome President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan to the White House today. This was our first meeting, and it was a very good one.

As I said, this was our first meeting, and it was a very good one. Over the last year I asked both Vice President Gore and Secretary of State Christopher to visit Kazakhstan during their trips to the region. Both told me how impressed they were by the great progress Kazakhstan has achieved under the strong leadership of President Nazarbayev.

While there are many aspects to the widening relationship between our two nations, one of the most important is our work in nuclear nonproliferation. When the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, there were four of the New Independent States, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, who had Soviet strategic nuclear weapons on their territory. One of my highest national security priorities has been to ensure

that the breakup of the former Soviet Union did not lead to the creation of new nuclear states. Such a development would increase the risks of nuclear accidents, diversion, or terrorism. That's why when I was in Minsk last month, I praised Belarus for working to eliminate its nuclear weapons and why last month's historic agreement to destroy over 1,800 nuclear weapons in Ukraine is so important.

In the 2 years since Kazakhstan attained its independence, it has shown the leadership to meet its international arms control obligations and to address the most dangerous legacy of the cold war. Kazakhstan signed a protocol in Lisbon making it a party to the START Treaty. In July of 1992, Kazakhstan ratified that accord. And last December, Vice President Gore had the privilege of being in Almaty when Kazakhstan's Parliament voted to accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a nonnuclear state.

Today I was honored when President Nazarbayev presented me with his Government's instrument of accession to the NPT. This historic step sets an example for the entire world at a pivotal time in international nonproliferation efforts. It will affect over 1,000 warheads from SS–18 missiles, the most deadly in the cold war arsenal of the former Soviet Union.

This step will also allow Kazakhstan and the United States to develop a full and mutually beneficial partnership. To strengthen that partnership and to support Kazakhstan's economic reforms, I am announcing today a substantial increase in the United States assistance to Kazakhstan from $91 million last year to over $311 million this year. In addition, we are prepared to extend another $85 million in funds for the safe and secure dismantlement of nuclear weapons in 1994 and '95.

President Nazarbayev and I also agreed today to continue our efforts to encourage and facilitate trade and investment between our two nations. We signed a charter on democratic partnership which states our common commitment to democratic values, including the rule of law and respect for individual rights. These values were a source of strength in both our multiethnic societies.

The United States and Kazakhstan will also sign agreements today on scientific cooperation, space, defense conversion, investment protection, and other areas. These are the building blocks of a strong and enduring relationship.

The President's visit here today opens a bright new era for that relationship, and the United States looks forward to being Kazakhstan's friend and partner in the months and the years ahead. We believe we have established the basis for a long-term partnership of immense strategic importance and economic potential for the United States.

President Nazarbayev has shown great courage, vision, and leadership, and we are prepared and eager to work closely with him and with the people of Kazakhstan.

Mr. President, the microphone is yours.

President Nazarbayev. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the—[*inaudible*]—official visit to the United States is a crucial stage in the development of the Kazakh-American relationship.

Today, President Clinton and I had talks that were held in a cordial and friendly atmosphere. This has been our first personal meeting, and I'm satisfied to state that it has been a fruitful one.

We have discussed openly a number of important issues of mutual interest. At the center of this discussion were the issues related to a further development of the Kazakh-American bilateral relationship, the latest development in the Commonwealth of Independent States and central Asia and strengthening of international security.

President Clinton and I highly appreciate the dynamics of a development of the Kazakh-American relationship. We unanimously have agreed that—[*inaudible*]—enjoy good prospects for a further expansion and deepening of our cooperation in various areas.

The most important one among the documents that were signed today is the Charter of Democratic Partnership between the Republic of Kazakhstan and the United States of America. This document in everyone's opinion marks a principally new phase in our relationship that has given a larger scale—[*inaudible*]—basis. It covers such aspects as politics, economy, military cooperation, science and technology, ecology, health care, and others.

I familiarized President Clinton with the situation in our region. And I'm satisfied with his deep understanding of Kazakhstan's interest to safeguard its security, territorial integrity, and in viability of existing borders, to—[*inaudible*]—stability and to create a favorable environment to follow the path of a democratic development and economic reforms.

These issues are of exceptional importance to us due to the signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by Kazakhstan as a non-nuclear state. Security guarantees provided by the United States are contained in the charter as well as our participation in multilateral cooperation within the framework of partnership in the name of peace, a program initiated by NATO, strengthened our confidence in the future of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state.

During talks, both parties confirmed their interest in an increased contribution that American businesses can make and to develop the economy of Kazakhstan. The conditions that are necessary for this to happen are there. We believe that American companies that have partaken in this—[*inaudible*]—could determine one of a more promising and mutually beneficial trends in our cooperation. The list of such entities has been submitted to the American business community.

We also believe that the setting up of the Kazakh-American Business Council for Economic Cooperation and to the central Asian funds for small business development with the headquarters at Almaty will also contribute to obtaining the aforementioned objectives. An entirely new aspect of our cooperation will develop when American companies take part in a conversion of the defense industry in Kazakhstan. And agreements have been made to set up a bilateral committee that will deal with these issues.

I'd like to express my gratefulness personally and on behalf of my delegation for the hospitality and warm reception and for the fact that all the problems that were discussed found deep understanding. I believe that the strategic relationship in economy and politics between the United States and Kazakhstan will serve the cause of democracy and economic reforms and will also help establish a just order of—[*inaudible*]—former Soviet Union.

I have invited President Clinton to visit Kazakhstan officially, the times of which will be agreed on through diplomatic channels.

Thank you.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, Bosnian Serbs have withdrawn only 28 of the 500 heavy guns from around Sarajevo. Will NATO carry out its threatened air strikes if any of those guns remain in place by the deadline? And also, do you foresee expanding the demilitarization formula to other areas of the former Yugoslavia?

President Clinton. The latter issue is something that would have to be discussed between ourselves and our allies and the leadership of the U.N.

Let me answer the former question first. I expect that the terms of the NATO agreement will be followed. Keep in mind, the Secretary-General of the United Nations asked us to take action. We agreed to take action. All along the way, the United States made it clear that if we were going to take this step, we had to be prepared to take the step. And we were assured all along the way that our allies in NATO and that the Secretary-General agreed. So I don't believe there is a fundamental misunderstanding on that point.

Let me say, we also have some people here from the press with President Nazarbayev, so I'll try to alternate with this lady, I think, in the back.

NATO Membership

Q. How acceptable is the idea of Kazakhstan's integration into NATO?

President Clinton. Well, first, let me say, I'm grateful that Kazakhstan has agreed to participate in the Partnership For Peace. The whole idea of the Partnership For Peace is to give countries that are not in NATO, that were part of the Warsaw Pact or part of the former Soviet Union or were just simply neutral and not in NATO, the opportunity to participate in military planning and exercises and to increase a level of confidence and security on the part of those countries. No decision has been made by NATO yet about when other new members will be let in. I think there will be some more new members let in, but the thing we're most anxious to do is to move this year—this year—with some joint training and exercises and planning.

Kazakhstan Oil

Q. For all the good feeling between your two countries, is the United States going to block the proposed pipeline between Kazakhstan and Iran—block international financing?

President Clinton. Why don't you let President Nazarbayev respond? We talked about that.

President Nazarbayev. That certainly is the question that must be addressed to me. Kazakhstan, particularly western Kazakhstan, is

a very powerful oil area. According to the estimates, there are about $25 billion—[*inaudible*]—of oil and gas—[*inaudible*]. The first American company, Chevron, that a contract with it was signed last April, has already started producing oil and selling that in international markets. The traditional ways of transporting oil went through Russia and Novorossisk and the Black Sea. In the first place, that's still the priority for us, and we're going to adhere to that and use the existing facilities—and we've got—[*inaudible*]—agreement with the Russian Government.

However, because they—[*inaudible*]—is used for political speculation, naturally Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, that are oil-bearing states, are actively seeking alternative ways. We've got a number of alternatives, the first one of which is to build a pipeline south of the Caspian Sea through Iran and—[*inaudible*]—into the Mediterranean, as well as through the Caspian Sea from the Caucasus and—[*inaudible*]—Mediterranean. The third one is through Iran into the Persian Gulf. All these projects are being examined at the moment, and a feasibility study is being made. And no final decision has been taken yet.

President Clinton. I think the—from my perspective, if I might just follow up, I was impressed with the fact that President Nazarbayev said his first priority was to try to get adequate access to the pipeline that goes through Russia. And we discussed what we might do together to pursue that goal, and I think we should first.

Yes, ma'am.

Future World Order

Q. [*Inaudible*]—at least one of the options of the possible—[*inaudible*]—forecast as to the outcome of the division of the world today? At least as far as the two—[*inaudible*]—are concerned that existed in the past, what is the world's division going to be?

President Clinton. If I knew that, I would be a far smarter man than I am. All I can tell you is that we hope is that the world will not be polarized in the way it has been in the past. We understand fully that neither the United States nor any international organization has the power to wipe all the troubles from the world, that as long as there are civil wars and people are fighting one another based on differences of race or religion or ethnic group or for political reasons, those things will probably occur as long as human beings inhabit this planet. But we hope the end of the cold war gives us a chance to develop a partnership with people all around the world based on shared values and shared commitments to democracy and to economic opportunity and to respecting borders, neighbors' borders, so that we can focus on fighting things that we all disagree with, including the proliferation of dangerous weapons and terrorism.

That is what I hope will happen. That is why the idea behind the Partnership For Peace is to give us a chance to have a Europe which is not divided for the first time since nation states have occupied the territory of Europe. We're doing our best.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, your own economic report today indicates that our trade, our exports with Japan, would improve by only $9 to $12 billion of the total amount of our trade deficit, if all the barriers were dropped. In that case, why are we considering sanctions? Shouldn't we begin looking at our own problems of productivity?

President Clinton. Well, no——

Q. And what is the state of your thinking regarding sanctions and whether this could lead to a trade war?

President Clinton. First of all, $12 billion is a lot of money, even today. Secondly, it's not a question of American productivity. We now know that American productivity is at least as high as that of anyone else in the world. Let me explain what that means—the $12 billion—the trade deficit would drop by $12 billion if all the barriers were removed.

What that means is that in order for us to move closer toward balance, two other things would have to happen which have not happened in this country because of the closed system which has existed. We would have to customize some products for the Japanese people in the Japanese market that would be available then to that market. And secondly, we would have to dramatically step up our efforts to market and to pierce that market. Then you're looking at much more than $12 billion per year. So, I think that that's a very significant thing, much more than $12 billion once those two changes begin to be made.

Also keep in mind the Japanese people today spend 37 percent more than Americans do, for example, on average for consumer products and services, so that—you've got to factor that in. If they actually were paying normal prices for products, goodness knows how much more they might buy and what that would do to the trade relationships of the United States or Europe, for that matter. This is a very important thing. I can only say what I have said already today which is that we have reached no decisions. This is what Prime Minister Hosokawa and I described as a period of reflection.

The story today about the cellular telephone issue is purely coincidental. That is, that's been an issue now for nearly 5 years I think. And the deadline for making a finding of fact, not deciding what action will be taken but for making a finding of fact, just happens to fall tomorrow. But it is, while it's coincidental, it is a problem which is illustrative of our general problem. There is no question that Motorola provides a world-class product, fully competitive in quality and price on that.

Anyone else who's here with President Nazarbayev have a question? Yes, please. Yes, go ahead.

Kazakhstan

Q. Mr. President, how does the United States view Kazakhstan among other central Asian republics, and what place does it give to Kazakhstan within this framework?

President Clinton. The United States believes that Kazakhstan is critically important to our interests and to the future of democracy and stability in central Asia because of its size, because of its geographic location, near China as well as Russia, as well as so many other countries that are important in that area, because of its immense natural wealth, because of its progress in promoting reforms, and because of its strong leadership. So it's a very, very important country to us and a very important part of our future calculations.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, given the strong position you took with your visitor from Japan the other day, are you not now really in a situation where given the expected finding of fact tomorrow, you just about have to impose sanctions?

President Clinton. Well, I'm going to make a decision within a few days. We need to clarify what America's approach is going to be now within the next several days. But I think that what's happened in the cellular telephone case is a classic example of what the problem is. There are a number of options open to us, including some that have not been widely discussed that may offer a great promise here.

And let me also say for those of you who worry about a trade war and other things, this is a battle that is raging not just in the United States and in Europe and in all other parts of the world that have been exposed to the mercantilist policies of Japan, this is a battle that is raging in Japan. And there are a lot of people in Japan who want to take a different course and may be strongly encouraged by the fact that we did not conclude a phony agreement one more time but instead are trying to have an honest progress to a better relationship.

In the interest of equal representation——

U.S. Investment in Kazakhstan

Q. My question actually is for both of you, sort of a follow-up on the oil issue question. President Nazarbayev, your country is going to be receiving substantially more aid from the United States. I'll ask you bluntly if U.S. oil companies will be receiving more preferential treatment in developing your oilfields. Mr. Clinton, I'll ask you if that was a key negotiating point.

President Nazarbayev. I've already mentioned that the first company to start work in Kazakhstan was Chevroil, that's conducted negotiations with the former Soviet Union for about 4 years. And after the collapse of the Soviet Union, we have been able to complete those negotiations in the course of only 6 months. International expertise has been made with respect to this project, and it's considered to be an internationally acceptable one.

The second consortium was put together in western Kazakhstan and such American companies as Mobil Oil, British Petroleum, Agip, total altogether about six major oil companies that are going to explore the depository fields. That exceeds Tengiz by 6 times. An answer—[*inaudible*]—come up with a feasibility study, the priority will in the first place be given to those companies, and the major company among them is Mobil Oil.

This is why I believe that these are very serious contracts that we have signed, altogether about 70 American companies working in

Kazakhstan—[*inaudible*]—oil and gas. They also involve gold and silver mining, manufacturing of nonferrous metals, and processing of agricultural—[*inaudible*.] For the first time Philip Morris bought the entire stock of a tobacco manufacturing plant, and I believe that's a good start.

President Clinton. The short answer to your question is no, there was no quid pro quo. Perhaps I can give a brief but somewhat lengthier explanation because I think it's an important question.

We decided to increase our aid because we thought the money would be well spent, because we see the progress of reform, we see the long-term commitment, and we see the enormous strategic significance in this country and in this President. To be fair on the aid, it might be correctly stated the other way around, that is, instead of our conditioning their aid on any kind of special deal for our people, what we saw was that our people had the confidence, that is our energy companies had the confidence in other companies to go there and invest. I think there are now 70 American companies with investments in Kazakhstan.

So in that sense, they have sent us a message, and they have told us that they believe this is a stable, secure, long-term, positive environment and that we ought to be part of helping to make it so.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 47th news conference began at 1:56 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. President Nazarbayev spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. The tape did not include the translation of President Nazarbayev's remarks.

Interview With Michael Jackson of KABC Radio, Los Angeles, California
February 14, 1994

Mr. Jackson. Good afternoon to you there, sir.

The President. Hello, Michael, how are you?

Mr. Jackson. I must tell you, Mr. President, when people heard that you were coming on this morning, their already broad beams grew broader. People are very, very delighted that you've taken the interest, sir, and the direct concern that you have with the suffering out here. But it's an inspiring morning.

Good morning, sir.

The President. Good morning. It must be inspiring. The courage, the determination demonstrated by the school's administration, faculty, and students to get the campus back in operation so quickly, just a month later, is very impressive. I want to compliment President Blenda Wilson and everyone else who worked on it. I think she's there along with Cal State University Chancellor Barry Munitz. And I just have heard so much about it.

FEMA spent a lot of time out there. I think Dick Krimm's with you there——

Mr. Jackson. Yes, he is. He will be on shortly.

The President. ——and we've had so many reports from Henry Cisneros and Federico Pena and all the people I've had out there and all the people from California who work at the White House who have been out there.

I couldn't believe that you sustained $300 million worth of damage. And all of your 53 buildings were damaged, and you're back open a month later. It's a real tribute to you. So I'm glad to hear the California spirit alive and well. I can hear it in the background from all the clapping and everything.

Mr. Jackson. It's here.

The President. The Vice President is coming out to Northridge on Wednesday to inspect the damage. And I hope you'll all go see him. He's younger and has less gray hair than I do, so more college students should like seeing him. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Jackson. Did he write that comment, Mr. President?

The President. No, no, but he might have. I mean, he's got a pretty good sense of humor about it. We kid each other a lot. And his sense of humor is great, especially if the jokes are at my expense. [*Laughter*]

Federal Aid to California

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, why does it take an earthquake, a disaster of this magnitude to get such a generous response from Washington?

I mean, shouldn't some of the Federal aid and assistance be available to people who are dislocated by, for example, the closure of so many cold-war-related industries here in California?

The President. Absolutely. Absolutely, it does. It should happen. Since I have been in office, we've worked very hard to dramatically increase the amount of assistance in terms of job training and in terms of alternative development of jobs for use of defense technologies, for commercial purposes, and in helping communities put themselves back together.

I came in here with a real philosophy that we ought to be spending a lot of money every year on defense conversion and on other things that dislocated people who wanted to work. So last year we spent $500 million on defense conversion. This year we're going to spend much more. And we need to do more.

Now, keep in mind, one of the things that constrains us now is the enormous Government deficit, which the Congress is normally willing to suspend in the case of an emergency. So that's one of the reasons these things happen more quickly. But we are moving toward investing more in communities and in workers and in new technologies. And it shouldn't take a natural disaster to get us to plan for and take care of the fundamental needs of our people.

Natural Disasters and Insurance

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, Mother Nature really has socked it to us and given most of the Nation a devastating few months. As you read and study the reports and you watch the news, do you have an overall comment that you'd care to make about the way that citizens impacted by hurricanes, blizzards, floods, fires, and now earthquakes have responded to these disasters?

The President. Well, I'd say the American people get an A-plus for the way they've dealt with this. You know, there was a 500-year flood in the Middle West. I visited there several times—just stunned by it. Then in the last several months you've had the fires in California, plus the mudslides and the terrible problem of the earthquake, and of course, another earthquake and the problems in Los Angeles just a couple of years before that. So this is really an enormously difficult time for people, especially in California but in many other parts of the country. And then in the East Coast, you know, we had the bitterest winter in over 100 years and many, many people died there.

But it seems that when these things happen, when nature reminds us that we're not in full control of our destiny, somehow people almost relax more, and they come together; they think about what's really important; they trust each other. I think it's fascinating in how many communities the crime rate dropped dramatically after this earthquake occurred, when presumably it might have been easier to go out and steal from people. People didn't want to do it as much.

I think that sometimes we need to remember what it was like in the midst of one of these natural disasters and see if we can't behave more like that all the time and realize we need each other and we are a community, and when we pull together and work together, we can do unbelievable things in a very short time. When we fight with one another, when we're divided, when we're shortsighted, then none of us can become what we ought to be.

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, I know you've toured the area. It's so easy to assess the damage and compare the scene with a war zone, but I think that's where the comparison ends. But this is a campus of 25,000 students who are hell-bent and determined to get on with life, to get on with their education, and they don't look like refugees from a battlefield. Sir, should——

The President. Good.

Mr. Jackson. Good. Mr. President, should there be such a thing as automatic sort of mandated natural disaster insurance so that no one is left out when the hurricanes and the earthquakes, et cetera strike?

The President. Well, we're looking at that. Let me say, we're trying to do more to try to reduce the cost of people and property of natural disasters by doing a better job of thinking ahead, by choosing where we will build with an awareness of potential disasters, by constructing what we do build very well, by retrofitting where it's cost-effective. You know, a lot of the retrofitting that was done on the highway structures in California really worked. And if we had had another 6, 7 months before this last earthquake, we would have retrofitted more and had even less damage. So these are things that we have to really invest a lot more time and effort in.

With regard to having a Federal disaster insurance fund, I think that you have to remember that insurance works when the risk is spread broadly. And that requires a lot of people to participate, including many who don't think they're particularly at risk and others who may not be particularly at risk.

So when the taxpayers do it like this, we spread the risk very broadly across all of us who live in America because some of us are in trouble. If there were a way to use insurance mechanisms to do a better job so we wouldn't have to increase the deficit, that would be better still. But we have to ask ourselves whether that would be putting even more burden on people who are really not at risk.

We're thinking about it, and we're soliciting ideas. And there are a lot of bright people in universities all over California and in businesses who may have some good ideas about this. And I assure you that—three or four have already been presented to us, and we're going to research them all very carefully and eagerly look for other options, because we have been very fortunate that we could get the money through the Congress to deal with the floods and to deal with the earthquakes. But it is a difficult thing.

Health Care Reform

Mr. Jackson. When we have health care reform, will the new system, whatever its final shape, better serve the masses in time of a major disaster?

The President. Oh, absolutely. I kept wondering, when I was out in California and I realized how many people were hurt or needed medical care or thrown out of their homes and maybe subject to overexposure, how many of those people didn't have health insurance, whether they didn't go to the doctor or didn't visit the hospital just because they didn't have any coverage, or whether they did, took medical care, and now wonder whether they can afford to pay for it or whether they're at risk of bankruptcy.

If we would simply join the ranks of all the other advanced countries in the world and provide comprehensive health care that can never be taken away through a system of guaranteed private insurance, it would stabilize life for working families enormously. I also will say that according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study issued about a week ago, small businesses would benefit perhaps more than big businesses because their premiums would go down and everybody would be covered.

We have simply got to stop making excuses and saying, "Well, America's the only country in the world that can't figure out how to cover its folks." You've got almost one in four people living in California without any health insurance—citizens, never mind the immigrant population, citizens who don't have health care. We have got to do a better job.

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, Blenda Wilson, who's the president of CSUN, would love to ask you a question if she may. And by the way, I've just realized why it was difficult for you to get through to Boris Yeltsin, sir. He was worried that you might have been calling for disaster relief. [*Laughter*]

The President. I thought I might have to get on the phone and phone around the world to get enough money to deal with it, but we made it. [*Laughter*]

Disaster Assistance and Education

Blenda Wilson. Mr. President, we're delighted that you would join us on this opening of our spring term. While we've been talking about disaster relief and health care, I recall your work several years ago with the education commission of the States and found you to be a strong advocate of education, partly because, I think, you realize as we do that the young people and middle-age people, for that matter, who attend California State University will be those citizens and employees and employers and entrepreneurs that are essential to economic development. When you think about the relationship of disaster relief and higher education and work-study programs, which are very important to you, what would you say to the students that are gathered here at this public university?

The President. Well, first of all, I'm proud of the fact that Congress was able to come up with the money to fully reimburse Cal State, Northridge, for the losses it incurred, along with a 10 percent match coming from the State. I'm very proud of that.

Secondly, I hope that during this clean-up effort, there will be even more jobs available in the short run, which will help a lot and which some of your students will be able to get.

But thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, the average age of a college student today is a little over 26 years of age. More and more

people recognize that if they want to get a good job with a growing income, if they don't want to have the kind of stagnant wages that most American workers have been saddled with for 20 years, they've got to have at least 2 years of post-high-school education and training. And we are busily engaged here in Washington in passing some education legislation and some training legislation which will make it easier for every person in America to get those 2 years of post-high-school education and training. That's the most important thing of all. If you stay there, if you see it through, if you go on and get a 4-year education, the more you have, the better your prospects are. But we know, based on the 1990 census, we actually now have hard evidence that the global economy is punishing high school dropouts, punishing high school graduates, and rewarding people who have 2 years or more of post-high-school education.

So if we want to restructure the California economy and we want new jobs in high-tech areas without the guarantee of defense, we've got to make sure that every young person and every not-so-young person in California who will go to a place like Cal State, Northridge, does so.

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, I can't think of an occasion when a Chief Executive of the United States has aligned himself so immediately and completely with a Californian concern or issue, in this case a natural disaster. Our leader locally is Mayor Richard Riordan, of course.

The President. Is he there?

Mr. Jackson. Yes.

Mayor Richard Riordan. Mr. President?

The President. I had to do it, otherwise he would have camped out on my doorstep here and never gone home. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Riordan. Well, I feel like you've been camping out on our doorstep. I'd like to thank you on behalf of not only the students, faculty, and staff of Northridge but all the citizens of L.A. for your A-plus effort and your A-plus team. We've had, I think, more Cabinet members in Los Angeles in the last month than you've had in Washington.

The President. Thank you, Mayor.

Mr. Jackson. Mr. President, thank you so very much, indeed, for taking our call on the spur of the moment like that, sir.

The President. Thank you, Michael. Let me just say one thing. I want to compliment the Mayor and everybody that we've worked with in California. I know you could say that they're so good at this because you're becoming experts at dealing with disasters. But let me say, I was a Governor for 12 years. I went through floods and hurricanes, I saw whole little towns blown away. I have lived through a lot of these things. And I cannot say enough about the leadership of the Mayor and the people out there. The work that they've done, it's just been terrific.

And in terms of doing this radio program, you know, one of the things I said I'd do if I ever were fortunate enough to be elected President is to try to give this job back to the people of this country and their real concerns. And you know, I just left a very important meeting with the President of Kazakhstan. That's a long way away, but it affects American interests. But our interests can only be affected there if people in California can succeed, if the people who are listening to this radio program can succeed.

So, I think I did my job today by talking to you, and I just loved it. I thank you for giving me a chance to do it.

Mr. Jackson. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you. Bye bye.

NOTE: The telephone interview began at 2:35 p.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Krimm, Assistant Associate Director for Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Letter to Burmese Opposition Leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi
February 10, 1994

Dear Daw Aung San Suu Kyi:

Let me take the opportunity to express again my deep concern about your welfare and to applaud your remarkable courage in pursuing human rights and democracy for the people of Burma. Despite your four and one-half years of detention, your determination and courage continue to inspire friends of freedom around the world. Recent resolutions adopted in the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Human Rights Commission make clear the international community's outrage over your continued detention as well as that of all other prisoners of conscience in Burma.

I also want to assure you of the United States' continuing support for the struggle to promote freedom in Burma. The 1990 elections handed your party an overwhelming mandate from Burma's people and firmly rejected military rule. Obviously, the path to democratic change must be worked out by the Burmese themselves who have assigned you a key role in bringing about such a democratic transition. We strongly condemn the effort to deny you the right to participate freely in the political life of Burma.

You have my utmost admiration for your stand. Like your courageous father, you symbolize the authentic aspirations of the Burmese people. History is on the side of freedom throughout the world and I remain confident that your cause will prevail.

Please accept my warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter. The letter was attached to the following statement by the Press Secretary which was released on February 15:

President Clinton has sent a letter to detained Burmese opposition leader and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Aung San Suu Kyi to offer his support for her efforts on behalf of democracy and human rights in Burma. Congressman Bill Richardson of New Mexico, Deputy Majority Whip, was invited by Burmese authorities to meet with Aung San Suu Kyi on February 14 and has delivered the President's letter to her. He met with her again today. Congressman Richardson is the first person outside of Aung San Suu Kyi's immediate family to meet with her since she was placed under house arrest in July 1989.

The United States urges Burma's military leaders to build on this small step by beginning a dialog with Aung San Suu Kyi and moving toward genuine democratic reform. The Burmese people made clear their desire for an end to more than three decades of military rule and the establishment of democratic government in the 1990 elections, but the government continues to thwart implementation of the results. The President regards the continued detention of Aung San Suu Kyi and all other prisoners of conscience in Burma as unacceptable and renews his call for their immediate and unconditional release.

Remarks to the Law Enforcement Community in London, Ohio
February 15, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Ray Skillern, for that introduction and, even more important, for your personal endorsement of community policing. I'm glad to be here with John Lenhart and Greg Merritt and my longtime friend Attorney General Lee Fisher. I thank him for what he said and for the work he is doing with all of you here in Ohio with Operation Crackdown and with many other anticrime initiatives.

I thank Senator Glenn and Senator Biden for coming down here. Senator Biden doesn't represent Ohio, except he represents all the law enforcement people in Ohio as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I appreciate him taking a whole day off from this break and

coming down and being with Senator Glenn and me and being here with your Congresswoman Deborah Pryce. The three of them will have to vote to produce a crime bill that will deal with the issues I came here to discuss with you today.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation to all the State officials who have come out either here or at the airport and to Ron Noble, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who came down with me. He has a lot to do with not only the Secret Service, who are my law enforcement detail—that's a job in itself from time to time—but also with the work we're doing to try to stiffen the regulations on gun dealers. I want to say a little more about that in a moment.

And finally, let me thank the leaders of the police associations who are here: the FOP president, Dewey Stokes, from Ohio; the head of the National Association of Police Officers, Bob Scully, who came down with us; and your State FOP president, Steve Young. I thank all of them.

I came here today because your work, all of you who are in law enforcement, is probably more important to most Americans today than it has ever been in the whole history of the country. We know what crime and violence is doing to our people. The good news is that they know what it's doing to them, and they really want us to do something about it. And maybe for the first time, the American people are willing to do their part, too.

This is a moment of great hope and opportunity for America. Everywhere I go it's what people want to talk to me about. The other day I flew into Shreveport, Louisiana, and the front page of the newspaper had a letter that a teenage girl had written to me. So she came out to meet me at the airport, this young girl. And her letter said this: "If I could meet the President, I would ask him to make his top priority crime. Crime is so bad I'm afraid to go outside. I really didn't pay attention to crime until someone shot and killed my friend who was one of my church members. My concern is,"—listen to this—"My concern is I won't have anyone to marry because all the nice young men will have been killed, incarcerated, or in a gang. If I could give only one gift to America and the world, it would be no guns, no killing, just peace."

Over the weekend, four people were shot, and a little girl was killed in an apartment complex in Bucyrus, not too far from here. This morning I met the widow and the father of Officer Chris Clites of the Columbus Police Department who was killed in the line of duty. I met a 14-year-old girl named Sarah Johnson from Cleveland who saw a friend of hers being beaten by three juveniles and two adults, and she ran into the crowd and threw herself on the body of her friend, unfortunately, too late to save his life. Too bad no adults would follow her example, maybe the child would be living today. I met a woman named Anne Ross from Dayton, whose life has been threatened repeatedly because she began a program called Ravenwood 2000 that works with police to close crack houses in her neighborhood, something the Attorney General has worked so hard on. I met a man named Jim Johnson, who's from the Driving Park area of east Columbus, who's devoting much of his life now to crime patrols and helping citizens work with police officers to reduce the crime rate.

In the last three decades, violent crimes have increased by 300 percent. Over the last 3 years, almost a third of Americans have either had themselves or someone in their families victimized by crime. Yesterday was the 65th anniversary of the Saint Valentine's Day Massacre in Chicago, which captured the entire Nation's attention. The country was riveted by the Saint Valentine's Day Massacre. Some of you may be old enough to remember it as children; I have seen movies about it. It absolutely galvanized the Nation. In 1929, seven people were killed; that was a massacre in 1929. In most cities today, it's a normal weekend.

What are we going to do about this? Here is what our administration is trying to do. First, we want a drug strategy that gets hard-core drug users, who cause most of the drug-related crimes, off the streets, out of crime, and into treatment. Second, we want a tough, smart crime bill that puts 100,000 more police officers on the street and violent criminals behind bars. Third, we want to use every resource at our disposal to fight crime and drugs from public schools to public housing. Fourth, we want to give our young people something to say "yes" to by putting hope and opportunity back in their lives. And finally, we want to challenge every American to work with you, the law enforcement community, as partners, to put the values of

work and family and community back at the center of the lives of our young people before it is too late for them.

I care a lot about this problem. The first elected job I ever had was as attorney general of my home State. I was a Governor for a dozen years. I know what it means to double the prison capacity of a State and to sign laws toughening crimes and to carry out the death penalty, to add to the stock of police officers and try to deal with all the problems that are facing them. I know this is a tough problem. I also know it is a complicated one. It's easy to demagogue, easy to talk about, and quite another thing to do something that will make a fundamental difference in the lives of the people of this country.

You have to help us to do something that is tough but that is also smart, something that will actually make a difference to every one of you when you get up in the morning and you put on your uniform and you put on your weapon and you go out and put your life on the line. You need to work with us to make sure that what we do makes a difference to you and to what you're doing, that it's not just another bunch of political speeches that sound good and score 90 percent in the polls, but may not make a difference. You need to make sure we make a difference.

The purpose of all public service, your work and mine, should be to get people together and to get something done. That is what we are trying to do here.

First of all, it's clear that to reduce crime significantly in America we have to reduce hardcore drug use. Last week our Drug Policy Director Lee Brown, who was the chief of police in Houston, Atlanta, and New York, and one of the pioneers of the community policing concept that Patrolman Skillern talked so eloquently about, announced, along with me, our strategy on drug control and drug abuse. It focuses on hardcore drug use because that's the worst part of the problem. Heavy users can—just for example, heavy users are about 20 percent of all cocaine users, but they consume two-thirds of the available cocaine. And more than 50 percent of the people arrested for crimes now test positive for drugs. We have got to get these hardcore users off the street. For those who are going to be back on the street, we have got to get them into treatment. We want to help them get the treatment they need, but if they don't get the message we have to use the courts, the jails, the prisons to make sure they do. Our budget and the crime bill, if they both pass, will help us to get another 140,000 hardcore drug users into substantial treatment programs that have a chance to work per year.

There are two other things that we have emphasized. First of all, there is a disturbing bit of evidence in this last year that casual drug use among young people is beginning to rise again. And we have to get the message out to them. The only policy to follow is no use. Drugs are dangerous. Drugs are illegal. It cannot become acceptable among young people to use drugs again. We have got to send the message out loud and clear. We know the most powerful tool we have over the long run is changing the whole culture in America. I don't know how many of you have been active in the DARE program, but when my daughter was in the 5th grade I heard her and her classmates give me no less than 10 speeches about the officer that came on a regular basis in the DARE program. It makes a difference whether kids are told early and clearly, by someone they really respect, that the only sensible policy is no use.

And finally, we're going to try to alter our policy relating to controlling the supply of drugs coming into this country. We spend a lot of time trying to patrol our borders. We spend a lot of time trying to patrol the high seas. We want to spend more money, more resources, and more efforts going after the drug dealers and the drug kingpins in their home countries. They come after us at home; we should go after them at home. The drug strategy must work with the crime bill. And the most important message I have to say to you again today is we need your help to pass a crime bill that makes a difference.

Last summer I stood with police officers and leaders of police associations, along with Senator Biden as the chair of the Judiciary Committee and the longtime strongest, most consistent proponent of getting a new crime bill, to propose a comprehensive plan to put more police on the streets, more criminals behind bars, and to do more than we'd ever done before to prevent crime. Just before Thanksgiving, as Lee Fisher said, the Congress passed the Brady bill, which requires a 5-day waiting period before purchasing a handgun so we can check into criminal records.

Meanwhile, in the Senate, Senator Biden introduced our anticrime bill, working with the Attorney General and with Members in both parties of the Senate. It went through the Senate, and it provides, among other things, for another 100,000 police officers on the street, for a ban on assault weapons, for an enormous increase in the investment that the Federal Government makes to the States for alternatives to imprisonment, like boot camps for young people, and more help for States. It's a big deal in Ohio, to deal with prison overcrowding and for some other things that I'll talk more about in a minute. It's a very good bill.

In the House, there were important parts of the program which were adopted, but the House has not yet succeeded in passing all the elements of the crime bill so that the Senate and House can then get together, agree on a common bill, pass it, and send it to me for signature.

The American people have waited on this bill long enough. It was almost passed, or a previous version of it, in 1992, and it didn't pass. This bill needs to be passed, on my desk for signature soon. This is not something we should take all year doing. We should take a few weeks, do it right, and send it to the President's desk.

I'll make this commitment: If Congress will pass the bill soon, I will respond by cutting through the redtape and the bureaucracy in Washington so that within a year 20,000 new police officers are hired and start the training that they need to make our streets safer. We need some clear things in the crime bill that come out of both the Senate and the House.

What's the bottom line? One, we've got to have a stronger police presence not only to catch criminals but to prevent crime. The Senate's approved and the House should approve another 100,000 police officers over the next 5 years. It will be paid for not by new taxes but through a violent crime trust fund that will pay for the entire crime bill through reductions in the Federal bureaucracy—reductions by attrition. We have proposed to reduce the number of Federal employees over the next 5 years by 252,000. That's a 12-percent reduction. It would make the Federal Government the smallest it's been in 30 years and take the entire amount of money we get from the savings and put it into fighting crime. I think it's a good swap.

But if we do it, then it's important that the local departments do what Ray Skillern talked about. We've got to have more police officers on the street, people who know their neighbors and know the children and understand when there are problems and listen to people when there's a stranger in the neighborhood and do things that are necessary to keep crime from happening in the first place as well as to catch criminals quicker. We know that works. We know that works.

The mayor of Houston was recently reelected with 91 percent of the vote. You can't get 91 percent of the people to agree that the sun's coming up tomorrow morning. [*Laughter*] Why? Because he put another 655 police officers on the street, and in one year—15 months—crime dropped 22 percent and the murder rate dropped 27 percent. Why? Because the police officers did two things: They got back in touch with the community, and they were heavily deployed toward the areas where they knew the biggest problems would be. We can do this. We can do this. We'll provide the people; you have to deploy them properly. But we can do it.

Now once again, this is an issue where the people may be ahead of Washington. We've got a smaller program that the Attorney General runs that the Congress has provided for us to put more police officers on the street. It's a grant program, and communities of all sizes all across America apply for it. We have given out 100 grants to cities and communities nationwide, including four in Ohio, to Cleveland, Mansfield, Newark, and Xenia. Now that's the good news. The bad news is, we have received applications from 3,000 communities. And instead of making people happy, every time—because there's so much focus on this at the grassroots—every time we announce these grants I get 10 calls from mayors saying, "I helped you in 1992. I've got a problem. Where's my money?" The answer is, your money is in the crime bill. Help us pass it, so we can help all of America and not just a few.

Second, the crime bill stiffens penalties. It does add capital punishment for a number of crimes and some of them are quite appropriate. When someone kills a law enforcement officer in the line of duty, I think the penalty for that ought to be death. There ought to be a deterrent that is clear and unambiguous. But even more significant perhaps is the concept that is now sweeping America that is known under the slogan "three strikes and you're out." And I want to talk about it because I support it. A

significant percentage of the violent crimes in this country are done by a very small percentage of the total criminal population. Most criminals are nonviolent. Most criminals who commit violent offenses are not committing life-threatening offenses or rape. We know that. We know that there are a core of people who are predisposed to do things which are horrible, and that is the genesis of the "three strikes and you're out." If people cannot stop doing things that threaten other people's lives, they simply shouldn't be eligible for parole.

Now, the important thing about this is, if we're going to pass it in the Congress we ought to do it right. There should be no partisanship in this, no politics, no posturing. We ought to do what is right for America. We ought to pass a tough, good, clear bill, but we shouldn't litter it up with every offense in the world that the average police officer will tell you in the front end shouldn't be part of it. In other words, we need to draw this properly and right, so we can set a standard that says "three strikes and you're out" and it means something that every American can agree with.

And then we have to recognize, as all of you know, that most laws, criminal laws, are State laws, and most criminal law enforcement is done by local police officials. And therefore, we have to hope that what we do in the Congress will set a standard that all other States then across the country will embrace, so we can identify the relatively small number of people that are wreaking heartbreak and devastation and death and put them behind bars and keep them there.

When we do that we also have to help you with more space for dealing with some of your prison problems. And we are debating what the best way to do that is. I want to say, on the way down here today, Senator Glenn gave me a speech—I could tell he'd given it before, but it still was good—[*laughter*]—about the Ohio prison overcrowding problem and how we ought to have nonviolent offenders and less expensive construction. He said, "You know, when I was a Marine, a quonset hut was good enough for me, and it ought to be good enough for criminals as well." Because I was a Governor and an attorney general I could write you a book on the cost of building penitentiaries and what's wrong with it, but I won't do that today.

The fourth thing we need to do is to make sure the criminals are not better armed than police officers. We ought to pass the assault weapons ban. The Senate bill that your other Senator, who is not here today, Senator Metzenbaum, has worked so hard on bans the manufacture, transfer, and possession of deadly military-style assault weapons and large-capacity ammunition-feeding devices. These weapons have become the weapons of choice for drug traffickers, street gangs, and paramilitary extremists groups. Just ask the leaders of the police organizations that are here, ask Bob Scully and Dewey Stokes what they know about this as a national problem, not just an Ohio problem, as a national problem. The leaders of the police organizations in this country have told Congress time and time again until they're blue in the face that these weapons cannot be allowed on the street, that it is wrong to send police officers out to fight people who are better armed than they are. This has nothing to do with sportsmanship.

Now the fifth thing we need to do is to make our schools gun-free, drug-free, and violence-free. If kids can't go to school safe, this country cannot move into the 21st century in good shape. It sounds like a simple thing, but there have been schools in this country where people do bullet drills. I met at one of my town meetings in California—this really eloquent young man stood up and said, "My brother and I, we don't want to be in a gang. We don't want to have guns. We don't want to do wrong. We want to stay in school and make something of ourselves. And we left the school in our neighborhood because it wasn't safe. We went to another school because we thought it was safer, and a nut walked in that school when we were registering, shooting a gun, and shot my brother standing right in front of me to register for school." There are hundreds of stories like this, all over America. We have got to make the schools safe. Our bill allocates $300 million over 3 years for local schools and communities for safe-school projects. Up to a third of it can be used for metal detectors, school police, or security measures, the rest to provide alcohol and drug education counseling for youngsters who are victims of violence and activities to get young people to stay out of gangs.

You know, we've got to put basic recreation and a spirit of teamwork and working together back into a lot of these schools. There are a lot of schools in America today where there is nothing for these kids to do anymore, where all the tough financial problems have found their

way into just taking out things that would give the kids something they can do.

I've said this many times, but if you think about it, all of us are part of gangs, we just need to be in good gangs. We all have a need to be a part of something. The local police force is a gang. If you're on a bowling team, it's a gang. Right? Your church is a group of people that think like you do. I mean, people are social animals; they have to be part of something. And we have to do that.

The final thing I want to say is there is lots of evidence that young people can be taught to find ways that are nonviolent to resolve their conflicts and their frustrations. They can do that. We have run across at least one school in the last year that had a wonderfully successful program for reducing violence, and it had to be suspended after a year because someone had given them $3,000 to bring in someone to run the program and they didn't continue the gift. We ought to be able to build that in. If we know you've got kids coming out of difficult circumstances, every school that needs to do it should have someone who is trained who can teach kids how to find nonviolent ways to deal with their frustrations and resolve their conflicts.

Another thing that's in this crime bill that's been a cause for Senator Biden I wanted to mention is that it makes a special effort to prevent crimes of violence against women, who are especially vulnerable to violent crime. This crime bill increases sentences for rape, requires rapists to pay damages to victims, protects women against domestic violence, and creates training programs to help judges learn more about this because a lot of judges don't know how to handle these things as well as possible. You haven't read much about this, but this provision dealing with crimes against women I think is one of the more important things in the crime bill over the long run. We have got to be more sensitive to this.

Again let me say, finally, we have to do more to prevent crime. There have got to be more things done that provide alternatives for kids. This crime bill has summer youth activities, recreation programs in high-crime areas, and after-school programs. We need to do more on that.

This year the National Service Program that I worked so hard to start has 3,000 young people going out all across America in their communities to work on trying to give young people something to do that will prevent crime, a summer of safety in service to America. I'm very proud of it; we need more of that all across the country.

Now let me say, I know the crime bill won't solve all the problems, but it will make a beginning. Our HUD Secretary, Henry Cisneros, has a safe homes initiative in public housing projects. The Treasury Secretary is tightening up on Federal licensing of firearms dealers. There are more gun dealers in America than there are people running filling stations, or something I know more about, people who own McDonald's. [*Laughter*] You laugh about it, but that's stunning, isn't it? It's stunning. And we have to do something about it.

We are doing what we can to try to deal with it. We also recognize that crime is highest in areas where families are weakest, communities are weakest, and where there are the fewest jobs. We know that. We know that a lot of these problems move in, almost pulled in by the vacuum created by the breakdown of family, community, and work. And we have some strategies designed to encourage the business community in this country to invest in putting people back to work in these areas where chronic unemployment is so high.

America, out of its generosity, has spent a lot of your money in the last 10 to 15 years trying to get American businesses to invest in the Caribbean, to invest in the developing world, to give people a chance to grow in the idea that it was good for our long-term self-interest, that if these people had jobs and incomes, they would buy more American products. In America's cities today and in our devastated rural areas, there are people who would love to buy American products if they had the jobs. We ought to have the same policy for them we do for countries abroad.

The last thing I'd like to say is we need help. We need you to help us pass the crime bill. But we also need the American people to recognize that you cannot do this alone. The most law-abiding societies are not necessarily those with the biggest police forces, they are those that have the strongest families, the strongest values, the strongest code of conduct against hurting their neighbors. We need help. And every American that is willing to support this crime bill and stand up and shout, hallelujah, when more police officers are hired on the

street needs to be not only law-abiding but law-supporting.

Every American can be part of a crime control unit. Every American can be part of doing something in the neighborhood school to help those kids who don't have parents to teach them right from wrong. Most of them are still real good kids, and they're doing the best they can early on and they need help. Every American can do something to restore these values.

And let me say, when I see what has happened in the crime area: 3 times as many murders today as in 1960; 3 times as many violent crimes per police officer as there were 30 years ago; and 3 times as many births outside marriage, where there has never been a marriage, also related to the ultimate crime problem, I realize that a lot of these things are going to require the American people to get together and get something done.

They can't just look at you. They can't just look at me. They can't just look at your Members of Congress. We have to look inside, too. Yes, there's a role for the Congress; yes, there's a role for the police. But there's a role for the American people, too. You can't make me believe that we can't take our streets back and give our kids their futures back. And we're going to do our best, starting with the crime bill. We want you to help us.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. at the Ohio Peace Officers Training Academy. In his remarks, he referred to Raymond Skillern, police patrolman, Canton, OH; John Lenhart, superintendent, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation; and Greg Merritt, executive director, Ohio Police Officers Training Academy.

Nomination for the Federal Election Commission

February 15, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Lee Ann Elliott, a former member of the Federal Election Commission, and Danny L. McDonald, a present member, to additional terms as members of the FEC.

"These two individuals have served their country admirably as members of the FEC. I am pleased that they have agreed to extend their commitment to this important body, which will be well served by their experience," the President said.

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

Remarks Announcing the Aircraft Contract With Saudi Arabia and an Exchange With Reporters

February 16, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Secretary Brown. Ladies and gentlemen, in this Olympic season, we come here today to announce a gold medal win for America's businesses and workers.

Last year the Government of Saudi Arabia decided to find replacement aircraft for its civilian fleet of approximately 50 airplanes. Today, the Saudi Ambassador, Prince Bandar, has officially informed me that King Fahd has decided to purchase the entire replacement fleet from American companies, from Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. The purchase will be financed by the United States Export-Import Bank. It will total almost $6 billion and will support tens of thousands of American jobs in Washington, California, Kansas, Missouri, Utah, Arkansas, and several other States.

The purchase is a vote of confidence in American quality, American workers, and the competitiveness of our exports. As Secretary Brown said, it underlines the efforts that we have made,

from NAFTA to GATT to the APEC conference to our national export strategy in lifting export controls on many products which for many years could not be sold abroad, to expand our markets, to reduce trade barriers, to create good high-paying jobs in America in a thriving and open world economy. It proves again that we can compete; we don't have to retreat.

The United States and Saudi Arabia have long enjoyed close relations. We have especially strong commercial relations in the field of civil aviation. With today's announcement, this proud tradition will continue well into the next century. Close economic ties complement the important political and strategic relationship that we have and that we value greatly with Saudi Arabia.

Let me note that I have already spoken directly with many Members of Congress and Governors and other State and local officials whose constituents will benefit from this sale. The message I gave them is simple: We worked hard on this, and we will continue to work hard at home and abroad to help our people thrive in the global economy.

In closing, let me thank especially King Fahd, Prince Bandar, and the Government of Saudi Arabia for this decision; Secretaries Brown, Christopher, and Pena; Tony Lake and others in the White House, including Bob Rubin and Mr. McLarty, all of whom had some role in this. We all spent a lot of time over a long period on this. The sustained effort that was done is another product of the teamwork that we try to practice in our administration. Secretaries Brown, Christopher, and Pena all personally traveled to Riyadh in part to emphasize the importance of this sale to our country. And I thank them especially for that.

Let me also offer my congratulations to the management and to the employees of Boeing and McDonnell Douglas. Your hard work really made this possible. We just tried to bring it to the surface. America should be proud of this day. And I hope this day will lead us to many others like it.

Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, it's been reported that you personally called on King Fahd to buy American-made aircraft. I'm wondering if this means that you'll be taking a much more active role in drumming up business for U.S. firms? For instance, in Vietnam, since you've recently lifted the trade embargo there, might you encourage leaders in that country to purchase U.S. aircraft?

The President. It depends on what the facts are in any case. I think you can say, first of all, that the Secretary of Commerce has showed an historic level of activism, not only in this area but in many others. The Secretary of State has done a remarkable job in a short period of time in changing the culture of many of our embassies and getting them in country after country after country much more involved in trying to promote commercial activities and working with the Commerce Department and others.

The Secretary of Transportation has, I think, focused on the global aspects of his job more than any of his predecessors that I can think of. So I think what you could say is that this administration will be aggressively involved in this kind of endeavor. When I think it is appropriate and potentially helpful, I don't mind asking for the business. But I think it's something I don't want to lay down a general rule of thumb on because I think it will have to be taken on a case-by-case basis.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, are you still contemplating more sanctions against Japan, or can you rule that out for now?

The President. Well, ever since the talks I had with Prime Minister Hosokawa, we've been reviewing our options, consulting with our friends, and trying to assess what course we ought to take. And I think sometime in the next few days my economic team—Mr. Rubin is here—and our national security team will come back with a set of options and recommendations to me. And then I'll have something to say about that. That is different from, of course, the announcement which was made yesterday by Ambassador Kantor on the cellular telephone issue. That's an issue of longstanding development.

Aircraft Contract With Saudi Arabia

Q. Mr. President and Prince Bandar, actually, does this emphasis on redoing the Saudi commercial airline system, does it sort of represent a shift in priorities and a shift in emphasis? Does the Saudi Government no longer feel as much of a military threat perhaps as it did before and feel the need to—[*inaudible*].

Prince Bandar. No, just means Saudi needs to modernize its fleet, that's all. [*Laughter*]

The President. For those of you who don't know it, the Prince is an accomplished pilot, trained on American fighters in the United States, and he just wants to always see them in the best and the newest airplanes. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:12 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks to the American Association of Retired Persons in Edison, New Jersey

February 16, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Bernice. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that warm welcome. I am delighted to be back in New Jersey. I always love to come here. You know, New Jersey had a lot to do with making me President in one of your typically close elections here. I keep hoping someday I'll see an election in New Jersey that's not close just so somebody doesn't have a heart attack right before the election. [*Laughter*]

I'm so glad that Hillary came up here with me today. I think she deserves a gold medal for trying to fix the health care system. I want to thank Dr. Flora Edwards, the president of Middlesex Community College, and all of those who made it possible for us to come here and meet today. I want to thank my longtime friend Senator Bradley for his statement. He and Senator Lautenberg, who couldn't be here today, and the Members of Congress who are here and those who aren't are going to have some tough decisions to make. I thank Congressman Pallone for his statement. This is the second time I have been to your district to talk about health care. Once I was at the Robert Wood Johnson Hospital, a wonderful medical facility, to talk about what we were trying to do to help to make sure we'd have more of those kind of facilities. And I thank Congressmen Klein, Menendez, and Payne and Hughes also for being here today and coming out of their district during this congressional recess period.

I'd also like to say I'm glad to be here with your new Governor, Governor Whitman. We had a great visit down in Washington at the Governors' conference. I thank you for being here. And Mayor Spadoro met me outside with the whole city government. I thought they were going to give me a list of everything they wanted from Washington. [*Laughter*] I now have met more people in this city government than most of you have, and I liked it, too.

I want to thank a special person—I want to ask him to stand up—representing the Edison Seniors Council, the man who wrote me and asked me to come here, David Sheehan. Where are you, David? Stand up. Thank you, Governor and Mrs. Florio, for coming. I'm glad to see you here. I want to say a special word of thanks to the AARP, to Bernice Shepard, and also to Kevin Donnellan and Molly Daniels and all the others who have worked so hard to get this group of people here.

I was a Governor in my former life—or as I like to say, back when I had a life—for a dozen years, and before that, an attorney general of my State. And I had a long, long time to work with the AARP to do 20 or 30 things that were important to the members of AARP in my State. And I always found that I could depend upon the AARP to do the right thing and to stand for the right thing, not only on issues that affected senior citizens, by the way. The AARP in our State was one of the strongest advocates for education reform, for example, trying to help their grandchildren mostly get the kind of educational opportunities that we would need for the 21st century. So I'm delighted to be here and delighted to embrace your goals of long-term care and prescription drugs for senior citizens.

When I became President I had some pretty old-fashioned ideas that I at least thought then and now I think still are too much in absence in our Nation's Capital. I had the crazy idea that the purpose of our political system was to get people together and to get things done and that that was more important than all the partisan squabbling and personal finger-pointing and all the blame-placing and all the kind of

stuff that we're treated to day-in and day-out, sort of emanating in this endless gusher of politics and negativism that our national system seems to produce. And I went there with the view that we ought to try to find a way to put that aside and actually deal with the serious problems of this country and to basically change and move toward the 21st century in ways that would guarantee the things we care most about, work and family and community; would enable America to go into the next century as the greatest country in the world, being fair to all of our people.

In the last couple of months I've had the opportunity to review the progress of the past year. And I won't repeat all that now, but I think it's clear that we've begun to turn this economy around. The deficit is going down instead of up. Investment is going up instead of down. New jobs are coming into the economy, because the Congress took some tough decisions.

This year, we're trying to face some more of our problems: developing a new approach to education at the national level to help States and local school districts reach world-class goals with grassroots reforms; helping people who aren't going to college move from school to work with further training and education so their incomes will be decent; and developing a whole new training system for people who lose their jobs so that people can have the security of knowing that throughout their lives, they'll always be able to get the training they need to get newer and better jobs.

Yesterday I went to Ohio to talk about the problem of crime, something that you've dealt with a lot here in the last couple of years. We're trying to pass a crime bill in the next few months in Congress that will put another 100,000 police officers on the street and take assault weapons off the street and put repeat violent offenders behind bars for good.

So I tell you, I think we are moving in the right direction. But I have to say that unless we have the courage to deal with this health care issue, it's going to be very difficult over the long run for our country to be fully competitive and for your Government to fully serve you. Why is that? There are many reasons, but let me just give you three, if I might.

First of all, nearly everybody in America's for balancing the budget in theory. What you need to know is, the budget we have now reduces defense, in my judgment, by all we can afford to reduce it and maybe then some a little bit. It reduces defense in the wake of the aftermath of the cold war. It freezes all domestic spending for 5 years, which means every time I want to give the State of New Jersey one more dollar to educate children or retrain adults or help poor kids with the Women and Infants Children program or the Head Start program, I have to cut another dollar somewhere else: total freeze.

Social Security recipients get their cost of living increases, but that's tied to inflation, and it doesn't go up any faster than revenues do. The only thing in our budget now going up at faster than the rate of inflation, faster than the rate of revenues, is health care costs, Medicare and Medicaid, at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. So, (a) there will never be a budget in balance unless we do something to bring health care costs in line with inflation; (b) we will be spending all of our new money shortly on nothing but health care, and not new health care, not the long-term care you want, not the prescription drugs you want, but more money for the same health care. So we won't be buying anything new, and we will be paralyzing the whole rest of our budget. So that's the first thing that bothers me about it.

The second thing you need to know is that this system is the only advanced system in the world—that is, no other country in the world has a system that doesn't provide health security for everybody, and yet we are spending 14.5 percent of our income, 14.5 cents of every dollar, on health care. Only Canada spends 10 cents; Germany and Japan are under 9. And we have to compete with them every day.

And if you've seen this argument we're in with Japan now over cellular telephones, health care costs for the American phones are a lot bigger than the ones they are for the Japanese phones. Today we just announced we sold $6 billion worth of American-made airplanes to Saudi Arabia, beating out our European competitors in spite of the fact that there is a huge extra cost in health care in every one of those planes. And that means American jobs, so that bothers me.

The third thing that bothers me is that Americans are rapidly losing their choices in health care and being forced into plans that give them almost no choice and don't cover the basic things that are needed. And another 100,000 Americans a month lose their health care for-

ever. So these are the reasons I say we have to face up to this problem.

What did Hillary say those people were in the health insurance ad, Harry and Louise? I always want to say Thelma and Louise; they're about that—[*laughter*]. And you know those health care ads where the actors are telling you how scared you ought to be of our program—they never put any real people on there.

We've gotten nearly one million letters from people talking about their real problems in the health care system. And so, since we can't afford to keep up with the health insurance companies who have all of your premiums to buy television ads with, we just started bringing ordinary citizens who've written us in. I want to introduce four people from New Jersey who wrote us letters who are here today. I wish they had written us ads. Barbara Hassmiller, stand up—where are you, Barbara?—who wrote us when her father lost his job at age 70 and had a stroke and was not eligible for long-term care under Medicare and was, thankfully, too well off to be eligible under Medicaid, the Government's program for poor people. Helen Kallos—where are you, Helen? Stand up—whose mother was taken ill at an advanced age and who wanted to help care for her mother at home. But under our system, you can't get any help for providing for your kinfolks if you keep them at home through long-term care. But if you're eligible, the Government will spend a fortune to put them in a nursing home but won't help you leave them at home for much less money. Margaret Meding, who discovered that her husband had a condition that neither Medicare nor private insurance would cover nursing home care for even though plainly it was the most appropriate thing. And finally, Arthur Paranto who had both Medicare and a Medigap policy, but his biggest health care problem was a huge drug bill which he got no help for.

When I ran for President, starting in 1991, I met people in the State of New Hampshire who literally were making a choice every week between food in their refrigerator and medicine in the medicine cabinet because Medicare provided no drug coverage, and this in the country that has the finest pharmaceutical industry in the world, leading the world in all forms of medical research related to drugs; when we know, based on the experience of a country like Germany, for example, that if you provide more prescription medicine to people in a proper way, you actually save money on hospitalization costs and more severe medical costs over the long run.

These are people you will never see in television ads, unless I can raise a lot more money for this campaign. But they are real people, and they have real problems that deserve to be addressed. They are some of the problems that the First Lady and her task force dealt with over a period of months when they consulted thousands of doctors and nurses and other medical providers and people in the insurance industry and consumers to try to come up with an approach that would deal with the real problems of real people, not the rhetoric that you often see in the campaign.

Now, I care about them. I care about the fact that there are people with no insurance, that there are millions of Americans with insurance who could lose it in a minute, that there are millions of others who pay too much for their insurance because they or someone in their family have a preexisting condition or who can never change jobs because if they do, they'll lose their insurance.

Sure, I'm concerned about the small businesses who don't offer health insurance and are afraid they can't spend anything to provide it. But I'm also concerned about people like the fine husband and wife I met yesterday in Columbus, Ohio, in a little delicatessen, where they have 20 employees' full-time, 20 part-time; they're not required to do anything. The lady had a serious medical condition; all of her employees' premiums went through the roof because she was sick. But she refused to drop their coverage. She said, "I'm going to cover my full-time employees, and I would gladly cover my part-time employees if only my competitors had to do the same." She said, "You know, I'm out here doing this because it is morally right. I'm not going to let these people work for me and not have health insurance. But none of my competitors have to do it. We wouldn't go broke if you just required us all to make a fair contribution to the Nation's health care system." I'm concerned about people like her, too.

What we're trying to do is to fix what's wrong with the system and keep what's right. You all know what's right. We do have the best health care in the world for people who have it available to them. We do have by far the best medical research and technology developments in the

world. And we shouldn't do anything to mess that up. What we propose to do is to fix the system of financing, which is crazy and which is adding tens of billions of dollars to this system, dollars that you pay that have not anything to do with the health care of Americans.

We want guaranteed private insurance for every American. We want preventive and primary care in that insurance package to save money over the long run. We want to protect the choices that people have. Today, fewer than half the people who are insured in their workplace have any choice anymore of their doctor or their medical plan. We want to increase that. We want to give small businesses and farmers and individuals access to the same rates that now only people who are insured, like me, through government or through big business have. We want to protect the academic health care centers like the Robert Wood Johnson facility I visited, and medical research. And we also know we have to preserve what is right for you.

Our plan clearly preserves and strengthens Medicare. It retains your right to choose a physician under the Medicare program just as it operates today, as well as dealing with these other issues. It puts $3 billion into medical research, including issues confronting older Americans like Alzheimer's, cancer, heart disease, and stroke research—more money into medical research, not less. If there's a breakthrough just around the corner, we want to turn the corner in a hurry.

But look what has got to be fixed. If we don't do anything, millions more will continue to lose their coverage. If we don't do anything, millions more will continue to pay more than they should. If we don't do anything, we'll still have older people being charged more for their health insurance than younger people when they're still in the work force. If we don't do anything, we will know that the insurance companies will continue to restrict costs and to decide who can or cannot be insured and under what circumstances.

In today's system, the insurance companies regularly charge older people more than younger people. In today's system, older Americans are also regularly victimized by costly and unnecessary tests and procedures and by overcharging and by being sold bogus long-term policies that don't have the coverage they purport to have. You know that as well as I do. That's wrong, and we have to do something about it.

I also want to thank Bernice for pointing out that this long-term care issue is not simply an issue for the elderly. We have millions of Americans living with various kinds of disabilities who could be much more productive, much less costly to society and much happier if they had adequate long-term care. They should also be taken into account.

This system can also be much less expensive administratively. It is unbelievable: Every single solitary study that's been done of our health care system comparing it with any other says we spend about a dime on the dollar more than anybody else pushing paper around. Why? Because we have 1,500 separate health insurance companies with thousands and thousands of different policies, requiring clerical workers in hospitals, in doctors' offices, and insurance offices that are not present any other place in the world, only to make sure that nobody gets covered for anything that the fine print of the policy says that they're not covered for. Nobody else does this. Nobody in the world does this.

And so we are paying for a paper system that is organized to keep people out of the health care system. So the best health care system in the world is not available to some people because of the paperwork barriers that are placed. And the people who are paying for most of these television ads want the paperwork barriers to stay there. Don't kid yourself. That is what is going on. It doesn't have anything to do with consumer choice. You get more choice under our plan than under the system they're taking us toward.

Now the Congress is going to begin to work on these programs, and there will be a thousand ideas. But there are a few major plans before the Congress now. Only one of them proposes to keep Medicare strong and makes it stronger; that's our proposal. Only one of them deals with long-term care and prescription drugs for the elderly, our proposal.

I have to say this in all respect: I am very grateful for the kind words that AARP has said about this plan. But there are interest groups in there spending tens of millions of dollars to beat this plan—are going to come after it piece by piece by piece. We are the only plan that offers any help for long-term care and for prescription drugs. And I would respectfully suggest that the AARP ought to be for the only plan that helps you. Otherwise, the interest groups will convince Congress that you don't really care,

and you will lose these parts of our plan. The time has come to be counted, to stand up, to take a stand, and to fight with us if you want to get something done. This is a fight. And if you want it, you're going to have to fight for it.

Let me also say that in addition to this issue of what new things can happen, you need to look at what's going to happen if our plan doesn't pass and someone else's idea does. There are a lot of people who really believe the only way to reduce the deficit and to reform health care is to basically take benefits away from older Americans. We have shown in the budget we passed this year and in the health care proposal we made that you can reduce the deficit and reform health care and be fair to older Americans.

If we fix the health care system, you can keep the deficit on a downward path, as the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office showed, saving unbelievable amounts of money by the first decade of the next century. And you can do it without slashing medical care to the elderly or the Social Security system. On the other hand, look at some of the other alternatives that are out there. Next week the Senate will consider a balanced budget amendment that many believe will lead to dramatic cuts in Social Security and Medicare without doing a thing to fix the health care system or to add to your security.

Now, no one can be against a balanced budget in principle. Remember, I've heard all that rhetoric about cutting Government spending, but you're looking at the person that's bringing the deficit down, with the help of Congress, not letting it go up. I've heard all the rhetoric. Our budget proposes to eliminate over 100 Government programs and to cut 60 percent of the specific line items in the Federal budget. So I know all about cutting spending. But this balanced budget amendment, according to every single analysis, will force either the Congress to raise taxes or cut Social Security and Medicare and aid to cities and States, or both, significantly.

The only way to get this deficit down to zero in a fair way without unduly cutting defense, which is not good for the country, or cutting Social Security and Medicare or having an unnecessary tax increase when we are building back for an economic recovery, is to reform the health care system. That is the responsible way to do it. But make no mistake about it, right now there are forces in the Congress who believe that they should use Medicare to either balance the budget or take the money away from seniors and pay for somebody else's health care, instead of asking them to take responsibility and pay a part of their own.

If this balanced budget amendment passes, or if these other health care proposals were to pass, which cut Medicare—and they all do—then we would all be trying to do something for middle class children in the future by hurting middle class senior citizens today. The middle class has taken a big enough hit. Let's do it in the fair, right, and disciplined way, not the cheap, easy, quick way.

We ought to be taking care of each other. We shouldn't pit the old against the young or the middle-aged. And we have a way to do it. It just requires us to undertake the pain of making thousands of separate tough decisions that will have to disappoint some people in the present system. But if we reform health care, we can achieve these savings without cutting benefits to the elderly; we can reduce the deficit without cutting Medicare. That's what we ought to do.

We proposed savings in Medicare. Do you know the present budget estimates that Medicare and Medicaid will increase in every year in the next 5 years between 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation plus population growth? It is unacceptable. But we think those savings should be plowed back into benefits that help the people who actually set up and operated the Medicare system and helped to pay for it all these years, the people who paid the payroll taxes. That's how Medicare was financed, after all. Don't forget that.

So we want to take the savings from Medicare, which will be achieved by bringing health costs in line with inflation and put them into providing the prescription drug benefits and put them into phasing in the long-term care benefits for the elderly and the disabled. That is the fair way to save money from Medicare, bring the deficit down, reform health care, and not hurt the senior citizens of the country. We don't need to mess up Medicare. It works. We need to add to it and strengthen it, and we can do that.

I will say again, three of the four letters I received from the fine people that were introduced today were from people who had a prob-

lem with long-term care, three of the four. If you are really poor in this country and you qualify for Medicaid, you can get in a nursing home. Unfortunately, most places you don't qualify for alternatives to nursing homes, so you may not get the best placement. But at least you will have some care. But if you are older and you are not really poor and you don't have a certain set of very unique conditions, you're out in the cold. And then, if you qualify for nursing home care under Medicare, which is reasonably rare, you still won't qualify for long-term care any place but a nursing home. And if you're not old enough to be eligible for Medicare and you're disabled, then you have to be impoverished to be eligible for Medicaid so you go to a nursing home instead of getting some in-home care where you might also be able to do something to generate some income. This system does not make sense, and we can do better.

The purpose of our common endeavors should be to allow all of us to rear our children with good values and a good education and a real shot at the American dream and then to live as long and as well as we possibly can, respecting the rights and the interests of our neighbors. We cannot do that with the health care system we have today.

There's one other thing about this program I'd like to emphasize, and that is that we try to do something to protect early retirees who run out of their health care benefits. This is a big issue in New Jersey. When so many big companies are downsizing, who's there to protect the people who are forced into early retirement? Many of them lose the benefits they've paid for throughout their entire working lives if a company decides to save money by cutting the benefits of retirees. A better approach, in my opinion, is to make a commitment to these workers. A more fair approach would say to any retiree over 55, your policy is guaranteed, and all you have to do to keep your health benefits is to keep paying the same share you were paying when you were a working person. I think that's fair, and I think we ought to do it.

Now, that is what our program does. If you want fair benefits for early retirees, if you want a prescription drug benefit, not just for the elderly but for families as well, if you want a beginning on this long-term care problem which is plaguing our country and something we had better face because people over 65 are the fastest growing percentage of our population, if you want health care costs brought under control in a way that is fair, then I would argue you have to support our plan. Not because you think it is perfect—this deals with a very complicated issue—but because it is the only plan that deals with these issues. And then you can come and say whatever you think about the edges of it.

Now, before I close, let me just say, sometimes when a person like me gives a speech like this and you hear it, you say, "Well, why is anybody against it?" And you either distrust them or you distrust the speaker, right? Because you know it's more complicated.

Let me restate: This fight is about who calls the shots in the health care system. It's about where the jobs will grow and shrink in the health care system, and it's about who pays, because people get health care. Even people without health insurance will eventually get health care, but normally when it's too late, too expensive, in an emergency room, and the rest of us pay for it.

So this fight is about that. Should the insurance companies and the HMO's that they control call the shots for the future? Should they be the ones who decide who gets insurance and who doesn't and who pays how much? Should we continue to be the only advanced country in the world that gives all those decisions to them, with all the consequences that you know?

And a lot of them—by the way, that does not mean they're all bad people. A lot of them are good people. A lot of them are doing the best they can under terrible circumstances. But this is a bad system. And a lot of them now say, "Well, what we want is to give everybody access." Let me tell you what they mean, folks. They mean they want to give you access just like everybody in this room right now has access to a Mercedes, right? Or maybe to a new Chevrolet pickup truck if you're from my part of the country. In other words, we all have universal access today to every car sold in America. It's just some of us can't afford to buy them, right?

So when you hear this word, perk your ears up and ask yourself, "Now, what do they mean by that? Give me the details." Say, when you hear that word, say, "What do you mean by that?" Because nobody else in the world that we're competing with talks about access. They say, "If you're a family living in our country,

here is your health coverage, and here are your responsibilities."

When they say access, do they still mean we're going to charge old folks much more than younger people? What's covered? What are the benefits? What are the costs? What are the copays? What are the deductibles? What about the people that don't feel like helping? Listen.

The second issue is, the tough issue is the employer mandate. Should we require all employers to do something toward their employees? That is a tough issue. I concede that. But look at what we have today. Seventy percent of the small businesses in America today cover their employees because they think it is the right thing to do. Most of them cover them with packages they think are not quite adequate, but it's all they can afford. And they pay on average 35 to 40 percent more in health insurance premiums than government and big business does.

So is it fair to the 70 percent of the small businesses to do that? Or shouldn't we allow them to go into bigger pools where they can get the same rates that government and big business do, and then say to all small business owners, "You have to do something to take some responsibility for your folks"? I think we should.

This is a fight over jobs. If you don't need as much paperwork, if you have one standard form, instead of 1,500 companies writing thousands of different policies, you won't have to hire as many people to keep up with who shouldn't be covered for something. But you will have—so you will have fewer jobs. Let's level with you. You will have fewer jobs in the clerical department of hospitals, clinics and insurance companies. But you will have more jobs taking care of people in long-term care, producing pharmaceuticals, providing basic primary care in public health clinics in inner cities and depressed rural areas. You will have more jobs. So there will be a job shift.

But we shouldn't pretend that this is easy. This is a real fight, and you have to decide whether that's a change you're willing to undertake. I tell you, I think we are willing to undertake it.

Under our plan, which has been studied by any number of people who are, to put it charitably, nonbiased—everybody who studies it says more than half the people in this country will get the same or better health care for the same or lower cost. Everybody who's studied our plan says that there will be some more costs for some people, principally those who pay nothing now and for young, single, healthy workers who will have to pay a little more so that elderly workers can pay a little less and families can get a little better break. I think that's fair. And I think most young people think that's fair.

This is a great opportunity for our country, because we're having an honest debate. I will try not to paper over the real difficulties. I tried to be frank with you today about what the real difficulties are. But I am telling you, if you want this country to be what it ought to be and if you want every elderly person in this country to have access to a life that he or she has earned by being a good American and if you want your children and grandchildren to grow up in an America not burdened by debt and not burdened by a Government strangled by health care costs and absolutely unable to invest in jobs and technology and education, in short, if you want us to do the sensible and the humane thing, then help us pass comprehensive health care reform that guarantees insurance to all Americans and has long-term care and has prescription drugs and is fair.

We need your help. Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. in the gymnasium at Middlesex Community College. In his remarks, he referred to Bernice Shepard, AARP board member; Gov. Christine Whitman of New Jersey; James Florio, former New Jersey Governor, and his wife, Lorinda; Mayor George Spadoro of Edison; Kevin Donnellan, AARP legislative counsel; and Molly Daniels, manager, AARP health care reform help desk.

Exchange With Reporters
February 16, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are there a lot of differences between the U.N. and NATO on Bosnia Sunday night?

The President. No.

Q. What is the problem——

The President. Well, I don't think there is a problem. The decision of the North Atlantic Council still stands. And the rules are clear: that the heavy artillery either has to be taken out of the safe zone or put under the control of the U.N. either in one of these areas where the weapons can be deposited; or if the weapons cannot be moved, they still must be under the control of the U.N.

So I think the issue is just simply working out the mechanism for control of weapons that are either too high in the mountains or snowbound or otherwise unable to be moved to one of these centralized areas. But so far, it seems to me that based on the detailed conversations I had today with the national security staff and the work the Joints Chiefs are doing that they're just working it out. They're just trying to work through what reasonable standards of control are. And I have no reason to believe that there's any difference at this time.

Q. Do you get the sense the Serbs are cooperating and will cooperate Sunday night?

The President. Well, I hope so. It's clear that the NATO allies are still firm. And it's clear to me that the U.N. is working out the real and meaningful definition of control of those weapons.

Health Care Reform

Q. [*Inaudible*]—can your plan pass without senior citizens group support?

The President. Well, I think the senior citizens groups are going to have to fight for long-term health care and for prescription drugs if they want it in there. They're going to have to fight. That's the message I gave them in New Jersey today. I think they will fight.

NOTE: The exchange began at 6:04 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, upon the President's return from Edison, NJ.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Trade With Kazakhstan and Romania
February 16, 1994

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

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add Kazakhstan and Romania to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

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

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

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The related proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Electronic Mail Message to Prime Minister Carl Bildt of Sweden
February 5, 1994

Dear Carl:

I appreciate your support for my decision to end the trade embargo on Vietnam and thank you for all that Sweden has done on the question of the POW/MIA's.

I share your enthusiasm for the potential of emerging communications technologies. This demonstration of electronic communications is an important step toward building a global information superhighway.

Sincerely,

BILL

NOTE: The message was transmitted on February 5 and released on February 16 as part of a statement by the Press Secretary announcing the first Presidential electronic mail correspondence with a foreign head of state. The release also included the text of Prime Minister Bildt's message to the President as follows:

Dear Bill,

Apart from testing this connection on the global Internet system, I want to congratulate you on your decision to end the trade embargo on Vietnam. I am planning to go to Vietnam in April and will certainly use the occasion to take up the question of the MIA's. From the Swedish side we have tried to be helpful on this issue in the past, and we will continue to use the contacts we might have.

Sweden is—as you know—one of the leading countries in the world in the field of telecommunications, and it is only appropriate that we should be among the first to use the Internet also for political contacts and communications around the globe.

Yours,

CARL

Interview With Don Imus of WFAN Radio, New York City
February 17, 1994

Mr. Imus. Here now, on the "Imus in the Morning" program, the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. Good morning, Mr. President.

Health Care Reform

The President. Good morning, Don, how are you?

Mr. Imus. Well, I'm not that great, because your wife was here in New York 2 or 3 months ago to do that "Sesame Street," and it is broadcast from the same studio complex we are. So she sent down the Secret Service to get me. And of course, when they showed I didn't know what they were here for. It made me kind of nervous.

But anyway, I was talking to her, and I told her that since I had last talked to you I had had major lung surgery, and I have health insurance. And out of my pocket, though, even with health insurance, it cost me $20,000. So I'm for any health care plan—[*laughter*]—including yours.

The President. Well, that's good. I hope the surgery worked well. Your lungs seem to be in good order as nearly as I can tell. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Imus. Well, I feel pretty good. She was astonished that it cost that much. I explained that I was in a private room and stuff like that. But still, there was a lot of expense. And I—just curious to me how ordinary people, the median wage in this country being around $19,000 a year, how they could pay for that stuff.

The President. Well, it's really tough. She was in Maine last week and talking to a woman that broke her wrist and was charged $40 for sitting on a cot in a hospital in an emergency room for 30 minutes, charged for an Ace bandage she didn't use and things like that. There are a lot of problems in the health care system, mostly related to the way we finance it. The

health care of this country—the delivery system, the doctors, the nurses, the medical research, all of that—it's very, very good. But the delivery system is messed up by the way it's financed. This is the only country in the world that has 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands and thousands of different policies. You've got to read the fine print to figure out what's the copay, what's the deductible, how much cash do you have to put up if you have something like the operation you had. It's a really tough deal.

Mr. Imus. Well, you know, one of the ways, Mr. President, you could settle all this is for you and the First Lady to take on Harry and Louise from those insurance company commercials in like a segment of "American Gladiators." [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes, you know, I wouldn't mind that actually. The first I heard about them, I thought they were Thelma and Louise, you know. [*Laughter*] I tried to take them on a little bit yesterday in New Jersey. The problem is that they don't reflect real people, but they can scare real people because when we hear something about health care, we always want to calculate it, as we should, in terms of, well, how is this going to affect me and my family and our policy.

But real people out there are in trouble. I mean, I was at a little delicatessen in Columbus, Ohio, the day before yesterday talking to the woman who ran it, and she insured her 20 full-time employees even though a lot of her competitors didn't. She told me the stories about what had happened to their premiums when she got sick, how much she resented the fact that she did it and others didn't. I mean, if you really go out there and talk to real people about how the system really works, it's very different than what these ads say. And the ads are designed to mislead people about our plan so that we can keep the same financing system we've got. That's why the health insurance industry's running them.

But as a result of the way they do things, some people pay much more for insurance than others because they're older. Some people pay more just because they're in small businesses. Some people cannot get any insurance or can never change jobs because they've got a preexisting condition. No other country in the world does this.

But one thing we do have more than anybody else in the world is clerical workers, in hospitals, in doctors' offices, insurance offices, keeping up with all these forms that are required so we can see who doesn't get what coverage and make sure you pay all that $20,000. I mean, that's the way the financing system works. That's what needs to be reworked.

Mr. Imus. When you and the First Lady lobbied the Business Council, and they voted two-to-one against the plan, were you surprised about that or——

The President. No, they've never—you know, mostly they've not been for any of this. I was surprised that we have as much big business support as we do. What I wanted them to do, although it's largely ideological, most of them are paying premiums which are too high now. I thought we might get them for the first time to go along with the requirement for universal coverage or guaranteed private health insurance, because every other country has it. That's what their competitors provide. And all their competitors have lower health costs than these guys do.

But I was very disappointed that they didn't do it. Now, the Chamber of Commerce came out for universal coverage yesterday, which was encouraging. But the big business group I still think supports universal coverage. There were some other—they've got some members who don't support some parts of our plan. And the group that came to see me said that, "Well, we really are not for this other plan. We think it's better strategy to say, 'Well, we ought to start with that.' "

But the truth is, you know, I didn't expect them to be in the vanguard of health care reform. But a lot of these big companies actually are paying more than they should because of all the cost-shifting. That's another big problem in our system. A lot of people who don't have health insurance ultimately get health care, but they get it when it's too late and too expensive. They show up at the emergency room, and then the hospitals have to pass those costs on to the people who do have insurance, which really runs the cost up of companies that have good health policies.

The Presidency

Mr. Imus. A lot of these mainstream news friends of mine who appear frequently on this program, like Tim Russert and folks like that,

they think that I hang out with you, you know, and like set policy. [*Laughter*]

The President. Don't disabuse them, you know. Is Russert—is that mainstream? I don't know. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Imus. I try to explain to them, I've talked to you five or six times on the phone, and I'm not one of those people who claims to have access that doesn't exist. However——

The President. I've still got my Imus doll in here, though, in the White House.

Mr. Imus. Oh, you do?

The President. You bet I do. I watch that head bob up and down all the time. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Imus. You know, by the way, thanks for the pictures you sent me. I was doing an interview with the Washington Post the day those arrived. And this woman begged me to give her one of them so she could put it in the paper. And I said I didn't think the President would be interested in doing that.

But one of the things I tell people is that having talked to you four or five times during the campaign and now twice since you've been President, I said I thought that probably I had changed more in my approach in that, you know, you are the President, and I'm not going to ask you goofy questions. And my question to you is, do you think you've changed?

The President. Oh, I think it changes you some. What you have to guard against is getting the bad changes with the good. I mean, I think anyone who assumes this office who really wants to make a difference here instead of just to occupy the White House changes. I think, you know, I am much more focused every day than I have ever been in my public life on the work at hand and what I can do. I think that the responsibilities are so great it requires much more concentration. And you just have to kind of filter out a whole lot of things that once might have occupied your time and attention.

On the other hand, you have to guard against becoming more isolated, because it is so easy to get isolated here. I mean, you've got to—because of the security concerns, the Secret Service is always here and you're always—you travel in an armored limousine and you travel on Air Force One and you're always—it's just easy to get isolated from the people. So what I have to do is to try to make sure that I'm growing in the job all the time and continuing to deepen my ability just to focus on the big issues that really affect the lives of the American people without getting isolated from them.

Mr. Imus. Somebody said the White House is the crown jewel in our penal system. [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes, that was one of my better lines, did you think?

Mr. Imus. Oh, that was yours. Oh, okay.

The President. Yes. I said I couldn't figure out whether it was America's most beautiful public housing or the crown jewel of the penal system. [*Laughter*]

President's Youth

Mr. Imus. Of course, I guess I could ask you, the bed in that old El Camino wasn't large enough to play football on, so, Mr. President, what was that Astroturf for? [*Laughter*]

The President. You're old enough to remember what it was like with a pickup truck, nothing but metal in the back, right?

Mr. Imus. Absolutely.

The President. If you wanted to put—that's the only car I had then. I carried my luggage back there. It wasn't for what everybody thought it was for when I made the comment, I'll tell you that. I'm guilty of a lot of things, but I didn't ever do that. [*Laughter*] But I don't think I should disclaim it, really, just leave it out there.

Mr. Imus. I mean, it's like saying you didn't inhale, Mr. President. I mean, come on here. [*Laughter*] Anyway, by the way, congratulations on that Saudi——

The President. No, it's just that I didn't inhale in the back of the pickup. [*Laughter*]

Aircraft Contract With Saudi Arabia

Mr. Imus. Congratulations on the Saudi aircraft deal. Mickey Kantor's doing a terrific job, isn't he?

The President. He is doing a great job. I mean, he's really been very, very good. You know, he's hammered out these major trade agreements, the NAFTA agreement and the GATT world trade round. And he's worked so hard to expand our trade operations. On this Saudi deal, we had three Cabinet members actually go to Saudi Arabia working on it: the Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown, whose major job it is to sell American products abroad, once Mickey Kantor gets us a fair framework; the Transportation Secretary, because it was airlines, Federico Pena; and the Secretary of State be-

cause it affected our foreign policy. They all went through Saudi Arabia and made an effort to help sell it. And you know, this is going to have a positive impact on about 60,000 jobs, which is an amazing thing.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Mr. Imus. And this may be a simple-minded trade question, Mr. President, but people like me wonder about this. How come we can't say to the Japanese, "Look, you guys can't send your junk over here until you let us send our stuff over there, and that policy starts tomorrow"?

The President. Well, you can do some of that. That's what we're trying to do with this telephone issue. I guess you saw the facts—when you mentioned Mickey, you must have seen him doing his interview on the cellular telephone——

Mr. Imus. Yes, I did.

The President. ——business, where he pointed out in the part of Japan where we have equal access, Motorola has 50 percent of the market. And in the Tokyo and Nagoya area, same products, where there's not equal access to take advantage of the whole system, the Japanese have 780,000 or something units, and Motorola has 12,000, less than 2 percent of the market.

So we've now concluded that case. We've established the facts, and we have to develop a response. But what you want to do is to do something that will succeed in opening their market without denying American consumers access to products they want to buy or without hurting American investments in Japan. We have increased exports to Japan dramatically, but exports from Japan to America have increased dramatically. And their markets are still the most closed of any advanced country in the world.

So in the past, America for 10 years tried 30 different trade agreements, the main focus of which was to change the processes by which they dealt with, instead of to, you know, achieve specific concrete results. And nothing ever happened. I mean, the trade deficit just got bigger and bigger. So we're going to try to pursue a much more aggressive policy now which will actually open markets.

And I might say there's a lot of people in Japan who agree with us. This is a problem for them, too, because as rich as that country is, the average Japanese pays almost 40 percent more for consumer products than the average American because their market's so closed.

So it isn't good for them either. They simply cannot continue to pursue the policy that they pursued when they were a poor country growing rich. They're now a rich country, and they can't export to the rest of the world and keep their own markets closed. And I think they know that. And we're going to work hard and try some different things to push that market open. But there are a lot of people in Japan who agree with us.

Mr. Imus. Of course, he was really aggressive, obviously, as you know, I mean, suggesting that they'd lied and broken that '88 agreement. I mean, he was pretty brutal there——

The President. Well, they didn't do what they said they'd do in '88. And last summer they said that we would have a trade agreement which would deal with autos and electronics and a lot of other issues—telecommunications—that would measure the results of our progress in qualitative and quantitative terms, which is a jargon phrase which means we'll see whether we're reducing the trade deficit or not. And they didn't want to do that here.

So there's a big fight going on in Japan now. The permanent government agencies there that have dominated policy for years and years, for decades, the trade and finance agencies, think the system they've had has worked. It's given them low unemployment and high savings rates, big exports and no imports, and they want to keep it. There are a lot of other people that want Japan to become a fully modern state with fair and open trade. And I think in a way we're helping the cause of the reformers by being tougher than America has been in the past on this issue in trying to get these markets open for our people.

Delbert McClinton

Mr. Imus. When the word got out around, particularly here in New York, yesterday that you were going to be on, all my friends at the networks called me and they said, "Ask him this, and ask him that." And I'd tell them, I'd say, "You ask him," because I'm not presumptuous enough to think I'm Ted Koppel or Tim Russert. I mean, our agenda here is to make you laugh, which we've done.

The President. But are they presumptuous enough to think they're you, that's——

Mr. Imus. No, they're not. [*Laughter*] Let me try to get some information, and the next time you have a gig at the White House we want to get you to book Delbert McClinton, because he's great. [*Laughter*] Do you know who Delbert is?

The President. Who is Delbert?

Mr. Imus. Oh, he's great. Man, you'd love him. If you love Elvis, you'll love Delbert McClinton. Sings that Texas blues.

The President. I like that Texas blues.

Mr. Imus. Oh, you'd love him. I'm going to send you a CD. I'll send it to my new best friend, Mark Gearan. I'll send it to him. He can give it to you.

The President. Are you hard up for a best friend? [*Laughter*] If you looked at Mark Gearan, if you can just look at him, he never—I don't believe he ever saw a country and western singer, much less heard one.

Mr. Imus. Well, maybe I'll send it to Paul Begala then.

The President. He's got a 1950's haircut. [*Laughter*]

Whitewater Development Corp.

Mr. Imus. I do have a math question, though. It's sort of like one of those, if Bill leaves L.A. traveling 55 miles an hour, and Bob leaves New York traveling 60 miles an hour, when will they each reach Sioux City, Iowa? So here's the question, Mr. President: You're the Governor of Arkansas making $35,000 a year, and Mrs. Clinton's over at the law firm making around $55,000. And out of what looks like a gross to me of around $90,000, how did you guys manage to lose $69,000 in that goofy Whitewater land deal? [*Laughter*]

The President. Oh, because we lost it over a long period of time.

Mr. Imus. Oh, okay.

The President. Most of it, the loss, was when we paid the bank loans back with interest, and we never got any money on the interest. So it happened over a long period of time.

Mr. Imus. Is that something that you think is going to—everybody I have on I ask this, and I've wanted to ask you. In your mind, is that something—I mean, are you guys sitting around there thinking this is going to turn into Watergate?

The President. No.

Mr. Imus. No.

The President. No, it's an investment I made 15 years ago that lost money instead of made money, because the property market turned around at home. It's a simple, straightforward thing, and it'll be shown to be. I mean, I'm absolutely comfortable with that. I mean, I'm amazed by all the twists and turns of interpretation that's been given. But that's about what happened.

Mr. Imus. Because I've had a bad run of luck here, Mr. President: I endorsed David Dinkins; I endorsed Jim Florio; I was supporting Barry Diller in his takeover for Paramount, so I don't need anything to happen to you now. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, there are a lot of folks that come after us on a regular basis. I wish they'd fight with us on the issues instead of what they do, but that's part of it. Apparently that's part of being President in the latter half of the 20th century in a highly competitive environment. All I know is I get up every day, show up for work, work as hard as I can, try to help people improve their lives, and that's what I'm going to keep doing. And the ones that want to keep attacking me, I'm going to let them do it and just do the very best I can with it. And I'll try to make your gamble good. I don't want you to be disappointed, but—[*laughter*]—keep in mind, sometimes if you make choices, sometimes you're going to lose. All your politicians can't win. It's like going to the horse races.

Mr. Imus. Of course, you notice how I've turned this into how it's going to affect me as opposed to your Presidency and the future of this country and the free world. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's probably, you know——

Mr. Imus. Let me say this: I don't mean to be disrespectful, but that vacation, that model home, that looked like someplace where Tonya Harding's bodyguards were holed up—[*laughter*]—no wonder you guys couldn't sell them. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, you know, it was a little place where a lot of working people without much money were looking for a place to retire and own some property in a beautiful place. And by the way, north Arkansas is full of folks like that. They're good people, even if they're not rich. I know that now that you've hit the big time, it's not worthy of you, but if you—[*laughter*]—maybe if you could guarantee me a profit I could go build a house on a piece

of land down there, and I could let you retire in Arkansas.

Mr. Imus. Actually, the guy I've worked with for 22 years, Charles McCord, has a house right on the shore there of Bull Shoals Lake, right there in Lead Hill, Arkansas.

The President. In Lead Hill, which is near Zinc.

Charles McCord. Exactly, 10 miles from Zinc, yes, sir.

The President. You've been there?

Mr. McCord. I built a vacation home there, Mr. President.

The President. Oh, there you are. It's beautiful, isn't it?

Mr. McCord. It is one of the most gorgeous parts of this country, period, and absolutely, northeastern Arkansas, the Buffalo River country, all of that, absolutely.

Bosnia

Mr. Imus. Mr. President, the United States—I just wanted to ask you briefly about Bosnia—the United States has always, in my mind, at least, set the agenda for NATO. But in the case of Bosnia, it seems that we are acquiescing to them. As the lone superpower in the world, aren't they really, bottom line, looking to us to do what we've always done?

The President. Well, that's what we were able to do in getting the resolution through last summer, authorizing the use of air power if Sarajevo was strangled. And then we and the French and then eventually the Germans and the British and all the others, agreed after this last terrible incident in the market in Sarajevo to strengthen that resolution and say that there ought to be basically an artillery-free zone around Sarajevo, which is what we're in the business of implementing now.

The difference is this—I know it's confusing—but basically the United Nations is on the ground in Bosnia. And the United Nations includes troops on the ground, includes troops from NATO countries. There are British troops on the ground; there are French troops on the ground; there are Canadian troops on the ground; there are Spanish troops on the ground; there are about to be some Dutch troops on the ground. A lot of these countries did not want NATO to use air power to protect Sarajevo or do anything else because they were afraid that their troops on the ground would be attacked and killed, and we didn't have any troops on the ground. And when I said I thought that the arms embargo ought to be lifted, a lot of those countries said, "Well, you may be right, but we're afraid for our troops on the ground who are there fulfilling the U.N. mission trying to keep people alive and deliver food and medicine, and keep the roads open." So to be fair to them, they were in a different position.

Now I think that the United States has finally succeeded in—and I told the allies at the NATO meeting in January we could not have an empty threat. So the Serbs now, I think, must know that if they don't comply, NATO will take action. And the United States has been pushing this for a long time. And I think we finally succeeded in bringing our allies around. I think a lot of them finally figured out that their troops on the ground were at greater risk by doing nothing than they were by taking action. But to be fair to the NATO allies, the United States has not put ground troops in Bosnia. I did not think we should. But because they had them there fulfilling the U.N. mandate, they were reluctant to have NATO bomb, because they were afraid of retaliation against their soldiers.

Now I think, we've sent a clear message to the Serbs. And I think everybody will hold tight. And we've got a chance. We've got a chance to really not only protect Sarajevo but to get a peace agreement that is decent and fair. And that's what we're going to be working for.

President's Health

Mr. Imus. A final question, Mr. President, your cholesterol is around 204, right?

The President. No, no, it's down now, I think.

Mr. Imus. Oh, it is?

The President. Well, I don't know, I think it's—what was it? Is that what it was?

Mr. Imus. Yes.

The President. Yes, I lost 15 pounds, but my cholesterol is still too high.

Mr. Imus. Yes, but the other day I read about the Clinton burger and that pastrami sandwich and that apple fritter the size of a baby's head. [*Laughter*]

The President. Hey, hey, the apple fritter—I had one bite of apple fritter.

Mr. Imus. Oh, okay. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's right, I did get off my diet that day. But I was transported. I mean, I was out there in a place I felt at home in. I was in a little town in Ohio, you know, and I spoke to all those police officers, and I stopped

at this little deli with this guy who had been a butcher's assistant when he was 13 years old and had finally saved enough money to open his own deli 3 years ago. And he built it with his hands, and he made this Clinton burger, And I thought, well, I'm going to eat it. He did it. And then I went to this restaurant in downtown Columbus and talked to those folks about health care. And I asked them what they thought I ought to have, and they said I ought to try the corned beef on pumpernickel. So that's what I did. They said that's what was good, so I tried it. Every now and then I lose my discipline. But I lost 15 pounds last year, and I'm going to try to lose 10 or 15 more this year. I like it better. I don't like to diet, but I like the way I feel when I'm a little bit lighter.

Mr. Imus. Mr. President, you were terrific. It's always great to have you on. Thank you very much.

The President. Well, thank you. Don't lose your sense of humor now just because I'm President.

Mr. Imus. No, I won't.

The President. Just give my adversaries equal time, that's all I ask. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Imus. Thanks.

The President. Have a good day.

Mr. Imus. All right, the President, Bill Clinton, here on the "Imus in the Morning" program.

The President. See you in Lead Hill.

NOTE: The telephone interview began at 8:03 a.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at a Brunch With Senior Citizens and an Exchange With Reporters

February 17, 1994

The President. I want to welcome all of you here today. You represent 60 million Americans, and we need your help to pass health care reform.

One of my key tests for health care reform is: Is it fair, and does it protect older Americans? Our proposal does. It preserves and strengthens Medicare. It gives new prescription drug coverage and long-term care coverage to senior citizens. And it protects the choice of a doctor.

Other approaches to health care reform in Congress threaten Medicare by taking money away from Medicare to pay for the health care of others. Congress comes back next week and will take up the balanced budget amendment. It also will take money from Medicare without doing anything to strengthen the health care security of senior citizens.

Make no mistake about it, right now in Congress there are people who represent interests who want to use Medicare as a sort of a bank to pay for other people's health care, to bring down the deficit, to do other things that have nothing to do with the purpose for which Medicare was paid in the first place.

We have demonstrated with our budgets that you can reduce the deficit and still be fair to older Americans. We have demonstrated with our health care plan that you can take savings from Medicare and strengthen Medicare by providing prescription drug benefits, by providing long-term care benefits, by doing something to help early retirees and guarantee the security of their health care plans.

I'm here today to say that I don't want Medicare to be used as a bank for other people's designs. I do want to strengthen Medicare and provide the prescription drug and long-term care benefits, but it can only be done if we fight together for a health care plan that has these provisions. Otherwise, if we don't fight, then these provisions will be taken out of our plan and, in fact, Medicare will be put at risk, either by the balanced budget amendment because of the way it works or by other people's health care plans.

So I need your help. We can do this. We can provide guaranteed health insurance for all Americans and include prescription drugs, which will save money over the long run, and include new options for long-term care, which will save

money over the long run, but only if you will fight. And I hope you will. I thank you for being here.

Yes.

Whitewater Development Corp.

Q. Mr. President, for the last couple of days, you've been talking about how hard the health care fight is going to be. At the same time, yesterday the Special Counsel in the Whitewater case said that his investigation he thinks is going to take a year and half. Is that going to be distracting for you, and why do you think it's going to take so long?

The President. Because most of it has nothing to do with me. I mean, this decision which many called for is going to cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, because what they did was to shut down the investigation that was ongoing of the S&L issues down there, which I have nothing to do with, and submerged it all in there. So it may take a good while because they have to go over all that ground. But I have really nothing to do with it, and they'll have to do whatever they're going to do in whatever time they're going to do it. The reason I thought it was a good idea to do the Special Counsel was so I wouldn't have to fool with it anymore, and I'm not spending any time on it.

Q. We see your lawyer coming in and out of here quite frequently. Are you meeting with him about this?

The President. I talked to him yesterday. But he basically just gives us a regular update, oh, every few weeks.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, are you contemplating taxing food stamps and the poor people to support your welfare plan?

The President. No.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, have you prepared the American people psychologically for the possibility of military conflict Monday?

The President. Well, I have done my best to talk about this, and we'll continue to talk about it as we get closer. I think the most important thing now is that the Serbs and others in Bosnia understand that the NATO allies are dead serious about carrying this out but that if the Serbs will move their weapons or put them under United Nations control, there will be no air strikes, and that we want to do what we can to get a permanent long-term peace agreement. That's what we're really working for.

The American people, I think, understand what is at stake here and understand our interest in not permitting Sarajevo to be shelled and hundreds of thousands of people's lives to be destroyed and in working for a peaceful agreement.

I have not committed ground troops to this conflict. I have said that we would participate in NATO air strikes, and I think it is the right thing to do. But I hope the air strikes will not be necessary, and they will not occur if the Serbs will comply.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Old Family Dining Room at the White House.

Announcement on the White House Conference on Aging
February 17, 1994

The President announced today that he is formally calling for a White House Conference on Aging to be convened in May of 1995.

"I am pleased to resume the proud traditions of White House Conference on Aging begun by President John F. Kennedy in 1961," said the President, noting that there has not been a White House Conference on Aging since 1981. "The fact that this will be the last White House Conference on Aging of the 20th century makes this one even more significant."

Under the terms of the Older Americans Act, which authorizes that such a Conference be held, a 25-member policy committee chosen jointly by the President and the Congress will be selected to work out the specifics of the Conference, including its agenda and the number of participants. Earlier in the fall, President

Clinton announced his selection of Robert B. Blancato, formerly of the National Italian-American Foundation and the former House Select Committee on Aging, to be the Executive Director of the White House Conference on Aging.

"An older America must soon face a new century," concluded the President. "A 1995 White House Conference on Aging allows us to plan for this challenge by working together to develop policy recommendations for the 21st century. We owe this to future generations."

Memorandum on Research Involving Human Subjects
February 17, 1994

Memorandum for the Vice President and the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Review of Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects

Federally funded biomedical and behavioral research has resulted in major advances in health care and improved the quality of life for all Americans. The pursuit of new knowledge in these fields of research often requires experiments that involve human subjects. Although human subjects research is an essential element of biomedical and behavioral research, bioethical considerations must influence the design and conduct of such research.

Since 1947, when guidelines for research with human subjects were promulgated, there has been increasingly widespread recognition of the need for voluntary and informed consent and a scientifically valid design of experiments involving human subjects.

Over time, this recognition has evolved into a rigorous and formalized system of regulations and guidelines, which were codified in governmental policies on human subject research, and were included in the former Department of Health, Education and Welfare's regulations in 1974, 45 C.F.R. 46. In 1991, 16 agencies formally adopted the core of these regulations in a common Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects. This Policy requires that all research protocols involving human subjects be reviewed by an Institutional Review Board. This review ensures that (1) risks are minimized and reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits; (2) there is informed consent; and (3) the rights and welfare of the subjects are maintained (56 Fed. Reg. 28003 (June 18, 1991)).

Although these regulations provide the framework for protecting human subjects in research, we must exercise constant care and ensure that these regulations are strictly enforced by departments and agencies. Therefore, I direct each department and agency of Government to review present practices to assure compliance with the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects and to cease immediately sponsoring or conducting any experiments involving humans that do not fully comply with the Federal Policy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Conflict in the Former Yugoslavia
February 17, 1994

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

On October 13, 1993, I provided a further report to the Congress on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support efforts of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to achieve peace and stability in Bosnia-Herzegovina. As part of my continuing efforts to ensure that Congress is fully informed, I am again writing to you, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to inform you that the United States has expanded its participation in this important effort to reach

a peaceful resolution of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

Beginning with United Nations Security Council Resolution 713 of September 25, 1991, the United Nations has actively sought solutions to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. In Resolutions 781 and 786 (October 9 and November 10, 1992), the Security Council established a ban on all unauthorized military flights over Bosnia-Herzegovina. Responding to "blatant violations" of the no-fly ban, in Resolution 816 (March 31, 1993) the Security Council extended the ban and authorized Member States and regional organizations to take "all necessary measures" to ensure compliance with the no-fly zone. NATO agreed to enforce the no-fly zone and "Operation Deny Flight" commenced on April 12, 1993.

Under Security Council Resolution 824 (May 6, 1993), certain parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina have been established as "safe areas." Sarajevo is specifically included as a safe area that "should be free from armed attacks and from any other hostile act." In addition, authority for the use of force in and around Sarajevo to implement the U.N. mandate is found in Security Council Resolutions 836 and 844 (June 4 and 18, 1993), which authorize Member States, acting "nationally or through regional organizations," to use air power in the safe areas to support the United Nations Protection Forces (UNPROFOR), subject to close coordination with the Secretary General and UNPROFOR.

As my previous reports to you have described, the participating nations have conducted phased air operations to prevent flights over Bosnia-Herzegovina that are not authorized by UNPROFOR. The United States has played an important role by contributing combat-equipped fighter aircraft, along with electronic combat and supporting tanker aircraft, to the operations in the air-space over Bosnia-Herzegovina. The no-fly zone has eliminated air-to-ground bombings and other air combat activity in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Most violations have involved rotary-wing aircraft. Our enforcement operations have been conducted safely with no casualties to date.

Recent heavy weapons fire in the Sarajevo area has resulted in a continuing heavy loss of life as well as serious injuries among the civilian population. An attack on February 4, 1994, killed ten people, and the following day a Sarajevo civilian marketplace was hit by a mortar attack that caused numerous civilian casualties, including 68 deaths. The United Nations Secretary General thereafter requested NATO to authorize, at the request of the United Nations, air operations against artillery or mortar positions determined by UNPROFOR to have been involved in attacks on civilian targets in the vicinity of Sarajevo.

On February 9, 1994, NATO accepted the U.N. Secretary General's request and authorized air operations, as necessary, using agreed coordination procedures with UNPROFOR. In addition, NATO took the decision to set a deadline for the withdrawal of heavy weapons (including tanks, artillery pieces, mortars, multiple rocket launchers, missiles and anti-aircraft weapons) from within 20 kilometers of the center of Sarajevo, with the exception of an area of two kilometers from the center of Pale, or for their regrouping and placement under U.N. control. After ten days from 2400 GMT February 10, 1994, all heavy weapons found within the Sarajevo exclusion zone, unless controlled by UNPROFOR, will be subject to NATO air strikes. In addition, NATO's decision provides the flexibility to act outside the 20-kilometer zone in response to any further artillery or mortar attacks on Sarajevo and authorizes the initiation of air attacks to suppress air defenses that would represent a direct threat to NATO aircraft in carrying out these operations. Further, U.S. airborne indirect-fire-locating units may be deployed to support these NATO operations. Importantly, U.S. forces assigned to NATO to conduct these missions retain their prerogative to take all necessary and appropriate action in self-defense, consistent with applicable NATO rules of engagement.

In my earlier reports I have informed you about the contribution of U.S. aircraft to participate in NATO air operations in Bosnia. In view of recent events, I have further directed the Secretary of Defense to take appropriate steps to ensure, in conjunction with our allies, that the assets necessary to implement the February 9 NATO decision are available in the region for the conduct and support of the NATO operations described above. At this point, more than 60 U.S. aircraft are available for participation in the authorized NATO missions.

In addition to no-fly zone operations and preparations to conduct air operations pursuant to the NATO decision, U.S. forces have conducted more than 2,200 airlift missions to Sara-

jevo and more than 1,200 airdrop missions in Bosnia. U.S. medical and other support personnel continue to provide critical services in support of UNPROFOR. Our U.S. Army light infantry battalion in Macedonia is an integral part of UNPROFOR monitoring efforts in that area. Finally, U.S. naval forces have completed over 18 months of operations as an integral part of the multinational effort to enforce the economic sanctions and arms embargo imposed by the Security Council.

I am taking these actions in conjunction with our allies in order to implement the NATO decision and to assist the parties to reach a negotiated settlement to the conflict. It is not now possible to determine the duration of these operations. I have directed the participation by U.S. armed forces in this effort pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I am grateful for the continuing support the Congress has provided, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in this endeavor. I shall communicate with you further regarding our efforts for peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

The President's Radio Address and an Exchange With Reporters
February 19, 1994

My fellow Americans, this morning I want to speak with you about the conflict in Bosnia. My administration has worked for over a year to help ease the suffering and end the conflict in that war-torn land. Now, a prolonged siege of the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo has brought us to an important moment.

In the coming days, American war planes may participate in NATO air strikes on military targets around Sarajevo. We do not yet know whether air strikes will be necessary. But I want to talk with you about what American interests are at stake and what the nature and goals of our military involvement will be if it occurs.

The fighting in Bosnia is part of the broader story of change in Europe. With the end of the cold war, militant nationalism once again spread throughout many countries that lived behind the Iron Curtain and especially in the former Yugoslavia. As nationalism caught fire among its Serbian population, other parts of the country began seeking independence. Several ethnic and religious groups began fighting fiercely. But the Serbs bear a primary responsibility for the aggression and the ethnic cleansing that has killed tens of thousands and displaced millions in Bosnia.

This century teaches us that America cannot afford to ignore conflicts in Europe. And in this crisis, our Nation has distinct interests. We have an interest in helping to prevent this from becoming a broader European conflict, especially one that could threaten our NATO allies or undermine the transition of former Communist states to peaceful democracies.

We have an interest in showing that NATO, the world's greatest military alliance, remains a credible force for peace in the post-cold-war era. We have an interest in helping to stem the destabilizing flows of refugees this struggle is generating throughout all of Europe. And we clearly have a humanitarian interest in helping to stop the strangulation of Sarajevo and the continuing slaughter of innocents in Bosnia.

I want to be clear: Europe must bear most of the responsibility for solving this problem and, indeed, it has. The United Nations has forces on the ground in Bosnia to protect the humanitarian effort and to limit the carnage. And the vast majority of them are European, from all countries in Europe who have worked along with brave Canadians and soldiers from other countries. I have not sent American ground units into Bosnia. And I will not send American ground forces to impose a settlement that the parties to that conflict do not accept.

But America's interest and the responsibilities of America's leadership demand our active in-

volvement in the search for a solution. That is why my administration has worked to help contain the fighting, relieve suffering, and achieve a fair and workable negotiated end to that conflict.

Over a year ago, I appointed a special American envoy to the negotiations to help find a workable, enforceable solution acceptable to all. And I have said that if such a solution can be reached, our Nation is prepared to participate in efforts to enforce the solution, including the use of our military personnel.

We have participated in the enforcement of economic sanctions against Serbia. We initiated airdrops of food and medicine and participated in the Sarajevo airlift, a massive effort, running longer than the Berlin airlift, which has relieved starvation and suffering for tens of thousands of Bosnians. Together with our NATO allies, we began enforcement of a no-fly zone to stop the parties from spreading the war with aircraft.

We have warned Serbia against increasing its repression of the Albanian ethnic minority in Kosovo. We have contributed 300 American troops to the United Nations force that is helping to ensure that the war does not spread to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which lies between Bosnia and Greece. And we have worked with our allies to ensure that NATO is prepared to help solve this crisis.

In August, at our initiative, NATO declared its willingness to conduct air strikes to prevent the strangulation of Sarajevo and other population centers. NATO reaffirmed that commitment at our summit in Brussels just last month. But the shelling of Sarajevo continued. Two weeks ago, in a murderous attack, a single shell killed 68 people in the city's market. And last week with our NATO allies, we said that those who would continue terrorizing Sarajevo must pay a price.

On that day, NATO announced it was prepared to conduct air strikes against any heavy weapons remaining after 10 days within 20 kilometers of Sarajevo, unless such guns are placed under United Nations control. That 10-day period ends tomorrow night. If the U.N. and NATO authorities find the deadline has not been met, NATO stands ready to carry out its mission. American pilots and planes stand ready to do our part.

I have asked Secretary of Defense Perry and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, to travel to Italy to meet with their counterparts from other participating NATO countries to review our preparations.

Over the past two days, there have been some encouraging signs in Bosnia that our ultimatum may be working. Bosnian Serb leaders now say they will comply with the ultimatum. There is some evidence that heavy weapons are being pulled back from around Sarajevo, but others remain.

Many nations have helped to underscore the seriousness of our common intent. I have conferred on this matter with Russian President Boris Yeltsin. And the Russians, in the last couple of days, have made very important contributions by using their influence with the Serbs and expressing a willingness to use their U.N. forces to help to enforce this order.

If guns are truly being moved or impounded, we welcome the news. If the Serbs and others fully comply with NATO's ultimatum, there will be no need to use force against anyone. But we are determined to make good on NATO's word. And we are prepared to act. Our actions will be determined by one thing: the facts on the ground.

I want to be clear about the risks we face and the objectives we seek if force is needed. American planes likely will account for about half the NATO air strikes if they proceed. General Shalikashvili has told me that our forces are well prepared for this operation. But the fact is, there is no such thing as a mission completely without risks, and losses may occur. I have conferred with my national security advisers and told them to take every precaution to protect our courageous soldiers in uniform.

Our military goal will be straightforward: to exact a heavy price on those who refuse to comply with the ultimatum. Military force alone cannot guarantee that every heavy gun around Sarajevo will be removed or silenced, but military force can make it more likely that Bosnian Serbs will seek a solution through negotiation rather than through Sarajevo's strangulation and that more innocent civilians will continue to live.

For that reason, I have also ordered American negotiators to intensify their efforts to help the parties reach a fair and enforceable settlement. I have consulted with leaders from both parties in the Congress and asked for their support in this effort. I want us all to stand united behind our forces if they need to conduct air strikes and united in our determination to do

our part in bringing an end to this dangerous conflict.

During this Olympic season, let us recall that only 10 years ago the winter Olympics were held in Sarajevo. Today, Sarajevo's athletic fields have been transformed into makeshift cemeteries for those killed in that city's siege.

In the week since NATO issued the ultimatum, the big guns around Sarajevo have fallen silent. Now let us work to help make this break in the violence continue so that Sarajevo's future may be marked by images of peace rather than by those of war and carnage.

While the cold war may be over, but the world is still full of dangers and the world still looks to America for leadership. Now, with our interests at stake and with our allies united at our side, let us show the world our leadership once again.

Thank you, and God bless America.

[*At this point, the radio address ended, and the President took questions from reporters.*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, has President Yeltsin assured you that the Russian role will be entirely constructive and under the NATO leadership and that there is no risk of a renegade Russian force protecting Serb weapons or Serb forces?

The President. Last night the United Nations Commander on the ground, General Rose, said that he was confident that all the U.N. forces, including the Russian forces, would carry out the U.N. mandate. And I have no reason to believe otherwise.

Q. But has President Yeltsin given you any such assurance? When was your last communication with him?

The President. When did I talk to him—the day before yesterday, I think. And we've been in constant communication. Based on my communications with him, I have no reason to believe otherwise.

Q. Mr. President, if there is compliance, is Sarajevo sacrosanct, or will you try to extend and pose the ultimatum in other parts where their slaughter goes on?

The President. I think for the next day and a half I'd like to let my statement stand for itself.

Q. Mr. President, could you just give us an idea of what you think the likelihood would be of the need for air strikes?

The President. I have nothing to add to the statement I made on that. I think my statement's pretty clear.

Q. Do you wish you had prevailed a year ago on this, in this action, and could have saved thousands of lives?

The President. We didn't have the votes we needed, though. We didn't have the consensus a year ago, we have now.

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Churkin that if there are air strikes, it could lead to a wider war—it would in fact produce a wider war?

The President. The purpose of the air strikes is made clear in the resolution of NATO and what the U.N. asked us to do. I think it is clear and self-contained and stands for itself. The words are clear.

President's Health

Q. Are your eyes doing better, Mr. President?

The President. They are much better. The doctor told me that nothing would heal them but time, and they're getting a little better. I don't look like the monster from the deep as much as I did 2 days ago.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, Commander of the U.N. Forces in Bosnia. Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaly Churkin was the Russian Special Envoy to the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
February 20, 1994

The President. I talked this morning with Secretary Perry and General Shali and General Joulwan and Admiral Boorda in Europe. There is a lot of activity on the ground. The Serbs seem to be moving weapons and also bringing the U.N. forces to the weapons that cannot be

moved. So that much is encouraging. But we are monitoring this as the day goes on. The deadline will stand, and I expect to get further reports throughout the day and to talk to Manfred Woerner later in the day after we see what happens.

Q. There seems to be some flexibility on this deadline. I mean, is it exactly at 7 p.m. our time, even if they found out they couldn't move certain weapons?

The President. The deadline only makes the artillery positions subject to attack, and I think that we should keep the deadline and we should keep working at it. There may or may not be some questions about whether all those weapons can be put into U.N. control, depending as much as anything else on the weather there. And we're just monitoring it.

Right now the report I got just before I came to church here was encouraging, directly from Secretary Perry and the military command we have there. But we're just going to have to wait and see what happens as the day unfolds.

Q. Are you hopeful, Mr. President, that you won't have to bomb?

The President. Well, I'm hopeful because of what I see happening. But basically, we have the procedures in place now, and as I said yesterday—I want to say again—what happens after 7 p.m. tonight will be determined by the facts on the ground. We have already authorized, I and the other leaders in the NATO coalition, we have already authorized our military commanders, working with the U.N., to draw their own conclusions and take appropriate actions. So the mechanisms are in place. This will be determined, as I said yesterday, entirely by what happens on the ground. We'll just have to see.

Q. Does the United Nations still have to authorize the first strike?

The President. Yes, the United Nations would have to approve the first strike. And right now, as I said, the activities on the ground seem encouraging. We'll just have to see. But there are still, plainly, weapons that are not yet under U.N. control, and they're not yet beyond the 20-kilometer safe zone. So we'll just have to see.

Q. Are you going to talk to Yeltsin before you——

Q. Are you going to talk to President Yeltsin?

The President. Well, we are in touch, close touch with the Russians, and I may well talk to him before any final determination is made. But that decision has not been made yet, and partly it's a function of the huge time difference, you know, between Washington and Moscow and what time it will be there by the time we know something. But we are keeping in close touch with the Russians, and I may well talk to President Yeltsin within the next 24 hours.

Q. What are you going to do all day?

The President. I don't know yet. I'm going to go take my family to lunch right now. It's a nice day, and I'm just going to be——

Q. Where are you going?

The President. We'll probably go back to the house and eat. But I'm going to be where I can get some reports.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:51 p.m. outside Christ Episcopal Church. During the exchange, the President referred to Secretary of Defense William J. Perry; Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. George A. Joulwan, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; Adm. J.M. Boorda, commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces in Europe; and NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on Results of NATO Action on Bosnia

February 20, 1994

I have just been informed by NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner that NATO and United Nations commanders have concluded that all known heavy weapons of the parties have been withdrawn from the exclusion zone around Sarajevo, are under the control of the United Nations, or soon should be. Therefore,

they have concluded that no air strikes in Bosnia by NATO air forces are required at this time.

This week's events clearly have given the residents of Sarajevo a respite from the shelling and a measure of hope. I want to congratulate NATO and each of our NATO allies for the demonstration of resolve that produced these results. I want to commend the high level of cooperation that has been demonstrated between the U.N. and NATO. As I told President Yeltsin in a call earlier today, I want to congratulate the Government of Russia for its contributions to this effort. Finally, all Americans join in praising the courage and skill of our service personnel and those of our NATO allies; they have been the muscle in NATO's ultimatum.

Despite the significant events of the day, we must remain vigilant. All parties should be aware that the ultimatum stands. The deadline has not been extended. Any heavy weapons in the exclusion zone not under U.N. control are, and will remain, subject to air strikes. NATO's decision also applies to any heavy weapons attacks on Sarajevo from within or beyond the zone. NATO and the United Nations will continue to monitor compliance extremely carefully.

The NATO decision and its results provide new potential for progress toward an end to the tragic conflict in Bosnia. In the coming days, American diplomats will be working with the parties to the conflict and our allies and partners to transform this potential into reality.

The President's News Conference
February 21, 1994

Bosnia

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It is now over 15 hours since NATO's ultimatum regarding Sarajevo went into effect. According to NATO and United Nations commanders, at this point the parties are in effective compliance with the ultimatum. There continues to be no shelling of Sarajevo. Over 250 heavy weapons have been placed under U.N. control. All known heavy weapons have now been removed or brought under U.N. control, except for a couple of sites that should be brought under control within hours as the U.N. operation continues. As a result, air strikes have not yet been necessary.

I spoke this morning with U.N. Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali and expressed my appreciation for his efforts. I again want to congratulate NATO, our NATO allies, and Secretary General Manfred Woerner for their resolve; the United Nations for its efforts and its cooperation with NATO; the Government of Russia for its important contributions to a peaceful resolution; and above all, the American military personnel and those from our NATO allies whose courage and skill provided the muscle that made this policy work. Let me review why we and our NATO allies took this action: to stem the destruction of Sarajevo and to reinvigorate the peace process.

Now that we have brought some breathing space to the people of Sarajevo, we are taking additional steps on both fronts. First, we intend to remain vigilant. The U.N. and NATO will continue to conduct intensive reconnaissance and monitoring of the Sarajevo area. The NATO decision stands. We will continue to enforce the exclusion zone. Any shelling of Sarajevo or the appearance of heavy weapons in the exclusion zone will bring a certain and swift response from the U.N. and NATO. Second, we are working to renew progress toward a negotiated solution among the parties. A workable, enforceable solution acceptable to all parties is the only way to ensure a lasting solution for Sarajevo and for all of Bosnia.

Negotiations among the parties are set to resume in the near future. American negotiators have been and will remain active in helping to bridge the gap among the parties. Ambassador Redman has had a series of intensive conversations in Europe, and this week in Bonn our experts will meet with the representatives from European Union countries, Canada, and Russia to take stock of where we are.

The challenge for all who have been touched by the fighting in Bosnia, the parties to the

conflict, our own nation, and the international community, is to build on this week's progress and create a lasting and workable peace for all the people of Bosnia.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, are you willing to extend the ultimatum to stop the killing in other parts of Bosnia and to persuade the allies and Russia to go along with the idea of enforcing it throughout the country?

The President. Well, that's one of the things that we've been discussing this morning and that our representatives will be discussing in Europe this week.

Let me say, first of all, we have to make sure that we continue to do what we can to protect Sarajevo. Second, we should remember that that option is, in effect, available now wherever there are U.N. forces, because if U.N. forces are brought under shelling, they can ask for close air support from NATO. Thirdly, if we decide to pursue this as a strategy, we think it is important, as we did in Sarajevo, that the United Nations not—excuse me, that NATO not undertake any mission it is not fully capable of performing. And I think that's very important. So we're reviewing——

Q. Well, wouldn't it be an irony, though, to have killing go on in other parts and just protect——

The President. Oh, yes. Well, we're very concerned about the prospect that maybe the weapons could be moved out of the Sarajevo area and transferred to another area. We're quite concerned about that. I believe that the United Nations Commander on the ground, General Rose, has been pretty clear and forceful about that, too, as he has been about everything. I think he's making a real difference there.

Q. Mr. President, Bosnia's Ambassador to the United Nations has expressed fears that the weapons that are being moved out of Sarajevo are being taken to other battlefronts. Do you see any evidence of that? And if so, is there anything that can be done to prevent it?

The President. Well, we're doing what we can to discourage it, obviously, and we believe that others will, including the Russians. And keep in mind, I think General Rose on the ground will take an aggressive attitude about that. And remember, as I just said to Helen, we now have operative right now a resolution to NATO which we supported, which gives the U.N. commanders the option at the present time, if they're under shelling, to call in NATO close air support.

Q. Mr. President, given your apparent success in this, how do you answer those who will now say to you and to other NATO leaders who may perhaps have been not as enthusiastic as you have been about such an operation, "Why not sooner?"

The President. Well, I would say, first of all, when we got the first approval ever for NATO out-of-area operations last summer, that resulted in immediately a reduction in the shelling of Sarajevo and the casualties, and then they built back up. So we've been working on this for some time. Even before then, we received permission to enforce a no-fly zone. So we've been working on this for some time.

I think that we finally had a consensus among our allies—and I have to compliment them—and which included, as I have said many times, NATO members who had troops on the ground there, unlike the United States. So I think that the main thing we need to do now is to build on this and figure out how we can use it to make a permanent peace.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Q. Mr. President, how can you build on this diplomatically? What can the United States now bring to the peace talks? You've always said that it has to be determined among the parties, but once you have a bottom line from the Bosnian Muslims, is there some new initiative, some way to push it? And might the Russian involvement on the ground lead to more Russian involvement in the diplomacy, as well?

The President. Well, I would hope it will. President Yeltsin and I have been discussing this, as you know, intensely, both through our representatives and directly. And I talked to him again yesterday. I hope that they will be intensely involved in this. I think it is important that all of us who are prepared to stick with this and who have made the same commitment, that if there is an agreed-upon peace will help to implement it, really push for that kind of peace. On the other hand, I think it is equally important that we not pretend that we can impose a peace that the parties disagree with, that they do not freely accept. So that's the delicate line we'll be walking, and that's what our people will be discussing this week in Europe.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Q. Mr. President, if the United States now is much more actively engaged in working with the Bosnian Government to achieve some sort of peaceful settlement, won't that bring additional responsibilities to the U.S. Government if the Bosnians do go forward and make major concessions? Specifically, how committed are you to dispatching some 25,000 U.S. military peacekeepers to try to enforce an agreement?

The President. Well, I have said since February of 1993, since shortly after becoming President, that if the parties themselves freely and clearly adopted a peace agreement which the United States felt was an enforceable one, that we would do what we could through the United Nations and through NATO to support the implementation of it as long as we had fewer than half of the troops there and as long as we were convinced that we had a fair chance to implement it. We're not committed to any specific number of troops, but I think we should, and that's been my position all along.

Q. You first talked of air strikes some 13 months ago. Do you now feel personally vindicated by the events of the past couple of days and week?

The President. To be honest, I haven't given any thought to that. Let me just say generally, in a situation like this, first of all, it's a complicated, heartbreaking situation. I want the United States to play a role in stabilizing that part of the world, so the conflict doesn't spread, and in bringing an end to the humanitarian tragedy.

I believe that the policy that I have advocated is and has been the right one. But I also fully recognize that, unlike our allies that I had to convince to go along with the policy, we did not have troops on the ground there. We did not have people who could be easily outnumbered and killed quickly. So I have to say a strong word of appreciation to our allies in NATO for the work they have done, as well as a strong word of appreciation to General Rose and to, generally, the renewed vigor of the United Nations forces in Bosnia, because they knew they would be at some risk if this policy ultimatum had to be carried out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 48th news conference began at 12:10 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Charles E. Redman, U.S. Special Envoy to the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, and Muhammed Sacirbey, Bosnian Ambassador to the United Nations.

Remarks to the American Council on Education
February 22, 1994

Thank you very much, Father Malloy, for that introduction. Now that we're in Washington, DC, I should tell you that the most important thing about him is not that he is the president of Notre Dame but that he was a legendary high school basketball player who played on the same team with the great John Thompson, here in Washington, DC. This is one of our big struggles in life. Some people would question, is it better to be the president of Notre Dame or be a great high school basketball player? The answer is, it's better to do both, if possible. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank you all for inviting me here and to say that I've looked forward to this day. I want to recognize many of you in the audience, but I think if I start I don't know where I'll stop. I am glad to be joined here by the Secretary of Education, and I know that the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor also are on this program.

Many leaders in our administration have come from the ranks of higher education. Donna Shalala was the chancellor at the University of Wisconsin. The Director of USIA, Joseph Duffey, who came in with me, was the president of American University and formerly the president of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Dr. David Satcher, the Director of the Center of Disease Control, was formerly the president of Maharry Medical Center in Tennessee. Shirley Chater, the Commissioner of Social Security, was the president of Texas Woman's University. Then there are the people in

our administration like the Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, the First Lady, and me, who taught at institutions of higher education and complained about you all the time. [*Laughter*] So we're actually all exhausted after the last year, and we're looking for a home to go back to—[*laughter*]—so I sort of came here for a job interview today. [*Laughter*]

For 75 years, the American Council on Education has represented colleges and universities with real distinction. And in large measure because of your common efforts, it is now generally agreed that we have the finest system of higher education anywhere in the world. No other nation gives such a high percentage of its high school graduates the opportunity to go on to college. None other offers such diverse choices among institutions. No other nation conducts as much basic research at its universities or produces as many Nobel laureates. No wonder tens of thousands of students come here from all over the world every year to study.

The shape of American higher education is changing, and with it, the needs and demands. This morning, in preparation for this speech in part, I went jogging with about 12 students from the Northern Virginia Community College. One had just become a citizen, was a native of Iran; another was a native of Sierra Leone; another was a native of Peru; another a native of Scotland. Nobody but me had a southern accent in the whole crowd. [*Laughter*]

Every great chapter in our history has begun by expanding educational opportunities, from guaranteeing free public education to creating the land grant colleges to enacting the G.I. bill. Education has propelled our economy, strengthened our democracy, and created our great American middle class.

As Governor, I worked to improve our schools because I thought it was the best way to lift people up in a State with a lot of people who worked hard but were not rewarded sufficiently for their work. I ran for President in large measure because I thought too many of our people were working too hard for too little, that the American dream of upward mobility was seriously imperiled, and that our country was coming apart when it needed to come together. As President, I work every day to try to secure and expand opportunities for people to be in that middle class and to see that American dream.

It is now clear that in order to do that, more than ever before, Americans must seek their own opportunities to improve their lives through education and training and that it must happen over the course of a lifetime. We now know that the average American, because of changes in the economy at home and abroad, will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime, even if that person stays with the same employer, although most will change employers frequently throughout a lifetime. If that is true, it is clear that we need an agenda as a people for lifetime learning.

And so today, I want to offer you a seven-point agenda for lifetime learning: first, to help every child begin school healthy and ready to learn; second, to set and achieve world-class standards in public education; third, to open the doors of college opportunity to every young American who is eager and able to do college work; fourth, to expand opportunities for our young people to serve their communities and their country while earning money for their education; fifth, to provide new learning opportunities for young people who are going from high schools to work; sixth, to change our unemployment system into a reemployment system; and finally, to challenge every sector of our society to accept greater responsibility for achieving an environment of lifelong learning.

I come today to ask for your support, to invite the Congress to continue its cooperation in enacting the lifelong learning agenda, and to call on all Americans to do their part.

Throughout our history, people have had the idea that if they worked hard, played by the rules, and made the most of their opportunities, they would be rewarded by a decent life and greater opportunities for their children. But for the last two decades, that whole idea has been called into question as more and more Americans have lengthened their work week while their wages have remained stagnant or have actually declined relative to inflation.

This happened because of a lot of things. The world is changing rapidly, more rapidly than our policies, perhaps more rapidly than our ability to understand the changes themselves. An economy that was once almost entirely domestic is now global in its competition for markets and for jobs. Once capital and information, management and technologies were limited by national boundaries. Clearly, today, they are not. Once the principal source of wealth was natural re-

sources. Then it was mass production. Today it is clearly the problem-solving capacity of the human mind, making products and tailoring services to the needs of people all across the globe.

In the 19th century, at most, young Americans needed a high school education to make their way. It was good enough if they could read well and understand basic numbers. In the 20th century, as the century progressed, more and more they needed more education, college as well. And in the 21st century, our people will have to keep learning all their lives.

This is clearly evident everywhere. Next month in Detroit, I will host a conference of the world's leading industrial nations to discuss how we can make technology, information, trade, and education create more and better jobs for all our citizens. This now is a problem throughout all advanced countries, the problem we have been experiencing for 20 years. In America we have had more good fortune than the Europeans, for example, in creating new jobs; our problem has been increasing incomes. In Europe hardly any new jobs have been created. Now in Japan they're having great difficulty creating new jobs. So you see, in all the advanced countries there is a combined crisis of jobs and incomes. In the United States, even though we created almost 2 million jobs last year, we are still millions short of where we would be, going back in 1989, if this had been a normal economic recovery. So you now have a global crisis in the advanced nations: How do you create jobs, how do you raise incomes?

If you look at the charts behind me, you will see, however, that even though this is an international problem for all the advanced countries, it is clear that for individuals in our country, education goes a long way toward solving the problem of jobs and incomes.

First, if you look at the unemployment rate in America in March of 1993—these numbers would be all slightly lower now but still more or less the same, the ratios would all be the same—people with no high school diploma had a 12.6 percent unemployment rate. People with 4 years of high school had a 7.2 percent unemployment rate. People with some college education had a 5.7 percent unemployment rate, that is, below the national average. People with 4 years of college had a 3.5 percent unemployment rate, way below the national average. And I would point out that this is after several years of severe defense downsizing which has dramatically increased unemployment among college-educated workers in some sectors of the economy. And these numbers still hold.

Now, if you look at the chart to my right, and now I'm on your right, too—I've turned around—[*laughter*]—if you see the earnings here, it is clear that what you earn depends upon what you're able to learn. Again, the mean earnings of full-time workers—this is calendar year 1992—$19,100 for people with no high school diploma, $5,000 more for 4 years of high school, $4,000 more for some college, $11,000 more for 4 years of college, stepping up.

It is, therefore, clear that if we really want America to grow jobs and increase earnings, we will have to dramatically improve the levels of education of the American people, that we have to start with the preschoolers, but we can't stop with the adults.

Today, these dozen young people that I ran with, I asked them what their ages were. The youngest was 19; the oldest was 32, in this community college. I would say their average age, I didn't run the math, but their average age was probably, oh, 24, 25. The average age of a college student in America today is, I think is 26. And it is likely, given the demographics and the fact that the youngest of the baby boomers are now 29, if my math is right, that the average age will continue to go up for another 10 years or so.

So any hope we have to hook the American economy to the 21st century and to open up opportunity again depends upon making sure that our education system is responsive to and adequate to the demands of the times and able, I might add, to make a strength of that diversity that I spoke about a few moments ago.

In 1993 we tried to clear some of the noneducational obstacles to our growth away by bringing the deficit down, creating incentives to invest in a growing economy, stripping away controls on exports that were outmoded so that we could export more of our high-technology products, opening up trade opportunities in Mexico and throughout the world with the GATT agreement and other initiatives, trying to build a foundation for economic growth.

Last year our economy created almost 2 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, a real change from previous years when more and more job growth had come only from Government. And we have begun clearly to

move in the right direction. But over the long run, if you look at these charts behind me, it is clear that the future of our economy and, therefore, the fabric of our society, is in no small measure in your hands and the hands of others who are committed to educating our people for a lifetime.

We're going to have to make some tough choices because we can't do everything we would like to do. But I believe we can, with discipline, continue to bring the deficit down and make room for investments that improve the skills and the productivity of the American people. In order to do that, we have to take the long view, and we have to avoid gimmicks. I believe—and I think I have some credibility in saying this now since I lived in a State and governed a State for a dozen years with, I think, the toughest budget mechanism in the country and since we now have adopted one tough budget, bringing the deficit down, and if this budget is adopted, our administration will be the first since Harry Truman's to have three consecutive declines in the deficit—I think I can say that I think this balanced budget amendment is not a good idea for the United States. And I'll tell you why.

First of all, if you constitutionalize the budgeting process and no one's sure what it all means, you're going to wind up having courts making decisions about budgets. If any of you have ever had your budgets in court, you know that's not a very good place to do it.

Secondly, if the amendment is carried out, it will lead to, in the near term, until we reform health care, it will lead in the near term either to huge tax increases which could cramp economic growth or to huge cuts in defense or Social Security and Medicare or investments in education and technology or all of the above. And if it is decided to ignore that, then what you will do is basically put the filibuster in the Senate and in the House in the only area where it doesn't exist today, the budget. That is, you will put 40 percent of the Senate and 40 percent of the House plus one vote in total control of the American Government and America's future. Now, that's what this does if it passes the way it is.

The budget that I presented cuts or eliminates outright over 300 Government programs and reduces the deficit according to very tough targets and increases our investment at the national level in lifelong learning by 23 percent by getting rid of some things and investing in others. If you think that's the way we ought to go, I wouldn't mind it, since you're in town, if it's not even a long-distance call, if you call your Senator or Congressman and tell them that that's the way you feel.

Why do we need to spend this money? Let's look at the various elements that I outlined earlier. First, in lifelong learning: With regard to early childhood, we all know that parents are the first and most important teachers, but sometimes Government can help them to do that. That's why our agenda begins with investing in our youngest children, giving them a healthy start in life, giving them a chance to succeed later as students and ultimately as citizens, giving them a chance to stay out of prison and in the work force and become full-fledged human beings in every way. That's why we're increasing our investment in child nutrition and immunization and investing not just in a bigger Head Start program but in a better one as well. Our budget will serve about 850,000 children this year and provide new opportunities for the very youngest children.

With regard to public schools, I want to talk a little about our Goals 2000 legislation that the Secretary of Education has worked so hard on. Back in 1989, I represented the Governors in negotiating the national education goals with the administration. The goals were designed to recognize the fact that from the day they start kindergarten to the day they graduate from high school, we owe our young people the best education in the world and then the chance to go to a lifetime of learning.

Our States and communities have always taken the lead in public education, and they'll continue to do so. But the National Government can do more to help. With the Goals 2000 legislation, we enshrine the national education goals, establish national standards by which we can determine whether schools are meeting those goals, encourage grassroots reforms, and give the schools the flexibility and the tools they need to meet the goals. We encourage States and communities to learn from one another, empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas like public school choice and charter schools, asking always one overriding question of every education official: Are the children learning what they need to learn to compete and win in the global economy? Goals 2000 has been approved by bipartisan majorities in

both Houses of Congress. I look forward to a speedy conference and to signing the bill into law next month.

We also favor dramatic reforms in the education and secondary education act. Our efforts to raise standards and to focus resources have sparked some controversy, so I thought I would mention this, even though it only indirectly affects you. I just think the status quo in this act is not good enough. As the House debates this act this week, we will fight for fundamental changes: first of all, high standards of all students, wherever they are; secondly, significant waiver authority for schools to make experimental decisions.

We've got real problems in this country today, folks. Baltimore, for example, has in effect chartered several of their schools, I think up to nine now, to be operated by private corporations to see if they can at least fix the physical facilities. If you want to know why—I don't know how many of you saw—here, I'll promote Al Gore a little bit here—the Sunday Times magazine has a wonderful article on the Vice President. It also has a stunning picture essay which says this better than I could: "America's Best Building." See, this is a beautiful library, and this is a lousy building. This is a school building; this is a prison library. Why? Because you can take a State into Federal court and make them build buildings like this for prisoners. And the students don't have any such constitutional claims now.

So these school districts are having to try some fairly radical approaches, and they're trying to say, "Well, if we've got some fat in this budget, if we can clean up the physical facilities, if we can make it available, we ought to try some things." We want to give people a chance to try that.

I made a joke about Father Malloy's basketball prowess, but you know, I think it's important for children when they're in school to be able to play basketball and baseball and have music and learn something about art. And a lot of schools in this country where the kids need it the worst, can't afford it anymore. You know, there are kids in neighborhoods that produce the greatest baseball players in the history of America where there are no gloves and balls and bats and playgrounds anymore. It's a serious problem. I could spend the rest of the time talking about that picture essay, but you ought to get that picture and ask yourself: How did my country come to this? Why, when it's so much cheaper to educate somebody than it is to keep them in prison, can you get a better library in the prison than you can in the school?

Which leads me to the next point. The other thing we try to do in this is to make sure that the limited money we do have goes to the school districts that need it the most. Why? Because they don't have access to the Federal courts to order people to build them those kind of buildings. So we have to spend the money that we have where it is needed the most.

And finally, we try to promote more parental involvement in the schools, knowing it will make a difference. If it makes a difference in Head Start, it will make a difference in elementary school, too.

We have a safe and drug-free schools initiative. First of all, we know that more than 160,000 kids every day stay home because they are afraid to go to school. Tens of thousands go to school carrying not just their lunches but knives or guns. In that kind of environment it's hard for teachers to teach and for students to learn, people are scared and people are armed. Our safe schools act helps to reduce violence by adding security, removing weapons, and maybe most importantly, helping schools to get the resources to teach young people to resolve their problems peacefully. And our national drug strategy provides more education to help them stay away from drugs and guns and gangs.

Let me just mention one thing. I know you're going to think I'm obsessed with this, but I heard about a program the other day in a school that is immensely successful: teaching children ways other than violence to resolve their difficulties. It was wildly popular among the students. There was a drop in violence in the school in question. A business had given this school $3,000 to pay for somebody to come in and teach the program, but because it was dependent upon largesse, the grant wasn't forthcoming the next year and so the $3,000 was gone. If $3,000 kept one person out of the penitentiary, it saved $30,000 a year. We have got to get our priorities back in order on this investment issue.

The next thing I want to talk about with regard to education is student loans, something you know a lot about. Last June I addressed a commencement at Northeastern University in

Boston, and I met the young student who spoke there named Doug Luffborough, who delivered an incredibly moving address. He talked about how his mother had worked hard at very low wages all her life, and he tried to tell her that he wanted to give up college so he could help her support his two younger brothers and their sister. But his mother insisted that he go on to college no matter how difficult her circumstances. His message was, "Never say I could have, I should have, I would have; just say, I can, I will." Well, that's great that he did that. But you and I know that there are too many young people who go to college and drop out or defer going to college because they think they can't afford it. And last year I proposed and the Congress adopted initiatives to change the student loan program to help people like Doug Luffborough, and I thank all of you for helping it pass.

The new direct lending program reduces fees, interest rates, and monthly payments for millions of borrowers. It gives every student the choice of repaying loans as a small percentage of income over time, which is a big deal for young people who know they want to do things that are personally rewarding but don't pay very much. It will decrease the debt burden that crushes too many of those people and discourages them from spending a few years in lower paying jobs. And it will save the taxpayers over $4 billion in just the first 5 years.

We have also strengthened the Pell grant program. When I became President, the Pell grant program was $2 billion in arrears. That's one of those pleasant things you don't know about until you show up one day and they drop that on your desk. I am pleased to report that if Congress accepts the proposal that the Secretary of Education has developed, the shortfall will be eliminated by the end of the next fiscal year, the number of student recipients will increase to 4.1 million, the most ever, average awards will increase, and for the first time in 4 years, the maximum benefit will increase.

Congress has also given us the tools to root out fraud and to decrease default, and we're beginning to use them. We want to listen attentively to your suggestions for reducing Federal intrusion and redtape. But we have to faithfully implement and vigorously enforce this law. That was the compact I made with students all over America in 1992: If I became President, I would try to open the doors of education to all young Americans, never make the cost a deterrent, but you've got to pay your loan back.

We also need to do more to open the doors of equal opportunity. Last fall, I signed an Executive order strengthening the partnership between the Federal Government and historically black colleges and universities. Last week, the Department of Education issued guidelines that lifted the cloud hanging over scholarships for minorities. [*Applause*]

You know, it's interesting to me, the more people know about this issue, the more likely they are to be on our side. Did you notice that?

Later today, I will sign another Executive order to advance educational excellence for Hispanic-Americans. I believe we now live in a Nation with way over 150 ethnic and racial groups. In a global economy with shrinking distances, instantaneous communication, and blurred borders, this can give us an advantage in the 21st century unlike that enjoyed by any other nation, but only if we have a genuinely deep commitment to universal education and the development of the capacities of all Americans.

Now, let me say one word about my favorite project, national service. Last year we provided new opportunities for tens of thousands of our young people who wanted to contribute something to their communities and earn money for education. The national service program which Congress adopted, AmeriCorps, will this year send 20,000 young people out across our country, helping police to stop crime and violence, tutoring the young, keeping company with the old, helping the illiterate to learn to read, organizing neighborhood cleanups, conserving national parks. Within 3 years, we'll have 100,000 young people a year doing that.

There was a program in Texas last summer where the young people helped to immunize over 100,000 people, and a respected evaluator just looked at the program and said that for every one dollar in tax money spent in that program of immunization, $5.50 in tax money would be saved with a healthier population. National service is more than a program, it carries the spirit of what America is going to have to be like if we're going to solve our problems and grow closer as a people.

I want to thank the colleges and universities that are participating. Smith College makes community service a requirement for graduation.

Spellman is forming real partnerships with communities throughout the Atlanta area. Hampshire College matches assistance with the national service program and provides for young people who join AmeriCorps. For every American who needs to find a first job, national service is a good place to begin.

Let me also now talk very briefly about this school-to-work issue, something that the community colleges have been particularly involved in. We have the best system of higher education in the world, but we are the only advanced country that basically has no system for helping all of our young people who don't go to the 4-year colleges at least have a smooth transition from school to work where they've got a chance to have a good job with a growing income.

For the half of the young people who don't go to college and the nearly three-quarters who don't get a 4-year college degree, we propose a better system to move from school to work, a new kind of education and training connecting the classroom and the workplace, removing the artificial distinction between the academic and the practical. Students will learn practical problem-solving in the classroom and at job sites. And for at least a year after graduating we want young people to get more training in workplaces and community colleges.

We have to have rigorous academics and practical learning. We have to tie the workplace to the learning environment in high school for young people who know they are not going on to 4-year colleges in a way that makes them respect learning and gives them the option, therefore, to go on to a 4-year college later and to work and succeed if they do not.

We know now, from a lot of studies that have been done of people's personal learning capacities, that a lot of very bright people actually learn more in a practical setting than in a more abstract setting. We also know that a lot of practical tasks now require very sophisticated levels of knowledge. Therefore, we have an opportunity to do something that Americans have resisted for too long, which is to merge instead of keep divided our notion of vocational education and academic education. And that is what the school-to-work program is all about.

Part of Goals 2000 is voluntary national skills standards that will enable every young person who goes through this program to get a nationally recognized credential, good for young men and women, good for employers who need skilled workers but don't always know how to recognize them. A B.A. degree should not and must not be the only ticket to a good job and a good livelihood, but you shouldn't be foreclosed from going on to get one by what you do in the school-to-work program. Our approach would solve both problems.

Finally, let me say, just as we need to train our young people, we have to retrain millions of workers who are losing their jobs, people who have been displaced by technological change, international trade, corporate restructuring, reduced defense spending, and ordinary cycles in the business economy aggravated by changes in the global economy.

The unemployment system into which employers all over America pay taxes was designed for a time when there would be cyclical changes in the economy which would require them to lay their workers off, so that humanity demanded that they give their workers some even though a reduced level of compensation, and then they would be brought back to work when the economy cycled upward again. The truth is that that doesn't describe what happens to most unemployed people anymore. And yet, the structure of unemployment is still designed for that economy.

What we need to do is sort of erase the whole concept of unemployment and develop one of reemployment. What would that mean? It would mean that at least on the day that someone loses a job, and before if they have any advance notice, people would be planning to use the unemployment time as a retraining time, not just waiting around until the unemployment benefits run out to have to look around for a new job or a new skill but to use the time on unemployment to learn and to grow and to develop new job skills and new awareness of what kinds of jobs are offered. We want to create one-stop job centers where unemployed workers can get counseling and assistance and learn about new job opportunities, the skills they require, and where they can best get the training.

Last month, just to give you one example, I attended a Labor Department conference on training and retraining, and I met some interesting people. I met a woman named Deb Woodbury from Bangor, Maine, who lost a factory job, had a bunch of kids, didn't know what in the world to do, learned new skills to be a marketing representative. I met a woman

named Cynthia Scott from San Antonio, who went from welfare to a training program in nursing and a good job in a hospital. I met a man named John Hahn from Niagara County, New York, who was laid off from a job he had for 28 years because of defense cuts and, being an older worker, was still given the opportunity to learn new skills for a new career as a biomedical technician. And I might say, he was lucky enough to find an employer who was smart enough not to discriminate against people because they weren't young, which has got to be a big part of this. We're going to move people through a mobile learning environment, we have to get over the notion that since you're not going to keep somebody for 30 years anyway, or at least not in job X for 30 years, people are going to have to be willing to hire people who are not young as well as people who are young.

Ironically, we've got two big blocks here in the labor mobility. One is a lot of young people can't get hired coming out of college because they haven't had any experience, and so they keep running around like a dog chasing their tail. How do you ever get it if nobody hires you? The other is people who have worlds of experience, but because they're so old, people say, well, they don't want to hire them. Well, they look younger to me every day. [*Laughter*]

So I think that employer attitudes are some things we're also going to have to work on. But if we can set up this kind of system, this reemployment system, it will become normal. Then losing a job may not be so traumatic because with income supports and retraining, people will be able to see it as an opportunity to move to a new and exciting and different career, so that job security won't be tied to a particular job so much as it will be to the ability to work and the ability to find a job. We'll have to redefine that security, but if we do, it will be deeper because it will be real, real meaning tied to the realities of this economy, not the economy of a generation ago. And I know all of you can identify with that, and many of you have worked hard on it.

Finally let me say, in order for any of this to work, there has to be a whole ethic that grips the American imagination. Parents and schools and teachers have to believe that this is important and have to support it, all of them. This is not something that professional educators alone can do.

I just—to give you an example of that, the kind of a flip side of a very troubling story today—I don't know how many of you saw the cover story in USA Today today, but it's about teen pregnancy and what a terrible problem it is and how births to teen mothers are going up again and now most of them are out-of-wedlock births. A couple of years ago, the Children's Defense Fund did a study on teen mothers. And they surveyed two groups of them, one who had a second child out of wedlock, another group that did not have another child out of wedlock. And the single most significant determinant for the ones who never had another child out of wedlock was the acquisition of a good education, which gave them an appreciation for what they could become and a devotion for the future and an understanding about what it took to raise children successfully. So this is something that has to grip the American imagination. Government programs alone can't do it. Educational professionals alone can't do it. There is something for all of us to do. But it begins with us here in Washington passing our agenda.

So again, I would say, if you believe we should prepare children for school better, if you believe we should set higher standards for our public schools, if you believe we should expand college opportunity and encourage national service and provide a transition from school to work and create a system of reemployment to replace unemployment, and if you believe we have to challenge every American to be a part of this ethic, then I ask for your support. I ask for your support in the Congress. I ask for your support in your institutions. I ask for your support in the country.

Education has always been important for democracy. Democracy is always a gamble, at every election, in every crisis, at every turn in the road, because it requires that a majority of the people have enough information in the proper context with a high enough level of security to make the right decision, sometimes under the most arduous circumstances. We are now being called upon to make a lot of those right decisions. And one of those right decisions is the simple question of how we can guarantee the success of this democracy into the 21st century. It begins with the program that I have discussed today. And I ask for your support, and I thank you for what you're doing to make

the American dream real for so many millions of Americans.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to John Thompson, Georgetown University basketball coach.

Remarks on the Ames Espionage Case and an Exchange With Reporters
February 22, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I know that all of you have been informed about the arrest of the CIA employee and his wife for espionage. I just want to make a couple of brief comments.

First of all, I have been kept informed of this investigation for some time now. It is a very serious case. I congratulate the FBI and the CIA for the work they did in cracking it. We will be immediately lodging a protest to the Russian Government. And because of the nature of the case, there's really nothing more I can say at this time. Thank you.

Ames Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, is this the worst case?

The President. I don't want to characterize it, but the FBI and the CIA did a very good job on this. They worked on it for a long time, and I can tell you that it is very serious.

Q. Mr. President, what does this say about the state of Soviet-American—or Russian-American relations? Is the cold war over or not?

The President. I don't want to comment on that. We'll be dealing with that over the next few days.

Q. Were any Americans harmed?

The President. What did you say?

Q. Were any Americans harmed?

The President. I can't comment on the case any more. Thank you.

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, could you comment on Mr. Greenspan's remarks about interest rates, interest rates going to continue to go up?

The President. I don't think so. I was encouraged by what he said. Alan Greenspan said that he thought that we had the best conditions for fundamental economic growth in two decades or more—I think that's quite encouraging—and that there was no reason to believe we had any problem with inflation. And if that's true, if we're going to have steady growth and no inflation, then we ought to keep relatively low interest rates.

Q. Did he miscalculate in bumping up short-term rates?

The President. I don't want to comment any more on that. I think the people setting the long-term rates should know what he said, there will be no—there's no reason to believe there's an inflation problem.

And let me also say that there's still a pretty good gap between the short- and the long-term rates. Historically, they have been, if you go back over 20, 30 years, they've been closer together. So the fact that the short-term rates went up a little bit, still the long-term rates could be lower than they are, considerably lower than they are. And the difference between short- and long-term rates would not be out of whack with 20, 30, 40-year historical average.

So I think the main good news for Americans is that Mr. Greenspan said that conditions for long-term growth are good; conditions for low inflation are good. And that's what we believe, and we're going to keep working on it.

Q. But he did say that long-term rates would go up, did he not?

The President. No, he said they had gone up, didn't he? I mean, he thought they—if we had explosive growth, they'll go up because we'll have more people wanting money.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:39 p.m. in the Colonnade at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the arrest of Aldrich Hazen Ames and Maria del Rosario Casas Ames.

Remarks on Signing the Executive Order on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans

February 22, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Peña, Secretary Cisneros, all the people here from the Department of Education, along with Secretary Riley, including Norma Cantu and Gene Garcia, who have been recognized. When I was listening to my longtime friend Dick Riley up here speaking, I was thinking that this group could have forgiven me perhaps for putting someone in my Cabinet who spoke English with such a heavy accent. [*Laughter*] You know, sometimes people from South Carolina are hard for even the rest of us southerners to understand. I remember once when Senator Fritz Hollings from South Carolina was running for President and he was in a roast, and Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts spoke at the roast. And he said that he was glad to be there in honor of the first non-English-speaking American ever to seek the Presidency. He'll probably resign this afternoon—[*laughter*].

We've had a wonderful day today, Dick Riley and I have, the kind of day we always wanted to have, fighting for better education in America. We were the Governors of our respective States together for a long time in the seventies and the eighties. We saw what education could do and what the lack of it could mean. And I want to thank him personally from the bottom of my heart for the extraordinary work that he has done as Secretary of Education.

This morning I started off the day by going jogging with about a dozen students from the Northern Virginia Community College, and it was interesting. Their average age, I'd say, was probably 26. One was a native of Peru; one a native of Iran, just became an American citizen; one a native of Sierra Leone; one a native of Scotland. And as a matter of fact, I think only 7 of the 12 were native-born to the United States.

Then I spoke to the American Council on Education and was on the platform with Juliet Garcia from the University of Texas at Brownsville and others today, and we had a terrific time. I want to thank her and all the rest of you who are here representing various organizations, including the Hispanic Education Coalition. I think I have you all down here: Laudelina Martinez, the president of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities; those here from the National Council of La Raza; the National Puerto Rican Coalition; Aspira; also MALDEF; the Cuban American National Council; the National Association for Bilingual Education; the Association of Hispanic Federal Executives.

I'd also like to acknowledge the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus who are here, including the chair, Congressman Jose Serrano; Congressman Bill Richardson from New Mexico—and we thank you, sir, for your extraordinary Burmese mission dealing with Aung San Suu Kyi; all America's proud of you for what you've done—Congressman Ed Pastor; Congressman Robert Menendez; Congressman Carlos Romero-Barcelo; Congressman Lincoln Diaz-Balart; Congresswoman Lucille Roybal; Congressman Robert Underwood; Congressman—is Solomon Ortiz here? I don't think so. I think that is everyone.

Those of you in this room, including many that I have not introduced, have been at the forefront in pressing for educational opportunity for Hispanic-Americans. It must have seemed sometimes a lonely cause. It is, today, an even more urgent cause than ever before. You are here today, in part, for me to say to you, you are not alone.

Our administration has embraced your cause and seeks to support it. We know that doors can be shut. We know that only about half of Hispanic-Americans complete high school; that between 1980 and 1991, Hispanic enrollment at institutions of higher education grew 84 percent but still lagged far behind the national average of enrollments. The percentage of Hispanics going to college is just about half of that from college students in other minority groups.

This is a complex problem. And finding solutions, therefore, can be deferred, as they often are with complex problems, or we can say, because the problems are difficult and complex, we should take even more aggressive action. I am determined that we must do the latter because we have to succeed. After all, in the next century, Hispanics will make up the largest mi-

nority group in our Nation. From this pool, we will draw many of our leaders, our educators, our work force, our future.

To ignore the barriers to educational opportunity only hampers our own future, as well as the future of Hispanic-Americans as individuals. If we fail the youngest and fastest growing segment of our population, we'll all fail. Therefore, we must do everything in our power to allow every American child to reach his or her full potential.

I believe and everyone in this administration believes that every child can learn and can achieve. We have set world-class goals in education, and we want to give our schools and communities the tools to achieve them. That is at the heart of our general initiatives on education, the Goals 2000 program, the school-to-work initiative, the reformation of the college loan program to lower the interest rates and string out the repayments so that all Americans can borrow money and then do work that they're proud to do, knowing that they will never be unduly burdened in paying back their loans. It's at the heart of the national service program. It's at the heart of the reemployment program, what we want to do in replacing the old unemployment system where people drew unemployment and waited for their old jobs to come back, when we know those jobs are not coming back. We now want a reemployment system so that the moment someone is unemployed, that man or woman can begin immediately, while drawing the unemployment, to engage in retraining to plan for a new and better job.

These are the things we want for all Americans. But we know we must do more if we are to achieve those goals for Hispanic-Americans. And therefore, these goals are at the heart of the Executive order that I sign today.

I know that all of you here have heard of the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans and the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans; both previously existed. But we also know, from months of working closely with Hispanic groups including many of you here, that this administration needed to do more. Together with Hispanic leaders in education, civil rights, and business, we put our hearts and minds into finding the means to address the problems affecting the education of young Hispanic Americans. This Executive order is far-reaching. It is a commitment to education for all Americans.

First, the order establishes a commission that will be made up from leaders of the Hispanic American community. Using the national education goals, this commission will track how Hispanics are doing and recommend ways to improve performance. The commission will also look for ways to better involve Government and the private sector in helping Hispanic students to achieve these goals.

The order will also marshal together the resources of the Federal Government by using an interagency working group. This is important because the problems in the education of young Latinos are tied to other areas, to poverty, to unemployment, to crime, to language barriers, to the breakdown of family, to name only a few. We need to address these problems in their entirety because that is the only way to make progress long-lasting. Agencies will set goals, and they will not get lost in a bureaucracy. Each executive department in every agency taking part will appoint a senior official to oversee their part of this program.

We will also move to increase Hispanic American participation in all Federal education programs. And every step of the way, we will continue to consult with the people and the organizations who have long been studying the education of Hispanics, and that includes many of you here today.

This Executive order expands on steps we have already taken for education. We propose an increase of $700 million for the Title I provision and to increase the access to Title I funds for Hispanic children by removing a major obstacle, the requirement that a child have limited proficiency in English. We propose a 12 percent increase in funding for bilingual education. We proposed, as I said, direct student loans to lower the interest rates and the costs and ease the repayment of student loans. We have proposed a national service program, that has already passed, that this year will provide the opportunity for 20,000 and 3 years from now 100,000 young Americans to earn money against their higher education by performing service in their communities.

But we all know that with these best efforts Government can only provide part of the solution. We can only succeed if all of us take personal responsibility for our families, our communities, our educational institutions, and our

countries. The ties of family have been a great strength in Hispanic America. These ties fortified by opportunity can nurture and keep a child on a straight and strong path going forward and upward through the generations. We have to continue to support that as well.

And now I would like to sign this Executive order and ask Representative Serrano, representing the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, to come up. I see Representative Luis Gutierrez, from Illinois, here also. Did I miss anyone else in the caucus? I think I saw everyone else. You shouldn't hide your light under a bushel back there. [*Laughter*] I'd like to ask Norma Cantu, Juliet Garcia, Laudelina Martinez to join me, along with Raul Yzaguirre of La Raza, Luis Nunez from the National Puerto Rican Coalition, Mario Mareno from MALDEF, Gilbert Chavez from the Association of Hispanic Federal Employees, and Hilda Crespo from Aspira to come up; and we will sign the Executive order. Please come up.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:31 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Norma Cantu, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, and Eugene Garcia, Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Department of Education. The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources

February 22, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1993 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, as required by section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report contains pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
February 22, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Radiation Control for Health and Safety

February 22, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360qq) (previously section 360D of the Public Health Service Act), I am submitting the report of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 during calendar year 1992.

The report recommends the repeal of section 540 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that requires the completion of this annual report. All the information found in this report is available to the Congress on a more immediate basis through the Center for Devices and Radiological Health technical reports, the Radiological Health Bulletin and other publicly available sources. This annual report serves little useful purpose and diverts Agency resources from more productive activities.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

February 22, 1994.

Statement on Action To Defend Minority Voting Opportunities
February 22, 1994

I have been advised that the Department of Justice has announced that the United States will participate in voting rights litigation in three States to defend minority voting opportunities. The legal action taken today in cases in North Carolina, Georgia, and Texas reaffirms my administration's strong commitment to defend the historic gains made under the Voting Rights Act.

The Voting Rights Act ensures that all Americans may fully participate in the democratic process. In recent years, our Nation has enjoyed a tremendous increase in minority voter access to our electoral system. These hard-won victories must not be abandoned. I applaud the forceful actions of Attorney General Reno and the Justice Department to ensure that voting rights are vigorously protected.

Remarks on the Technology Reinvestment Project and Earthquake Relief and an Exchange With Reporters
February 23, 1994

The President. Thank you. I have to bear so much bad news, I must say that's the only time I've ever been introduced as the bearer of good news. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, and thank you all for being here, the members of the administration, the Members of the Congress, and our distinguished guests from California. We're glad to see all of you here.

We are here to announce some new help for California as you work to come out of the consequences of the earthquake. But first I want to talk about the announcement made just this morning at the Pentagon to which the Vice President referred.

This morning we announced the latest round of awards in our technology reinvestment project, which helps companies and workers in defense industries to develop technologies to meet our Nation's commercial and military needs. This is the fourth round of TRP awards we've announced since October. So far, $605 million in competitive Federal grants awarded on merit have gone to firms and communities through this innovative program. It's a cornerstone of our reinvestment and conversion initiative, recognizing that those who worked so hard to win the cold war should not be unduly burdened by cutbacks in military expenditures and that all the work they have done, the expertise they've developed, the barriers that they have broken, should be turned to the advantage of America as we move into the 21st century.

The TRP is of special interest to the people of California because California has been on the leading edge of military technology. And converting this know-how for dual use and commercial applications will help our country move into the next century as the economic leader of the world, using things that relate from biomedical and environmental technologies to advanced transportation and communications systems, all rooted originally in our investments in national defense.

The projects which have been funded are exciting; they're futuristic; they're farsighted; they have potentially enormous beneficial impact to all the American people. I can't tell you about all of them—we awarded 50 just today—but let me just mention a couple.

One involves the Bay Area Rapid Transit System and Hughes Aircraft. Together they'll develop an advanced automated train control system that will identify the precise location of every train, even those in tunnels. That will allow trains to operate at closer distances to each other, and that means the existing infrastructure can double its rider capacity.

Another project will establish a technology center in Cerritos, California, to transfer leading-edge composites manufacturing technology to 16,000 small defense and commercial firms just in the Los Angeles area. The University of California at San Diego will work with Alcoa Electronic Packaging and Hewlett Packard to

offer displaced defense engineers a 2-year master's program in world-class manufacturing engineering. This will emphasize foreign language training and include an internship in international manufacturing companies. The aim, of course, is to help these folks build on their old skills with new learning to keep them vital and employed and to keep our country competitive in the global marketplace, to provide economic opportunity and shore up military strength, and to ensure that the people who won the cold war won't be left out in the cold. That's what this TRP, the technology reinvestment project, is all about. And that's why I'm proud it's proving to be such a success.

I will say that on the last round of grants, I think California won—again, I will say, on a purely competitive basis—almost 40 percent of the total dollars. And when you consider the fact that when we started this, the State of California, with 12 percent of the country's population, had over 21 percent of the Nations's military expenditures and has had almost 40 percent of the base closings, the last two rounds of base closings, and over 40 percent of the last round of base closings, it is heartening that in the race for the technologies of the future and, therefore, the jobs of the future, that the whole conversion effort is obviously beginning to work in the way that it ought to work.

Let me now say a few words about our continuing efforts to deal with the consequences of the earthquake. In the 5 weeks since the Northridge earthquake, our administration has worked closely with State and local officials, as all of you know, to try to help families, businesses, and communities. We are working to get the whole region back on its feet again. All of you know what the Vice President has already said, that the FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, Secretary Cisneros, Secretary Pena, Mr. Panetta, and many, many others have worked tirelessly to try to deal with the problems that were generated by the earthquake.

Immediately after the earthquake, I extended the period for which Federal Government's paid the entire cost of FEMA disaster assistance and increased from 75 to 90 percent the share paid by the Federal Government for FEMA public assistance programs. Now, today we are announcing some loan guarantees which will help to meet the remaining share owed by the State of California.

Congress has appropriated new funds for FEMA, for the Small Business Administration, for the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, Education, and Veterans Affairs to rebuild these homes and businesses, to house the homeless, to repair the highways and bridges, to restore the damaged schools and other facilities.

I do want to say a word of thanks to Secretary Pena for trying to accelerate the construction process. We stood on one of those totally broken sections of highway, and they said it was going to take a year to fix. I can only imagine how mad the drivers would be. I know how mad the drivers get at me when we stop traffic at one intersection for 2 minutes here. I multiplied 2 minutes times whatever the number is to get to one year, and it seemed to me that we ought to try to make the contracts go faster. I thank you for that.

Recently, your Governor, Speaker Brown, the Senate president pro tem Bill Lockyer, Mayor Riordan, and other officials have asked if there was any way we could lend California the money they believe is needed to pay the State and local share of the FEMA assistance costs.

Today I am asking Secretary Cisneros to offer loan guarantees totaling more than $500 million to jurisdictions affected by the earthquake, including the cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, and other towns and communities which suffered damages. This loan guarantee authority we are extending to local governments will enable them to obtain loans from private lenders at below-market rates that will take some of the bite out of the cost of recovery. The assistance will be provided under HUD's Community Development Block Grant Section 108 loan guarantee program. I've asked Secretary Cisneros to work with the local governments to work out repayment terms that meet the needs of local communities. The Secretary is also committed to providing technical assistance in preparing the applications and to expedite the review process. This will ensure that the flow of assistance to those in need in southern California will continue without interruption.

I've asked the Federal agencies whenever possible to use their discretionary authorities to waive rules and regulations to expedite the delivery of further assistance.

This step today builds on these efforts. It reflects a commitment that our administration

has made to the people of California, a commitment to do all that we can to help your people work their way out of this disaster, day-in and day-out, until all the work is done.

In recent years, the citizens of southern California, in particular, have endured multiple disasters, from riots to fires and mudslides and now the earthquake. That's what people around here call a character-building experience. I just want you to know that I am committed to ensuring that our Government continues to meet those obligations that we have to give you the opportunity to make a full comeback in the face of this latest setback.

Let me just say one other thing, if I might. Even though this is a time of renewal and reconstruction for the people of Los Angeles and California, it's also a day of sadness for many people in that area and for many of the rest of us who believe in the rule of law and appreciate those who enforce it. Yesterday, as all of you know, a rookie policewoman named Christy Lynne Hamilton was shot and killed in the line of duty less than one week after she became a commissioned police officer. A teenager with a semi-automatic weapon hardly gave her a chance to emerge from her patrol car before she was shot down. She received her diploma, as I said, just 5 days ago. At the academy, she was honored by her classmates as being the most inspirational officer candidate. And now her city has lost a policewoman who could have made a difference to people on her beat. Her force has lost its ninth officer this year. Her children have lost a mother. There have been too many funerals and too many folded flags presented to too many grieving survivors.

Our duty is clear: We have pending before the Congress an opportunity to pass crime legislation that is both tough and smart, that would put another 100,000 police officers on the street, a proposal of real value for the cities of California, and at the same time, ban the kinds of semi-automatic weapons that are used for killing people like Cristy Hamilton and which have no justification for sporting or hunting purposes.

I hope that we can make this legislation law and that we can do it soon. Many of you in this room have worked for a long time on these issues. Senator Feinstein, in particular, got the semi-automatic weapons ban into the Senate crime bill, and we all thank you for that.

All I can tell you is that we are here primarily to celebrate our coming together to overcome the destructive impacts of an act of God. It is time that we here in Washington muster the courage and the fortitude to do something to help you also overcome the acts of people that have no basis in law or honor, not only to honor the memory of Cristy Lynne Hamilton and all those others like her we have lost but to defend the honor of the American people to live together as human beings in a common community.

Thank you very much.

The Vice President. Before the President takes questions, let me say we inadvertently forgot to acknowledge Secretary Ron Brown, who's played a special and leading role in organizing the administration's response to a whole range of economic problems, in particular in the State of California. And we wanted to remedy that oversight.

The President. Thank you.

Ames Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, are you satisfied so far with the Russian response to the espionage arrest? And what do you think of Senator DeConcini's proposal today that there be a 60-day freeze on Russian aid until we get answers from the Russians?

The President. First of all, this morning I met with my national security team for some length of time before the Secretary of State went up to the Hill. And we decided then what we had already decided, that I should emphasize to you that—to you, the American people through the press—that I have known about this particular case for some time.

I have continued to pursue our policies toward Russia because Russia, like other countries, is not a monolith. It is not a single force. It is many forces and many developments occurring at once. I still believe it is in the interest of the United States to support democracy, to support the movement toward economic reform, to support the absence of weapons proliferation, to support the denuclearization of Russia. And therefore, I think we should be careful before we make specific determinations about aid flows. A lot of our aid flows, for example, are directly to individuals who are trying to privatize their businesses, having nothing to do with government or government policies. Most of our government aid is in the form of aid to take down the nuclear weapons. And I don't think anyone thinks we should slow that up.

This is a serious case. It is an unusually serious one because of factors I cannot discuss. But I also believe that, given all the facts as I understand them—and I know, I think, quite a bit about it—that we are pursuing the proper policy. And at this time, I think we have lodged the formal protest and a strong one. I think we should wait and see what the full response of the Russians is before we make any other determinations.

Q. Have you had any response yet? And what do you expect them to do? I mean, what gesture are you waiting for?

The President. Let's give them a chance to make an adequate response, and we'll see what happens.

Q. Have you instructed Director Woolsey to begin a damage assessment? And have you been given any preliminary briefing as to the scope of damage?

The President. The answer to the first question is, yes, the damage assessment is ongoing. The answer to the second question is, I have gotten a preliminary assessment. They are working on it. I had a good discussion with Mr. Woolsey today. I am satisfied, by the way, that the CIA worked with the FBI very well over a considerable period of months. Keep in mind they have been working against the worst consequences for some considerable period of time now while they've been attempting to complete the investigation and wrap up the case.

Q. Sir, do you intend to discuss this with Mr. Yeltsin? You've had a lot of personal discussions with him. Is it going to put this on a personal level?

The President. We may well discuss it, but I can't make a decision on that at this time until we see what the official reaction of the Russians is and until I have a little bit more time to reflect on what our options are, sir. I don't think I'm in a position to make that decision right now.

Q. So far the reaction has been, what are we making such a fuss about, since we spy and they spy and we both know each others spies. Is it hypocritical of the United States to make this fuss?

The President. First of all, we're making a fuss about this man. This man was not just a spy; this is a person who is a 31-year veteran of the CIA. So quite apart from the Russians, this was a very serious offense against the United States of America by one of its citizens. So this is a very serious matter. Also, it is a serious matter because of issues which I am not at this moment at liberty to discuss. What I said yesterday is this was a serious case going back several years. I do not think the facts of this case at this time undermine in any way, shape, or form the policy we have followed for the last year toward President Yeltsin and his Government and the forces of change in Russia; I do not believe that. But this is a very serious case, and it has to be pursued aggressively, and we will do that.

Q. Don't you think there was a real lapse in finding these people?

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. in the Grand Foyer at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Pete Wilson of California; Willie Brown, California Assembly speaker; and Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles.

Statement on the Technology Reinvestment Project

February 23, 1994

This marks another major step in our effort to protect our national security and promote our economic security in the post-cold-war world. We are investing in projects that will create the jobs of the future by exploring ideas, developing technologies, creating products, and strengthening skills that will keep America strong, militarily and economically.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the fourth group of awards in the technology reinvestment project.

Remarks to the Business Council
February 23, 1994

Thank you very much, Bob, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I was glad to walk in here and see the Attorney General. I just saw Lloyd Bentsen, the Treasury Secretary. He said, "I've heard this speech before. I think I'll leave." [*Laughter*] Mr. Panetta, how are you? Is anybody working in the Federal Government?

I am delighted to be here, and I thank you for the invitation to come by. I have seen many people in this audience on various occasions to talk about different issues over the last several months. And I'm glad to see so very many people in the administration here tonight to have the opportunity to speak with you. We have tried to maintain close ties to the American business community and to work in partnership on as many issues as we possibly could.

As all of you know, the Business Council was formed in 1933, a pretty tough year for this country, to help President Roosevelt pull America out of the Depression and move it forward. This group provided guidance on a number of profoundly important issues then, and I believe has a very important role to play today.

Most of you know that with the help of Bob Rubin, the National Economic Adviser, and Alexis Herman, who is here, my special liaison to the business community and to other public groups in the country, I have worked in a very disciplined way over the last 14 months to try to seek out the opinions of people in the business community of different political parties, different views, both support and sometimes opposition, because I think it is so important to have a dialog and for you to believe that there is a genuine listening ear in the White House and a real interest in trying to work on these problems together.

I'm glad to see Senator Riegle and Senator Packwood here. We have a lot of important work to do today in this coming session of Congress. But let me just say, when I took office it really was the end of one era and the beginning of another. The election conveniently dovetailed, missing by only about 3 years the formal end of the cold war and the beginning of the post-cold-war era with a whole new awareness in our country of the extent to which all our affairs were shaped by a global economy which we can no longer totally control or even largely dominate, and that we had profound questions to face on the eve of not only a new century but a new millennium, which would determine whether or not we would go into that new millennium stronger, better, and more well positioned to make sure that it wouldn't be only the 20th century that would be known as the American century in the history books.

I have always believed that the purpose of politics in our country is to get people together and to get things done. Therefore, I have always sought and often achieved partnerships sometimes with allies that were unusual in the cause that was plainly good for the public. I want to thank those of you who were part of those partnerships last year, part of our efforts to reduce the deficit or to pass NAFTA or to get the GATT agreement done, or to reduce export controls or to start a genuine defense conversion initiative or to help prove that we could pursue an environmental policy that would be good for the environment and also good for the economy. I also want to challenge you to keep talking with us as we face the problems that lie ahead this year and in the years ahead.

I have tried to address the issues that the business community talked to me about in the campaign of 1992, the issues that are uppermost in the minds of most of you who just want a good environment in which to operate. We've worked on the budget deficit and the investment deficit in America. We've tried to get the growth rate up and to produce jobs in the private sector, after years in which most new job growth net was in the public sector. We've tried to address the fact that for more than a decade, health costs have outpaced the growth of the economy by a factor of two or three, and that we have not been as aggressive as we ought to be as a nation in opening the world to our products and services and, at the same time, making sure our markets were open as well.

In short, I have tried to fashion a role for the Government and this time, fit it to this time—one that recognizes that the private sector is the engine of economic growth, but that our Government has a role to play as a partner in setting the framework and dealing with the

basic fundamental questions that every government must face in dealing with the particular challenge of this age and time—trying to prepare our country to compete and win in the global economy.

The economic plan which the Congress adopted last year by such a stunning margin reduced the deficit by $500 billion, cut spending by $255 billion, allocated every new tax dollar to deficit reduction, cut over 300 Government programs, including $80 billion in entitlement savings over the budget which was in place when I took office, much more than was thought possible when we began.

This year's budget, which I have submitted to the Congress, cuts 379 program lines out of a total of 636 in the Federal budget, eliminates 115 programs altogether. And the Wall Street Journal said, and I quote—I'm sure the editors will make sure nothing like this appears again—but they said, and I quote, "For the next year, discretionary spending will actually fall by $7.7 billion without adjusting for inflation. That has not happened since 1969." This budget reduces Federal employment by 118,000, more than the 100,000 this year recommended by the Vice President's reinventing Government commission.

If we stay on the path we are now on, by 1998, the National Government will be smaller than it has been in 30 years, the deficit will be $200 billion a year less than it was projected to be when I took office and before our plan passed, and for the first time since Harry Truman was President, there will be 3 years of declining deficits in a row. The deficit as a percentage of national income is now as low as it was in 1979, before the deficits started to explode. In other words, we have restored fiscal discipline to this budget and to this Government without gimmicks or without fooling with the Constitution.

I hope that the budget I have presented and the record established by the Congress last year will be sufficient to persuade at least most of you that we should not pass the balanced budget amendment because it would mandate one of two things: either significant tax increases which could imperil the economic recovery along with cuts, significant cuts in defense, in Social Security or Medicare and Medicaid and in areas where all of you believe we should be investing more; or it will be ignored. And if it is ignored, it will put the Government's future in the hands of 40 percent plus one of both Houses, basically giving minority control over the future of the country to whoever wants to blackball any kind of budget proposal made. This is a gimmick. We don't need it. We are bringing the deficit down.

And I'll talk a little more about today, a little more about what we have to do to bring it down further. Do I think it should be structurally in balance? Yes, I do. But it's also important to note that the Federal Government doesn't handle its accounts the way most of you do. We don't have a capital budget. We don't amortize capital expenses. We don't separate long-term investments with high return from current expenditures that amount to basically consuming the same programs we've had in years past. So I hope that you will support budget discipline but oppose the balanced budget amendment.

The second point I'd like to make is this administration tried to prove once again that open trade is a bipartisan American commitment, that we have never done very well when we tried to close our borders or be protectionist, but that if we are going to open our borders and push for open trade in a world economy where we are 22 percent of the world's GDP as opposed to 40 percent, which we were at the close of the Second World War, we have to demand equal access to our goods and services.

We worked on NAFTA. We worked on GATT. We worked on a national export strategy, supported strongly by the Secretary of Commerce, who is here, and also the Secretary of State, who came in. And I want to say, for the first time in a long time, we've got the State Department and our Embassies all around the world genuinely working on promoting American economic interests, that the commercial desks mean something there now, and we are really trying to do this in a disciplined, comprehensive way that I believe is very, very important.

The Saudi purchase of the Boeing and McDonnell Douglas aircraft I hope—it may be the biggest, but I hope it's only the first in a long line of examples of partnership involving, in this case, three Cabinet members, the President's Chief of Staff, and many others working to see that we got a contract that American business earned on the merits, the kind of contract we have too often lost in the past for

reasons having nothing to do with the merits. And I'm very proud that that happened.

We lifted export controls on $37 billion of high-technology equipment in the telecommunications area and the computer area that had no relevance to the post-cold-war era. And it will be a very significant and important contribution to economic growth.

I have approved for announcement tomorrow a new export administration act which will be significantly better than the present law. I want to be candid with you: A lot of you won't like it all because we do provide for the continuation of the capacity of the President and the Government to restrict exports for reasons that appear to be good and sufficient. I urge you to look at what we will recommend, evaluate it. If you think it is wrong, tell us and work with us.

But remember this: One of America's continuing responsibilities is to try to do whatever we can to deal with some of the problems that will replace the terror of the nuclear age, in all probability, in the 21st century. One of those big problems is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, not just nuclear weapons but biological weapons and chemical weapons and the vast proliferation of conventional but high-tech weapons that can do a lot of damage in a short amount of time.

So we will, for the foreseeable future, as a nation have certain responsibilities that I believe require us to maintain the ability to do some things in the area of export control that may be difficult for everyone from time to time. So I urge you to look at the act, evaluate it. If you think we're wrong, be as specific as you can and tell us why, because we want an honest dialog on this. I think you know that I am for more trade. And I think you know I want to listen if you think we're wrong on this. So I think we're on the same wavelength, but we do believe that this administration and its successors for the foreseeable future, in a world in which there will be a lot of chaotic events that can be made much worse by irresponsible conduct by others, we need some leverage in this area. And I hope we can reach agreement on what the proper balance is.

I am very proud of where we are to date. If you look at the last year, we've had a very good year. I appreciate what Chairman Greenspan said about it in his congressional testimony yesterday. Business investment was up 18 percent in 1993. There was a record number of public offerings for high-tech companies. Durable equipment expenditures were at their fastest pace in 20 years. The private sector provided for over 90 percent of the nearly 2 million jobs created by the American economy in 1993, which, as I said, is a reversal of the trend of recent years when many of the new jobs were coming from Government.

These are things that I think are very, very important. Yesterday Mr. Greenspan said—I've got his quote. I wouldn't have quoted him if I had known he was going to be here; I would just ask him to stand up and speak and I'd sit down. [*Laughter*] But he said, and I quote, "The deficit reduction package apparently had a salutary effect on long-term inflation expectations. The outlook for the economy as a result of subdued inflation and still low long-term rates is the best we've seen in decades." That is the environment we want to preserve. It is the basis which will permit you to create success for the American economy.

The question then is, what is our role, and what are our responsibilities? What things do we need to do, and what things do you need to help us do well? First, I think it is clear to everyone here—and I might mention I'm glad to see my friend David Kearns because he's done so much work on education—that we're still a long way from where we need to be in the education and training of the American work force. We are supporting some bills which have enjoyed significant bipartisan support and business support in the Congress that will enable us to enshrine in law the national education goals and promote local experimentation, everything from charter schools to public school choice, in the Goals 2000 bill.

We are supporting opening the doors of college opportunity to everyone with a student loan program now that has lower interest rates and better repayment and will allow up to 100,000 people in 3 years to be part of a national service program to earn some money against their college costs by working in their local communities.

We are supporting a school-to-work program which will build on the apprenticeships which now exist in some States and some industries but which are not uniform throughout the country. Most Americans will not get and do not need to have 4-year college degrees to have good jobs. But the economic data is clear, 100 percent of the American people coming out of high school now need at least 2 years of some

kind of further training, whether in the work force, in a community college, in the service, in a blend of all. But if you look at the income differentials, it is shocking.

The unemployment rate for people who drop out of high school is 5 percent higher than it is for high school graduates. That unemployment rate, in turn, is 2 percent higher than it is for people that have 2 years of college. That unemployment rate, in turn, is another 2 percent higher than it is for 4-year college graduates. Average income is $4,000 lower for high school dropouts than for high school graduates, which is—their incomes are $4,000 lower than for people who have had 2 years of college, and their incomes are about $8,000 lower than people who graduated from college. So it's clear that this country has a national interest in at least getting people through high school and with 2 years of further education and training.

And finally, I hope, as major employers, you will help us when the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education come forward at the end of the year or later in the year with this reemployment system. The unemployment system on which payroll taxes are paid today is based on an economy that no longer exists. People are not normally called back to the job they are laid off from. But that is the premise of this unemployment system. That's the whole basis of the feud attacks. And it doesn't work anymore.

We believe we can cut down on costs over the long run and dramatically increase labor mobility if, instead of waiting for people passively to run out of their unemployment and then start looking for a job which, because they haven't acquired a new skill, will probably not pay what their old job did, if we start immediately, as soon as people are unemployed, retraining them for a job that is relevant to the future.

I think this is a profoundly important structural change that we have got to make if we want labor market mobility, if you want a pool of trained workers. And we don't want a lot of alienated, hard-working Americans who think that they went all over the country looking for decent jobs, they have played by the rule, and they can't find a place in life. So I hope you will help us this year to pass the reemployment system.

The next thing I hope you'll do is to help the Attorney General to pass a good crime bill. We had a bunch of people in from California today to talk about earthquake relief, and I couldn't help noting that yesterday in California—you may have seen it on the news—a 45-year-old mother of two who had been a policewoman for 4 days was gunned down by a teenager who just murdered his father with a semiautomatic weapon—one week, less than one week after she had become a police officer.

This crime issue is a complicated one. It is easy to demagog and difficult to do much about. But there are things we can do. We know there are things that work. We know that if we had the same ratio of police to violent crimes today we had 35 years ago, and the police were walking the streets, working with the neighbors and the kids in the neighborhood, that the crime rate would go down, not just because of more arrests but because there would be fewer crimes. We know that.

If you look at the experience of Houston, where, in the last 15 months, there was a 22 percent drop in crime and a 27 percent drop in the murder rate—and coincidentally, the mayor got reelected with 91 percent of the vote; I think there was some connection there—if you look at what they did, it was the deployment of more police officers in a better, smarter way, more relevant to the existence of the people in the communities. I see Mr. Lay nodding his head there. That is what happened. I've seen this happen place after place after place.

This crime bill also provides not only stiffer penalties for serious offenses but also provides more money for drug treatment for people, facilities, and alternatives to incarceration, opportunities like boot camps for first-time nonviolent offenders. We can have a smart, as well as a tough, crime bill.

I hope you will help us to pass a sensible welfare reform bill this year which recognizes that welfare should be a second chance, not a way of life, that cracks down on child support enforcement and provides education and training and child support and moves people into the workplace.

I hope you will support the administration's antidrug strategy. I know that Lee Brown was here. And I see Jim Burke over here. I should let him come and give a speech for it. But we have a significant increase in funds to help us deal with drug problem areas in this country. And it's an important time to take a stand on this because of the disturbing evidence that there is now an increase again in drug use

among young people because they think it may be more acceptable. And it's no more acceptable or no less dangerous than it was last year, the year before, or the year before. This is a cultural thing we have to change. And we're trying to make a beginning on that.

Finally, let me say a couple of words about health care. We spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. No other country except Canada spends over nine. They are at about 10. Erskine Bowles, who has done such a great job as head of the Small Business Administration, probably because he's qualified—it wasn't a political appointment in that sense; he spent 20 years helping people start businesses—says that we're servicing less than all of our people with 14 percent of our revenues and other countries are servicing all of theirs within the range of nine. That doesn't make any sense. And no company could survive like that in a competitive environment. I think that is one of the problems.

We know that every month about another 100,000 Americans lose their health insurance permanently. We know we have significant problems where people who retired early from companies that aren't solvent are losing their health care before they are old enough to get on Medicare. And a lot of other companies that are critical to our economic future are bearing massive burdens because of that. We have some American companies now spending almost 19 percent of payroll on health care.

We know that there is massive cost-shifting in our system because of totally uncompensated care and because Medicare and Medicaid, especially Medicaid, often don't reimburse our physicians and hospitals for the full cost of their care. We know small businesses pay 35 to 40 percent more in premiums for the same health care coverage that big business and government pay.

We know that if something doesn't happen and present trends continue, that we'll be spending over 18 percent of our gross domestic product on health care by the end of the decade. And if present trends continue, none of our competitors will be over 12, which means we'll be at a 50-percent disadvantage.

We know that some of this is unavoidable because of factors, good and bad. The good factors are that the United States invests more in medical research and medical technologies, in academic health centers. A lot of you in this room are probably on the board of various academic health centers. And that is an important part of our economy, an important part of our quality and way of life, and we wouldn't give it up for the world. And we shouldn't. And we pay a premium for that in our health care system.

We also know that this country is more violent than other countries. We have higher rates of AIDS than a lot of countries. We have bigger, therefore, bills at the emergency room, more people cut up and shot and getting expensive care than other countries. That's something we would gladly trade in, and we're trying to find out how to trade it in. But until we trade it in, we'll pay a premium in our health care system for that. And it's wrong for us to pretend that health care reform on its own terms can close the gap between where we are and where our competitors are.

Nonetheless, we also know that this is the most bureaucratic, the most expensive to administer system in the world, even though a lot of big companies have found ways to have access to managed competition and to squeeze the inflation out of their costs. But the system is causing us great grief.

The other thing I want you to understand—going back to the budget, because so many of you supported the deficit reduction plan—is that every single scenario for every single budget—and you can ask the Budget Director to attest to this—shows the deficit going down for about 3 more years and then shows it going right back up when we have flattened all discretionary spending, when we have continued to decrease defense, only because of exploding health care costs overtaking everything else in the budget.

So that if we do not reform the health care system, if we don't do something to get costs under control and to provide coverage to everybody to stop the cost shifting, then you will see an exploding Federal deficit as we move toward the end of the century. And you may want us to spend more money on—what will the world look like by then—on job retraining, on export promotion, on defense conversions, on the development of dual-use technologies, on whatever, and we won't have it because all of our new money will be going to health care—everything—and not more money for new health care, but more money for the same health care.

You may say, "Well, inflation is down in health care costs." Inflation has gone down in

health care costs every time there has been a serious attempt to reform the system. It went down in the Nixon administration when President Nixon proposed almost the same plan that I've proposed. And then it started right up again. So I would say to you, we have to find a way to deal with this.

The Congressional Budget Office, in evaluating our program, confirmed our analysis that our plan would pay for itself and contribute to deficit reduction, and it would reduce health care spending—listen to this—$400 billion between the years 2000 and 2004. In the short run, we had differences with the CBO; they said that our program would cost a little more of Government money and save a little more in private sector money, by the way, than we had estimated. But we've had these kinds of differences before, but we worked them out.

I want to be clear on a couple things. Number one, any health care bill that I sign will pay for itself and contribute to long-term deficit reduction. It won't be some pig-in-a-poke that will explode the Government budget in the years ahead.

Number two, I do not want to pay for people who do not have health care now who are in the work force with new broad-based taxes. I don't think it's right to tax people who are already paying too much for their own health care to pay for somebody else's.

Number three, a lot of the doctors who have read this program actually like it. We consulted with hundreds and hundreds of doctors, and I had a doctor in my office a couple of weeks ago that put together an organization with several thousand other doctors who worked for him. He said, you know, if people understand what's really happening to medicine, they would like this. It gives doctors more protection than the present, the status quo will, unless we do something to change it.

The fourth thing I want to say is, the nub of this is something I would hope you would agree with me on. The nub of this is, you cannot solve this problem of cost-shifting and of inflation until you do one thing: find a way for everybody to have access to health care and to pay for it, so that somebody else doesn't have to pay for it. Then if you want to control costs, there has to be some competitive pressure. That is, the consumer has to know what the health care bill is, which is why in our plan employees have to contribute as well as employers. And there has to be some competitive pressure, which is why we proposed the most controversial part of this from the point of view of most large employers, which is the whole alliance structure.

And I will just say this about the whole issue of alliances. I do not want to create a new Government bureaucracy. I want to find some way to recreate the same economic reality that the farmers' co-ops did when they were organized. In other words, if you want to have community rating, which I think is very important to this, so you don't have real rating discrimination, especially for small businesses, if you want to have real community rating, you have to have a way to aggregate at least the smaller purchasers into big enough units so they can buy on the same terms that most of you can. And if you don't do it, you can legislate community rating all you want, and it won't happen. The State of New York has legislated community rating. But it doesn't necessarily happen.

So if you don't like this, then tell me how you would do it. Somebody says, "Well, make these alliances voluntary." Washington State made them voluntary. Look at the Washington State plan. Anybody that wants that instead of mine, step forward. The alliances are voluntary in Washington State because there is one plan and one fixed price. If you fix the price, you've got community rating. So Washington State can make the alliances voluntary because the small businesses want to get in so somebody else will handle all their paperwork for them. It's a heck of a deal. And the price is already set. The Congress won't do what Washington State did, I predict. We want to see competition and market forces, not price fixing. But that is a possible option. I don't think it's going to happen.

The point I want to make is this: This is a complicated thing. There are no easy answers. My bottom line is I can no longer justify why America spends more and does less than anybody else with a system that threatens to bankrupt the Government, paralyze our ability to invest in the future and to grow and to be a good partner with the private sector, and that promises to charge you more and more every year in cost-shifting once you have squeezed all you can squeeze out of your ability to compete by your size and your disciplined organization, which is what most of you have been able to do the last 2 or 3 years.

So what I'm asking you for on behalf of myself and the Congress, including Members in the other party like Senator Packwood, who really want to see something done on this, is to be our partner in this. You know based on your experience that everybody is going to have to be covered. And there is only—in my opinion, there are only three ways to do it. You can have a tax and do it the way the Canadians do. You can require employers to cover it, the way most people are covered here. You can have a mixture the way the Germans do, where employers, cover their employees but if you're a high-income person, you have to get your own. You can have an individual mandate on everybody, but the problem is, look at the problems States have right now in enforcing the automobile liability requirement.

So there is no easy way to do this. If this were easy, it would have been done 60 years ago when Roosevelt tried to do it or 20 years ago when President Nixon tried to do it or in the Carter administration. This is not an easy thing. But we have reached a point—if you look at the trends in the Federal budget, if you look at how we're spending our money in our economy, if you look at how every last red cent you spend needs to be evaluated in a globally competitive context, we have reached the point where, on sheer grounds of humanitarianism for the working people of this country—and most people without insurance work, and they pay their taxes to give health care to people who don't work today—so on the grounds of humanitarianism and self-interest, we need to do this.

If we care about what the Federal budget is going to look like 5 or 10 years from now, and you don't want to see Leon Panetta either gray or bald within 2 years, we have got to face this question. We have tackled it and danced around with it and struggled with it and piecemealed it, literally, for six decades now. And I believe the time has come to act.

If you can help us get wired together on the basic principles of coverage for everybody, an end to cost-shifting, responsibility for individuals as well as employers in sharing some of the cost, we can work out the rest. And we need less rhetoric and more commitment to try and to solve what is a huge problem for all Americans.

We've got a lot on our plate this year. But I didn't run for this job just to come to nice dinners. I thought you hired me to get things done. I can't do it unless you help. But helping means not only being critical but being a critical part of the solution.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:12 p.m. in the ballroom at the Park Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David T. Kearns, former chairman, Xerox Corp., and former Deputy Secretary of Education; Kenneth L. Lay, chairman and chief executive officer, Enron Corp., Houston, TX; and James R. Burke, former chairman and chief executive officer, Johnson & Johnson, Inc., and chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America.

Statement on the Nomination of Jamie Gorelick To Be Deputy Attorney General

February 23, 1994

I applaud Attorney General Reno's choice of Jamie Gorelick to be the next Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Justice.

She has ably served my administration with great distinction as General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and I am confident Jamie will continue to bring her sharp legal mind, penetrating analysis, and tremendous management capabilities to her newest assignment.

I look forward to working closely with Attorney General Reno and Jamie Gorelick in fighting for passage of a tough, smart crime bill and to give the American people a Justice Department that is innovative in its approaches and solutions for crime reduction and law enforcement.

Nomination for Posts at the Department of the Air Force
February 23, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Rudy de Leon Under Secretary of the Air Force, the number two civilian position in that branch, and Jeffrey K. Harris Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space.

"These two individuals have each given almost two decades of substantial service to their country," the President said. "I am confident their experience and commitment will serve them well in their important new roles."

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

Nomination for Ambassador to Finland
February 23, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Derek Shearer, director of the International and Public Affairs Center at Occidental College in California, as Ambassador to Finland.

"Derek Shearer has a keen intellect and a broad range of foreign policy experience, particularly in international economics," the President said. "I am pleased that he has accepted this assignment, and I have full confidence that he will represent our country effectively and with honor."

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

Remarks on Arrival in Groton, Connecticut
February 24, 1994

The President. Well, this is hardly the time and place for a speech, but I am delighted to be here with Senator Dodd and Senator Lieberman, Congresswoman Kennelly, and your Congressman, Mr. Gejdenson.

We're here to talk about health care today and to talk about the future of the people of Connecticut and the future of our country. I also want to say, since I am fairly near Groton, that I think most of you probably know, but yesterday Electric Boat was awarded one of the administration's technology reinvestment projects for defense conversion, to help to use the defense technologies that were developed in the 1980's to build the high-tech jobs here at home of the 1990's. And that will be a help in the future.

Audience member. Sea Wolf!

The President. Well, we hung in there with the Sea Wolf—we did the Sea Wolf. I did that. We reversed that decision. That's right.

I also want to just say a special word of thanks to all of your for braving this weather and for coming out and for bringing your messages as well as your support. My family and I are very grateful for the friendship that we've been given all across this country, especially in the last month as I've dealt with the loss of my mother, and we've tried to deal with a lot of the challenges facing our country. And when you come out here and stand in this rain after the tough snow you had last night, it's very moving to me personally. I thank you for that.

I want you to know one other thing. We've got a lot of tough challenges still ahead facing our country. We've got a lot of hard work to do in the Congress. We are facing the health care issue, the welfare reform issue. We're going

to try to redo the unemployment system of the country. We have got a lot of big challenges facing this country, but we're going to meet them with your help and your support. And I just want you to tell these folks standing behind me that you do support them when they take the chances and show the courage to change the country and move it toward the 21st century.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:47 a.m. at the Groton/New London Airport.

Exchange With Reporters in Norwich, Connecticut
February 24, 1994

Health Care Reform

Q. Are you troubled at all, sir, by word coming off the Hill from the likes of Chairman Pete Stark that the employer mandates and the alliances are in trouble, that he sees little if any chance of them getting through?

The President. No. Mr. Stark has his own plan, and it's sort of a modified single-payer plan. So you wouldn't need the alliances if you did what he wanted, you know, if the Government paid for it all and fixed the price, if you had—just expanded for Medicare. But we see no evidence that beyond that subcommittee that that plan could pass.

But on the other hand, he does want universal coverage, and he wants comprehensive benefits. And so I consider him an ally because he wants that. He's been in this area a long time, and he has a fixed view about how he thinks it should be done. And so anything that's sent to his subcommittee obviously he's going to try to—he's going to see that it reflects his view. We'll just see what happens.

I think—but keep in mind, you've got that committee that a bill would have to come out of, and you've got two other House committees, then you've got two Senate committees. So you've got subcommittees in all the committees, five of them, and then the ultimate committees, and then the battle on the Floor. And this is just beginning.

So I'm not concerned about it because I think what everybody's going to have to do is to ask and answer the questions that at least he's asked and answered: Are you for universal coverage? Do you want reasonable benefits? And all these people here who have written me these letters make the best case for having a simple, clear comprehensive system that covers everybody and that involves things like prescription medicine. And I know you've been briefed on the letters they wrote me and how the system's affected them. But I consider, therefore, even though Pete Stark has a totally different view about how it ought to be done than I do, what he wants to do is what I want to do.

So I'm not troubled by that. We'll just have to see what comes out of that subcommittee, what comes out of the Ways and Means Committee as a whole, and where we go. I just think that the main issue now is going to be getting all the Members of Congress to sit down and ask and answer in a very calm and clear-headed way these hard questions that relate to making sure everybody has guaranteed private insurance, having the benefits be comprehensive to include preventive and primary care and things like this prescription-drug benefit that we're here to talk about. If that happens, than I think we're on the way to victory. We'll work out everything else, but I'm going to have a lot of very good conversations with people in both parties who are interested in this to deal with those big questions. If you can get there, I'm convinced we'll work out the details. I'm not worried.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2 p.m. in Slater Hall at the Norwich Free Academy. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to Senior Citizens in Norwich
February 24, 1994

Thank you very much. I think John Kiszkiel did a great job of introducing me and talking about the problem. Sam, when you get done, maybe we ought to run him for office around here. [*Laughter*] He did a great job, didn't he? I thank him for opening his pharmacy this morning and for introducing me to some of his customers. I'll mention them in a moment.

I also want to thank Charles West, who, if you notice, when I heard Charles West up here talking, I thought, he's the only guy up here that doesn't have an accent. He's from Arkansas. [*Laughter*] He's like me. So I loved hearing him talk. But I want to thank Charles and Ron Ziegler for coming here and expressing the support of the pharmacists of America and the people who run our drugstores all over the country for the administration's health care initiative. I am very grateful to them. And their support will be pivotal as we go into this critical session of Congress and try to pass the health care bill.

I thank your Members of Congress for being here, especially our host, Sam Gejdenson, who has done a great deal of work in Congress on a number of issues that are important. On health care and defense conversion and job training and exports, if there is an issue that requires us to be on the cutting edge of change, you can bet that Sam Gejdenson will be on the cutting edge of the issue. And I really appreciate that.

I thank my friend Barbara Kennelly for coming here and for her support and outstanding work in Congress. My longtime friend Senator Lieberman, you heard him talking about that, I actually worked in his first campaign for the State senate when we were both in our twenties, and that was a day or two ago. [*Laughter*] And my friend of many years Senator Chris Dodd, who talked about his connections to this wonderful community and who is really working hard on this health care issue as he has on all human resource issues over the years, I thank him for that. There are many others in the audience that I can't mention, State and local officials, including my old classmate, your attorney general, Richard Blumenthal. I'm glad to see him here, and a recent father.

I want to thank our host, the Norwich Free Academy—this is a fascinating school with a great history—the administration, the teachers, and all others, especially Mary Lou Bargnesi and everybody that's made me feel so welcome here today.

And I'd also like to say just a special word about how nice it is for me to be back in Connecticut. Connecticut has been awfully good to me, since long before I ever thought I'd be up here running for the President. I went to law school here. The most important thing that ever happened to me happened here: I met my wife. When I kissed my wife and daughter goodbye this morning, they were sort of jealous that I was coming here even after we'd seen all the snow on television last night. [*Laughter*]

This State and this congressional district were good to me in the last campaign for President, and I'm doing my best to keep faith with the commitments I made. I also have to say I've been immensely impressed, as a fanatic basketball fan, with your basketball team this year. I think they've got a good chance to get to Charlotte, but I can't promise to cheer for them if they play Arkansas. It's amazing, you know, when I come in late at night, sometimes they show these basketball games fairly late at night; it's one thing that I still get to do. Most of my interests and hobbies are restricted to some extent by my job, but at least late at night I can channel surf like the rest of you do, and sometimes I pick up the basketball team.

I also want to say, because one of the congressional Members mentioned this, that I frankly quite appreciate the fact that most of your big insurance companies here who write health insurance, Aetna, Travelers, ITT Hartford, Signet, have not participated in financing the misleading campaign against the administration's health plan.

I am not trying—there are people who believe we should just eliminate insurance companies altogether from this health plan. What I have proposed is that we guarantee private health insurance to everybody and then give small business people and self-employed people and others the same market power that big business and government have so that everybody can get

lower rates. So that the companies that operate here will actually do quite well if our plan passes as long as they're willing to give people competitive prices and as long as we're willing to have a comprehensive, simple plan so that there is no incentive to spend time figuring out how not to pay for people's health care, and instead, we figure out how to provide it at high quality and reasonable costs. So, I appreciate that.

This is a people issue to me. You know, so many of these issues in Washington—you must be bewildered some nights when you turn on the evening news, and you hear some big issue being debated in Washington and they're using 10-dollar words that don't mean anything to you. There's a whole different language that surrounds this health care debate. And when we started working on this, sometimes I'd have to stop our own people in the middle of a sentence and say, "No, no, no. Speak English. Explain to me what you're really talking about. Don't use all this gobbledy-gook language. Let's talk about how this affects real Americans in their daily lives."

This is a big deal, folks. It's a big deal because—[*applause*]—it's a big deal, first, because there are an awful lot of very good things about American health care, an awful lot of very good things about it: the doctors, the nurses, the health facilities; the fact that most of our people have at least access to some health care is better than if they didn't have anything; Medicare works well. It's efficiently administered with a low overhead, and for those things which it covers, it works well. And it shouldn't be messed with or changed where it works. But there are a lot of problems, as you know.

My wife received almost a million letters, when we started this health care effort, from Americans who described what was wrong with the health care system as it affected them. I met with four of those folks here today, and I want to ask them to stand up in a minute. Then I met with three others in the Greenville Drug Store, as you heard Mr. Kiszkiel say.

Bob Hug from Milford, where—is he back here behind me? Stand up, Bob. I lived in Milford my first year in law school on the beach in a house that I bet hasn't survived the condo craze of the eighties, but anyway I liked it. He's written three letters to us. He lives on a fixed income, is paying more as many do in fees and premiums without getting better benefits. He pays $2,000 a year for medicine not covered by Medicare under the present system. In June, he wrote—and I hope this won't embarrass him, but I'm telling you this because I want to illustrate what this fight is all about—"My wife and I sometimes don't take our medication, as we need the money for food. Other seniors do, too. Why can't we include prescription drugs in Medicare?" Well, under our proposal, we will.

Marian Darling, from Madison—is Marian up on the stage?—who had the same story for herself and her husband except their annual bill was $5,000. Arthur Poppe of Simsbury—he's here, I think—who had some services for his wife which were covered when she was in the home, but when she had to be put in a nursing home, then they weren't covered anymore. So the Government program sometimes operates just like insurance policies do. You've got to read the fine print to figure out what's covered and not, and then you still can't control it if it happens to you. And Edith Longe of Oakdale—is Edith here? Let's give her—[*applause*]

At Greenville Drug Store I was joined by Louise Jaczynski—Louise, where are you? Are you here? She still works part-time. She works as a crossing guard for schoolchildren. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] But she's on maintenance therapy for a substantial health condition which requires expensive medication. You have a State assistance program here which has done a lot of good; most States don't have it. But there are strict income limits and because of the way Medicare benefits are now being calculated, the income limits, she's now 80 bucks over the income limit. So what should she do? Quit her job and lose thousands of dollars plus the right to keep helping young people, plus the probability that she's lengthening her own life and lowering her own health care bills by staying active? Or keep the job and pay thousands and thousands of dollars for medical bills? What should she do?

Joe Riley—Joe are you here? Joe Riley was a foreman at King-Seeley Thermos before it shut down. He was laid off a year before his retirement, so he lost all his benefits with Medicare, and now he has cancer. Now, listen to this, every time he gets out of the hospital, his benefits are covered for the next few months for up to 500 bucks for medicine. So as long as he keeps going back to the hospital before the benefits run out, he can get the drugs. Now, what we hope is that he'll get better, and he

won't have to go back to the hospital, but he'll still need the medicine. So, what should he do? Go back to the hospital? If you do, what does that do to the cost of the health care system? If you need to do it, it ought to be there. But no one should be sitting here thinking, I'm going to lose drug coverage that I have to have unless I go back to the hospital.

Finally, Arlene Sullivan is here. Arlene, she made my day; she gave me a kiss when I showed up to the drugstore. [*Laughter*] Then Louise did, too. Arlene is a widow, a retired secretary. She has some pretty serious health problems, and she gets some of her drugs at a discount through the AARP program; others she purchases directly from Greenville Drug Store. But there are a lot of these, and sometimes she has trouble, which drugs treat which illnesses, and the coverage is not clear. Why should there be any difference in what is covered and what isn't if the doctor prescribes them and you have to have them just by what's covered?

Now, Americans are now engaged in a very serious debate about this issue. This is a complicated issue. Almost 15 percent of our income goes to health care in America. No other nation spends more than 10. Canada spends 10 percent of their income. Germany and Japan spend about 9. Now, in spite of that, all three of those countries provide health care to everybody. We don't cover everybody. And from those people who have coverage—as you've seen, all these people had coverage, but they often don't have what they need covered, especially prescription drugs. And for people who aren't old enough to be on Medicare, almost all of them can lose their health insurance at some time or another.

You know, you've had some big companies in Connecticut who have been forced by the pressures of the global economy to have some lay offs. Now, under the present law, they can keep the health insurance they've got from their old company for 18 months as long as they can afford to pay for it. What about those that can't afford to pay for it 9 months later if they don't have a job? What about those that, after 18 months, lose their health insurance because they had to get a job at a small business that doesn't provide health care?

So, there are some serious problems here. The question is: How do we keep what's good about our health care system and fix what's wrong? How can we give health care security that really means something to all our people? Other countries do it. And they do it, and don't spend as much money as we do.

For many elderly Americans, the neighborhood pharmacist is the symbol of good health care. For many older Americans, the local pharmacist does a whole lot more than just fill the prescription and ring up the register. He's a problem-solver. He's a friend. One of the people in John's pharmacy today told me, "He spends a lot of time with me. He explains how these things work." I saw one bill rung up in the pharmacy today and with every new prescription, you get a little printout from this pharmacy which says, here's what the drug is; here's what it's supposed to do; here's the proper usage, explaining how to manage this.

The pharmacist is often the one person who can really be counted on to answer questions and calm fears and to catch a problem sometimes before it becomes a crisis. They can call different doctors and let them know the effects of combining the drugs that have been prescribed. They sometimes tell you actually what you are taking and why you should take it and how often you should and why. They are really problem-solvers. If a medication isn't helping or is causing harmful side effects, often it's the pharmacist who gets the first call.

That's why I am especially grateful for the support of the leaders here today, for Charles West and Ron Ziegler and for the grassroots Americans they represent, more than 100,000 community pharmacies, retail druggists, and the 1 million employees who work for them. They understand that we can fix what's wrong with the American health care system without messing up what's right.

I heard a lot of you clap when one of the members, one of the people who spoke before me, mentioned preserving choice of pharmacies and doctors. It's a good thing to do. But millions of Americans are losing their choices of doctors, of plans, of coverage. Under our approach, we preserve choices. And we will actually increase the number of choices available to a lot of folks still covered in the workplace.

Under our proposal, you can keep your Medicare. You can keep your doctor. Your children and grandchildren will have much greater access to primary care and preventive care. Under our proposals, older Americans in need of long-term care will have new choices, new choices, the

choice of getting that care in the home or in a community setting.

What we're trying to do is to give health care security to people over 65 and people under 65. We're trying to preserve Medicare and to improve it by adding the prescription drug and the long-term care benefits. And that's why the pharmacist and the druggist here support this proposal. In addition, this proposal provides, as a basic benefit, coverage of prescription drugs and pharmacy services for all Americans for the very first time—for the very first time—and provides for prescription drugs for people on Medicare for the very first time.

Listen to this: Pharmacists have studied this question and determined that each year they write 17 million prescriptions that are not filled because customers cannot afford them. That's 17 million. Hillary often recounts to me her conversations with the hospital pharmacist she met during her father's illness. He told her of the many patients he sees leaving the hospital with prescriptions he knows they will never fill, because they can't afford it.

Now, medicine can't work miracles unless it is used. There's overwhelming evidence that without the regular treatment of adequate medicine, many people actually get sicker or hospitalized or require nursing home care and therefore impose far, far greater costs on the health care system, on the taxpayers than would be the case if there were a prescription medicine benefit. Without medicine, care often comes too late and costs too much. Pharmacists know this. They see this in Americans every day. They see it in human terms. You heard it talked about today. They are here because they want to solve the problem.

Until we do, as many as 8 million Americans—8 million Americans—each month will continue to make choices between drugs and other essentials, including literally the food on their table, just like this letter said. I've had people tell me this in State after State all over America.

Under our proposal, anyone receiving Medicare will continue to choose the doctor and the druggist they want, but they will have the drugs covered under Medicare and under the basic benefit for people who are not old enough to be on Medicare.

Now, I want to make it clear that this is not just some pie-in-the-sky offer that is not paid for and not thought through. Yesterday, two independent studies concluded that if we cover medicine under Medicare, we could save about $30 billion between 1996 and the year 2000, mostly by involving community pharmacists in preventing related hospitalizations and nursing home stays. One study was done by the Center for Health Policy Studies, the other by the respected, nonpartisan consulting firm, Lewin-VHI. The Lewin firm also determined that this benefit would improve the lives of Medicare beneficiaries.

Forty-six years ago, Harry Truman passed through this community campaigning for guaranteed private health insurance for every American. He was right then. When Richard Nixon said 20 years ago, as Ron Ziegler said, that "employers and employees ought to contribute and ought to provide health insurance for everybody; we ought to cover everybody," he was right then, and we're right now.

The real question is whether Senator Dodd is right: Are we in one of those cycles of history where we're going to do something about it? The early part of the century, free public education; in the thirties, Social Security; in the sixties, civil rights. Are we going to fulfill the responsibilities of this generation to finally, after 60 years of talking about it, solve this problem? Are we going to continue to make excuses, walk away because everybody's got a different idea, or are we going to solve the problem? That is the great question facing the United States Congress and the American people.

I full well realize that when you have a system that involves 1,500 separate insurance companies writing thousands of different policies with a blizzard of different rules and regulations, compounded by the Government's Medicare and Medicaid programs that have a lot of good features but a lot of dizzying complexities and things that aren't covered, when we are spending 10 percent more on paperwork than any other country in the world but that employs a lot of people and generates a lot of earnings, that there are a lot of interests at stake. I know that. But fundamentally, this is a simple, direct, profound issue. How can we justify spending almost 50 percent more of our income than any other country on Earth and still have to put up with stories like the stories of the people I introduced here who stood up? I say to you, my fellow Americans, this is the responsibility of our generation, and we must fulfill it.

The strange thing is that this is just another one of those deals, as my mother used to tell me, when doing the right thing turns out to have the right consequences in all kinds of other ways. If we do this, we will also help to reduce the Government's deficit; we will also help to improve the quality of life; we will also actually lower the cost of the health care system.

If we adopt our program, we will improve individual responsibility because we ask everybody to share some of this. But most importantly, we will not have to listen to these stories anymore and all the other stories that are in those million letters that Hillary got.

I once heard a distinguished New Englander, former Senator and Secretary of State, candidate for Vice President, Ed Muskie from Maine, say that when he was the Governor of Maine, one of the ways that he really thought that you could gauge success was by whether the problems came around twice. And if the same problem came around a second time, somebody hadn't done their job. This problem, my fellow Americans, has been coming around to us and getting worse and worse for six decades.

I say to you, it is time for all of us to do our job. The Congress cannot do it alone. They have got to know that you will stick with them. They have got to know that you expect them to work their way through all these complicated claims and counterclaims by the interest groups with the vision, the stark, clear vision, of the human beings that are being affected by this and our responsibility for the future.

In spite of the difficulties we face, I think we are going to do it, thanks to you.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:43 p.m. in the Slater Hall Auditorium at the Norwich Free Academy. In his remarks, he referred to John Kiszkiel, owner, Greenville Drug Store; Charles West, president, National Association of Retail Druggists; Ron Ziegler, president, National Association of Chain Drugstores, and former Press Secretary to President Richard Nixon; and Mary Lou Bargnesi, principal, Norwich Free Academy.

Nomination for Deputy Secretary of Defense

February 24, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate John M. Deutch, a highly respected expert on military technology and current Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, to serve as Deputy Secretary of Defense under Secretary William Perry.

"John Deutch is a sound and sophisticated adviser whose expertise on military technology and policy has served the Department of Defense well in his tenure as Under Secretary of Defense," the President said. "Secretary Perry and I will rely heavily on his knowledge, imagination, and judgment as we work to maintain the strongest military in the world at a time of budgetary constraints."

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

Nomination for Ambassador to Kuwait

February 24, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Ryan Clark Crocker, a career member of the Foreign Service and formerly Director of the Iraq-Kuwait Task Force, to be Ambassador to Kuwait.

"Ryan Clark Crocker has led a distinguished career in the foreign service and has a keen understanding of the issues facing Kuwait and the rest of the Middle East," the President said. "He is well-qualified to serve as our country's

Ambassador to Kuwait, and I am pleased he has agreed to accept this new assignment."

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

Nomination for Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

February 24, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Nelba R. Chavez, of San Francisco, as Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services.

"Dr. Chavez' broad range of experiences in the areas of mental health and substance abuse will provide valuable perspective in addressing these problems," the President said. "Her dedication to these issues will be a great benefit in her new position."

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

The President's News Conference

February 25, 1994

Hebron Massacre

The President. Good morning. I want to speak briefly about events in the Middle East and in Russia.

Early this morning, Palestinian Muslim worshipers at prayer in the Mosque of Abraham in Hebron were brutally gunned down by a lone Israeli settler. It can be no coincidence that the murderer struck during the holy month of Ramadan and chose a site sacred to Muslims and to Jews. His likely purpose was to ruin the historic reconciliation now underway between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

On behalf of the American people I condemn this crime in the strongest possible terms. I am outraged and saddened that such a gross act of murder could be perpetrated. And I extend my deepest sympathies to the families of those who have been killed and wounded.

I also call on all the parties to exercise maximum restraint in what we all understand is a terribly emotional situation. Extremists on both sides are determined to drag Arabs and Israelis back into the darkness of unending conflict and bloodshed. We must prevent them from extinguishing the hopes and the visions and the aspirations of ordinary people for a life of peaceful existence.

The answer now is to redouble our efforts to conclude the talks between Israel and the PLO and begin the implementation of the agreement they have made as rapidly as possible. Accordingly, this morning I asked the Secretary of State to contact Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat and to invite them to send all their negotiators involved in the Israel-PLO talks to Washington as soon as possible and to stay here in continuous session until their work is completed. They have both agreed to do that.

Our purpose is to accelerate the negotiations on the Declaration of Principles and to try to bring them to a successful conclusion in the shortest possible time. Those negotiations have already made considerable progress as marked by the Cairo agreement. It is my hope that the parties can turn today's tragic event into a catalyst for further progress and reconciliation.

Ames Espionage Case

I'd also like to say a word about the Ames espionage case and our broader interests regarding Russia. Three days ago, an employee of the CIA, Aldrich Ames, and his wife were arrested for spying, first for the Soviet Union and then for Russia, over a period dating back to the mid-1980's. If the charges are true, the Ames couple caused significant damage to our national security and betrayed their country.

This is a serious case, and we've made that crystal clear to the Russian Government. The CIA is working to assess the damage to our intelligence operation. The Justice Department is vigorously pursuing the court case. The FBI is continuing to pursue its investigations. It is important that we not say anything at this point that could jeopardize the prosecution. We need to be firm as we pursue both this case and our national interest in democratic reform in Russia.

Support of the United States for reform in Russia does not flow from a sense of charity or blind faith. Our policy is based on our clear American interests clearly pursued. It is in our national interest to continue working with Russia to lower the nuclear threshold, to support the development of Russia as a peaceful democracy, stable and at peace with its neighbors, to be a constructive partner with the United States in international diplomacy and to develop a flourishing market economy that can benefit both their people and ours. It is, therefore, in our interest to make every effort to help the long-term struggle for reform in Russia succeed.

That's why I've worked with members of both parties in Congress to secure assistance for reform in Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, and other new states, why I went to Moscow in January, to urge the Russian people to stay the course of reform, to join us in building a more positive partnership, and to advance the process of democracy and market reform.

Earlier today, I met with Members of Congress from both parties to discuss these issues, to stress the need for continuing our long-term and bipartisan approach to dealing with Russia. And I urged them to resist calls to reduce or suspend our assistance for reform in Russia and the other new states of the former Soviet Union. After all, a great portion of our aid is to facilitate the dismantlement of nuclear weapons that were aimed at the United States for over four decades. It is in our interest, plainly, to continue this policy.

The majority of our economic assistance is flowing not to government but to reformers outside Moscow, mostly in the nongovernmental sector, to help them start business and privatize existing businesses, to help private farmers, and to help support exchange programs.

Throughout the cold war, our Nation acted with a steadiness of purpose in overcoming the challenge of Soviet communism. Today, whether it is in our policies toward Russia or toward the Middle East, we need that same steadiness of purpose. Our policies must be designed for the long term and for the American national interests.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Q. Mr. President, Russia seems to be taking the view that the spy case is no big deal. Are you satisfied with Russia's response and cooperation to this? And if they don't withdraw individuals from their Embassy here, will you expel them?

The President. Well, let me try to clarify, first of all, what we have sought and why we have sought it. We have not sought Russian cooperation in any damage assessment. That was simply, I think, an erroneous report. We have sought Russian cooperation, if you will, in terms of taking what we believe is appropriate action in this case, and we think it's important that appropriate action be taken.

We have expressed our views in what we hoped the Russians would do. If they do not do that, then we will take action, and we will take it quickly, and then it will be apparent what we have done.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, has there been any formal response? Out of Moscow today they said they think they can have a dignified resolution. Has anything been offered? And also, are you looking for a second possible double agent in the CIA?

The President. We are—we have made our position clear. We have been in contact with the Russians. We think appropriate action will be taken one way or the other very soon.

David [David Lauter, Los Angeles Times].

Hebron Massacre

Q. Mr. President, you referred to the perpetrator of the massacre today as a lone settler, and the evidence so far suggests that he did

act alone. But there have been repeated reports over the years of Americans providing aid, both fundraising and other sorts of aid, to extremist groups on both sides. And I wonder whether, in light of today's massacre, whether there is more that needs to be done here to try to prevent Americans from providing aid and other forms of support to Jewish extremist groups that may be involved in these sorts of actions.

The President. Well, let me say, based on what we now know, we have no reason to believe that this killer was involved with any group. If we find out differently, we will assess our position at that time.

I can say this, that Prime Minister Rabin, himself, has recognized the need to strengthen the security provided by Israeli forces against extremists, including Israeli extremists. But as far as we know, this was the action of one individual.

Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

Q. Mr. President, what is it about this massacre as opposed to other setbacks that have occurred in the Middle East that has brought you to this podium today, that makes you feel it's necessary to make a strong statement?

The President. First of all, its scope and setting is horrible from a purely human point of view. Secondly, it comes at a time when it appears to be clearly designed to affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of others by derailing the peace process. And I am hoping that the statesmanship of the leaders in the region and the attention that this will bring to the terrible problem will not only diffuse what could become a much worse round of killings and counterattacks, but will actually be used to thwart the purpose of the murder and to reinvigorate the peace process.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President, just to follow up on the earlier question, there have been reports from the scene that the Israeli army stood by and allowed this massacre to go on. What kind of recommendation would you make to Israel to try to do an investigation to see what happened and change the perception maybe of that?

The President. Well, we have no reason—we do not know that to be true. I can say that at this time. And we have—the Secretary of State has talked with Prime Minister Rabin. I was not able to talk with him myself yet because of the other meetings I had this morning. I believe the Israelis are committed to increasing security where they can do so. And I don't want to comment on that without some evidence or reason to believe its true.

G–7 Meeting

Q. Mr. President, there's a G–7 meeting on Saturday in Frankfurt. It's supposed to focus on Russian aid. Do we go to that meeting with any particular proposition on the speed of aid or the conditionality of aid to Russia? And also, at that meeting, Bentsen will be meeting with Japanese Finance Minister Fujii regarding the failed trade talks, framework talks. Do you see the Gephardt and Rockefeller open markets still being helpful to your mission to open markets in Japan? Do you support that?

The President. Well, we've taken no position on any particular legislation. I think that it shows the determination of the American people to improve our trade and open the markets, especially the involvement of Senator Rockefeller, who's actually lived in Japan and I think is thought of genuinely as a friend of Japan but someone who understands what is at stake here.

With regard to the other question, I think we're where we always have been. The kind of aid and the amount of aid which will flow to Russia and the sources from which it flows I think will be a function of the policies and conduct of the Russians.

Yes, Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Russia

Q. Are you concerned now, sir, apart from the Ames case, about other developments in Russia that might make your policy there appear almost to be in denial, based on what you and others wish were happening or hope will happen, rather than what really is happening there?

The President. No, I mean my policy has nothing to do with what I wish or hope will happen. Our response will be dictated by their behavior. But I think the—what I think is naive in this whole element is the suggestion that we should have ever believed for a moment that every event in Russia and every speech made by every Russian politician in every election of every member of Parliament would somehow be in a constant straight line toward a goal that we wanted to predetermine. They have to make their own future. That's what I said there over and over again.

This is not black and white; this is gray. There will be developments over the course of our

relationship with Russia which—as there are over the course of our relationship with every other country—where we won't like everything that happens. We should do things based on a clear-headed appreciation of what is in our national interest.

No one has made a compelling case to me, publicly or privately, that it is not in our national interests to continue to work with the President of Russia and the Government of Russia on denuclearization, on cooperation and respect for neighbors, and on economic reform where we can support it. That is, the privatization movement, for example, I would just remind you, is still going on in Russia and has basically occurred more rapidly there than in other former Soviet countries.

So I don't believe the fact that a few speeches are made that we don't agree with or that policies are pursued based on an election they had for a Parliament that we don't agree with should force us to abandon what is in our national interest. When it is no longer in our national interest to do these things, then we should stop it. But we cannot be deluded into thinking that our national interest can be defined by every election and every speech in Russia. That can't be.

Yes, Tom [Thomas L. Friedman, New York Times].

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, in inviting the parties to come here to Washington, do you also anticipate that you or the Secretary of State will adopt a different posture toward these negotiations? Up to now, we've kind of let them handle it and keep a hands-off approach, wisely. But do you see, in fact, now that they're going to be here and given the urgency you've assigned to it, do you see yourself or the Secretary taking a different posture toward the talks?

The President. I think, first of all, the very act of inviting them here indicates some sense of urgency on our part. What we have done to date, as you know, is largely to try to give both sides the security they needed to proceed and the assurances that we would support it, but that they would have to freely make the agreement. We still believe they will have to freely agree.

We believe they are close to agreement. We want to do things that will prevent this last terrible incident from derailing that and to try to send a signal to the peoples in the region to not overreact to this horrible act, that the path of peace is still the right path. Whether that will require us to do more in particular meetings, I can't say, because we have discussed this with Chairman Arafat, with Prime Minister Rabin because we wanted to move quickly, and they did, too. And we'll just have to wait for that to unfold.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Ames Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, Senator Nunn has just said that we should not be asking Russia to voluntarily bring back their diplomats, that we should have simply expelled them the way we would have during the cold war and after the cold war, that this is too serious a case. Why didn't we just expel the diplomats still working here?

The President. I think that the judgment of the security services and the national security team was that the Russians ought to be at least told what we know—not negotiated with, there was no negotiation—told what we know and given an opportunity to take whatever action they wanted to take. And if they don't, then we will do what we should do. And we will take appropriate action. We will do that soon.

Q. Mr. President, does that also mean, as Senator Leahy and Senator Mitchell and others are suggesting following your meeting this morning, that you, the United States Government, will also expose Russian diplomats who are, in effect, who are really intelligence officers who are not declared to the U.S. Government as intelligence officers? Will you take that step, and if you do, don't you invite retaliation, counterexpulsions, counterdeclarations, exposures on the part of the Russian Government against U.S. officials in Moscow?

The President. We intend to take the action that we think is appropriate, and you won't have to wait long to find out what that is.

Representative Dan Rostenkowski

Q. Mr. President, are you in any way interfering with the judicial process in appearing with Congressman Rostenkowski in Illinois on Monday? There have been suggestions——

The President Absolutely not.

Q. ——that Attorney General Reno had concerns that you would be appearing with someone under investigation?

The President. First of all—let me make a couple of comments about that. First of all, I have had no conversations to that effect with anyone in the Justice Department. Secondly, there is no way in the world we would do anything like that. Thirdly, this investigation has been going on for months. I have been in Chicago before with Congressman Rostenkowski. I am going there and will be with other Members of Congress, at least one other I know and perhaps more, to talk about issues that directly relate to this administration's work that he is a critical part of, health care and crime. And finally, there is still a presumption of innocence in this country. He has not yet been charged with anything.

But I can tell you, there has been absolutely no contact of any nature about this case with the Justice Department and the White House that anyone could draw any inference of impropriety on. And I have received nothing back the other way that I shouldn't go to Chicago. I am going there to fight for things I believe in that he has played a critical role in. I am going to be with at least one other, perhaps more Members of Congress—I don't know yet—and I'm going to be doing something that I have already done while this investigation has been going on. No one ever said anything about it before.

Yes, Gene [Gene Gibbons, Reuters].

Ames Espionage Case

Q. You said that the Ames case had caused significant damage to the national security. Can you be more specific, sir? And secondly, you've said the FBI investigation is ongoing. Are you satisfied that we know the full extent of the penetration of the CIA at this point?

The President. Well, I can say very little about that except to assure you: I talked with Director Freeh this morning myself; I am confident that the FBI, working with the CIA, is doing everything that is humanly possible to fully investigate this case. I do not want to raise red herrings or other possibilities, only to say this, that it is not unusual, as the FBI Director said this morning. Sometimes it happens that when you're in a criminal investigation and you're on to something, the investigation turns up information that could not have been anticipated in the beginning. I am not trying to say that has occurred. I'm not trying to raise any false hopes. All I'm telling you is, I have directed the FBI and the CIA and everybody else to do everything they can to get to the full bottom of this. And I have nothing else to say about it.

And again, I'm not trying to raise some tantalizing inference, I'm just saying that we have to keep going and try to root it out. After all, this is fundamentally a problem within America, about whether people here who are Americans are spying, and that's our responsibility to try to find it out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 49th news conference began at 11:55 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks to the NCAA Soccer Champion University of Virginia Cavaliers
February 25, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Senator Robb, Mrs. Reid, and to the captains and all the members of this wonderful team, and your coach, and your athletic director, and your parents and friends.

We're very honored to have you here today. I was thinking about this a little bit. The Vice President is right, he and I are from the South, and when we were boys nobody played soccer down there, and we had to learn about it really through our children. And one of my most prized pictures is a picture of my daughter trying to do what they did. It hangs on my wall in the White House now, with Chelsea kicking her soccer ball. I have followed this game closely since she was about 5 and entered a league which had both boys and girls in it. And I watched the little girls grow up in this league, fighting with the boys on the soccer field. It was a great experience for me. And I'm really proud that the United States is going to host the World Cup here. I think it will do a lot for soccer in the United States and a lot for

our image as a soccer-playing country throughout the world.

But I think that today I'd like to focus on what this fine team has done for the sport in the United States and to thank you for that. I also noticed that, Coach, my researchers tell me that your record is 252–54 and 29 ties. And if that is true, we would like to invite you to become a congressional liaison. [*Laughter*] We would like margins like that on our major bills. I don't know how you did that.

I also was thinking we might recruit your goaltender. Jeff Causey, where are you? That's what being President is like; people take shots at you all the time, day to day. [*Laughter*] And we decided that you could help us be in the right sort of frame of mind to come to work every day.

We're delighted to have you here. We're proud of you. We're proud of what you represent and proud of the teamwork that you represent. And that's the last point I'd like to make.

One of the things I really like about soccer is that even though people are given the chance to star, to excel, to score, it really is fundamentally a team sport. It's a sport where people really have to think about what's best for the team and how they can do well together. And that's a lesson we're trying to get across to America now. There are a lot of economic and educational and social problems that we can only face if we start to think of each other again as well as ourselves and start to play on a team again. And so you've set a good example not only for soccer but for the way we might do better in our own lives. We thank you for that and wish you well. Congratulations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room at the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Landra Reid, mother of Cavaliers soccer player Key Reid and wife of Senator Harry Reid of Nevada; Cavaliers coach Bruce Arena; and Jim Copeland, director of athletics, University of Virginia.

Nomination for Ambassador to Egypt

February 25, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Edward S. Walker of Maryland as Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

"Ambassador Walker's broad experience in the Middle East and his dedicated service to the United States in the Foreign Service will be a valuable asset to our Embassy in Egypt," said the President. "I am delighted to nominate him to this position."

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

The President's Radio Address

February 26, 1994

Good morning. Today I'm speaking to you from the First Police District in Washington, DC, the base for hundreds of police officers under the command of Inspector Robert Gales. The men and women who are with me here today and the other police officers throughout our Nation are a lot like you; they're our neighbors and friends, they're mothers and fathers, brothers, sisters, daughters, and sons. The difference, though, is that it's their job to keep our streets, our workplaces, and our schools safe, and it's a dangerous job. In the last year alone, about 150 police officers were killed in the line of duty. Today I want to talk about two officers, one who died this week in Los Angeles, and the other, killed a few weeks ago just blocks from where I'm sitting now. Both followed in the footsteps of their fathers who also wore a badge. They served with idealism, dedication, and honor, and they died in the line of duty.

For Officer Christy Lynne Hamilton, becoming a policewoman was the beginning of a new life and the fulfillment of a dream, one she put off until after she raised her two children. She was 45 years old when she earned her badge in Los Angeles just last week. She said, then, the only thing she was afraid of was not doing a good job. No one else thought that was a possibility. She was voted the most inspirational person in her policy academy class. Then, in her first week on the job, she was murdered with a single round from an assault rifle, aimed by a 17-year-old boy who had just killed his father.

Officer Jason White was just 25 years old. He had a new wife, Joie, a new home, a job he loved. The officers here at the First Police District knew him well. He was on the force for 3 years, and every day he made a difference. He worked with young people at risk, he helped citizens set up community patrols, he took on the drug dealers on his beat. And then one night, 2 months ago, he was killed, shot six times with a handgun at point-blank range when he tried to question a suspect.

These brave officers and their other fallen comrades across our Nation left behind people who loved them, respected them, and looked up to them. For them, their relatives, their friends, their coworkers, for all the people in this country who deserve protection, Congress must move to make our streets, our schools, and our workplaces safer.

Last year Congress passed and I signed the Brady law after 7 years of hard struggle. And on Monday it will take effect. It will require background checks of anyone buying a gun. And that will help to keep guns out of the hands of people with prior criminal records and the mentally unfit. The law will prevent thousands of handgun murders.

Consider these figures on firearm crimes that are being released today by the Justice Department. Between 1987 and 1992 about 858,000 armed attacks took place every year. In 1991 and 1992, the annual rate of murder with firearms was 16,000 in each year. This is where the Brady law will help. Among criminals who used a firearm and had a prior record, 23 percent, nearly one-fourth, said they bought their guns retail. Among murderers, about 5,000 had prior records and were still able to buy a gun in a retail store. Among those who killed police officers, 53 percent had a prior conviction record and still were able to do that.

If the Brady law had been in effect, none of these guns could have been purchased at a retail store. So it's a good start. But we need more, much more. We need a new crime bill that is both tough and smart. Our crime bill punishes serious criminals. It sends this message: Kill a police officer and you face the death penalty. It tells violent felons: Three violent crimes, three strikes, and you're out.

Our crime bill also works to prevent crime. It will give us a stronger police presence, 100,000 more police officers in our communities in the next 5 years. It will help stop young criminals from being better armed than the police by banning assault weapons. And while we take these steps, we encourage all our people to work with officers in their communities to reclaim our streets.

Here at the first district, a high premium is put on community policing. We know this works to reduce crime when officers know their neighbors, know the kids on the streets, when they do things like are being done here, where the officers organize citizen patrols and look after the children. Two officers here, Limatine Johnson and Joyce Leonard, run a safe house for kids where they can play games, watch movies, and learn away from the mean streets. I hear that the kids called Officer Johnson "Officer Lima Bean." And they smile when they do.

Police officers, it has been said, are the soldiers who act alone. But we can't let them be alone. The community must honor their service, respect their example, obey the laws they uphold, and walk beside them. If we do that, we can replace fear with confidence and help to make our country whole again.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the First District Police Headquarters.

Statement on the Church Bombing in Lebanon
February 27, 1994

The killing of people at prayer is an outrage against faith and humanity. On behalf of the American people, I condemn in the strongest possible terms this latest incident in which innocent Lebanese at communion on Sunday morning were killed by bombs planted in a church. I extend my deepest sympathy to the bereaved.

Just as Friday's massacre in a Hebron mosque was aimed at the peace process, this bomb attack seems clearly aimed at Lebanon's reconciliation process. The extremists have a common purpose, to promote division, strife, and war. They must and will not be allowed to succeed.

I call on men and women of all faiths to unite in opposition to the forces of dark hatred. The people of the Middle East deserve a peaceful future. They deserve the right to pray in peace, as we join them in praying for it.

Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
February 28, 1994

Q. Can you give us any sense of what is going on in Bosnia and what has happened——

The President. Well, you know the essential facts, that last evening after midnight our time, United States aircraft, flying under NATO authority, warned some fixed-wing Serbian aircraft, Bosnian Serbian aircraft, to land, and when they didn't, they were shot down. There were two warnings. Every attempt was made, to the best of our information, to avoid this encounter.

We have had responsibility for enforcing the no-fly zone since last April. It has been since last fall that there were any fixed-wing aircraft that we knew of violating the no-fly zone, and we're attempting to get more facts now. We're also trying to brief everyone involved in this effort to bring peace to Bosnia about the facts, and if we find out any more information, of course, we'll be glad to give it to you. But it seems to——

Q. Why now? Why now? Is this a new get-tough policy?

The President. No, no. The violations—the principal violations of the no-fly zone have been by helicopters, which could easily land. We've not had a fixed-wing violation reported of any kind, much less one we were in a position to do something about, to the best of my information, since last fall, since September. Those are much more serious because of the capacity they have to engage in military conduct from the air. Our mandate under the United Nations was to enforce the no-fly zone to eliminate the prospect that the war could be carried into the air.

Q. How were you informed, President Clinton? How did you learn of this, sir?

The President. Early, early this morning I was notified.

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:05 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to the President's departure for Chicago, IL.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Violence and Crime at Wilbur Wright College in Chicago, Illinois
February 28, 1994

The President. I'm glad to see all of you. I'm glad to also be back at Wright Community College where I first came in December of 1992, although, Congressmen and mayors, you will remember, it was in a different facility. This

is much nicer and newer. It's good to be back here.

We're here to talk about two things that relate to one another, crime and health care. It's appropriate that we're having this discussion today because today the Brady bill becomes law. It requires background checks on anyone who buys a handgun or gun and will help to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and people who are mentally unfit. It will prevent now, we know based on research, thousands of handgun murders all across our country. Here in Illinois, where you already have a tough law similar to the Brady law, it will prevent people who should not have guns from buying guns in other States, using them here to commit crimes.

Before we begin, I'd like to talk with Jim Brady who made history with his heroic efforts, along with his wonderful wife, Sarah, to pass this bill. They worked for 7 long years to pass it. I want to say Congressman Rostenkowski has supported the bill all along the way, but there was surprisingly continuing opposition in Congress. It all melted away last year. I hope that our campaign and election had something to do with it. But for whatever reason, we had a good, good, strong bipartisan measure of support for the Brady bill. It's now the law as of today.

And I just wanted—I've got Jim Brady on the phone, I think. And I wanted to congratulate him and thank him for his efforts. Jim, are you on the phone?

James Brady. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Is Sarah there?

Sarah Brady. I'm right here, sir.

The President. Well, it's nice to hear you both.

Mrs. Brady. Well, it's good to hear from you.

The President. As you know, I'm here in Chicago with a lot of people who understand the importance of what you've done. I'm here with doctors and other health care professionals who treat gunshot victims and people who are recovering from wounds. So I'm sure they're all very grateful to you, just as I am today.

Mrs. Brady. Well, we thank you for your leadership and for their support. It took a real team effort to get this passed, and we thank you very much for it.

The President. Well, I know that you believe this is just the beginning in our fight, and I know that you've got a lot of other objectives you want to try to achieve. I want you to know that we're going to be in there pulling for you and working with you.

Mrs. Brady. Well, thank you. We appreciate it.

Mr. Brady. We can't lose then.

The President. You know, today, Secretary Bentsen is announcing that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is taking an assault weapon called the "street sweeper" off the free market.

Mr. Brady. Yeah.

Mrs. Brady. That's a wonderful move, and we applaud that highly.

The President. The weapon was originally developed for crowd control in South Africa. Several years ago, the U.S. Government banned it from being imported, but it's still made and sold here. So today, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is reclassifying the "street sweeper" and another assault weapon, the USAS–12, as destructive devices, increasing the taxes on manufacturers and dealers and requiring the buyers to take extraordinary measures. Starting tomorrow, if you want to buy one, you have to appear in person, provide a photo ID with fingerprints, and have a local law enforcement officer verify that the buyer can own it in his home State. And that, I think, will make a big difference.

So we're going to keep working on these things; we're going to try to pass this crime bill, including the assault weapons ban in it. I know you're going to help us. And I just want to say on behalf of Chairman Rostenkowski and Mayor Daley and myself and all these fine health professionals that are here, we appreciate you and we're grateful to you, and I hope you have a great celebration today.

Mr. Brady. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. Brady. Thank you.

The President. Thanks, Sarah. Bye, Jim.

Mr. Brady. Bye now.

The President. Take care.

[*At this point, the telephone conversation ended.*]

Well, I'm glad we could take a little time to talk to them. You know, Jim Brady has paid a terrific price for the fact that we didn't have the Brady bill when he was wounded. I think it's remarkable that he and his wife are continuing to work on these matters and are continuing to get out there.

Chairman Rostenkowski, I'm glad to see you here today. Glad to have a chance to talk about

this crime issue, which you've been interested in for a long time and how it relates to the health care bill that we're working on in Congress now. Mayor Daley, I'm glad you're here. I know that you were the State's attorney before you were mayor, and I know you've worked very hard on the community policing. And every time I've ever talked with you, we've started our conversation with a discussion of crime. So I'm glad that you joined us here today.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the crime bill that's before the Congress and then introduce the people here around the table and then invite the rest of you who are here, if we have time, to make some comments, because I think it's very important that we see that this crime problem is being manifested as a public health problem, too, and that many of you who deal with the cost and the human tragedy of this can speak very dramatically to why we need to change our laws and our policies.

Our crime bill does a number of things. It contains a "three strikes and you're out" provision written properly to really cover people who commit three consecutive violent crimes. It gives us 100,000 more police officers so that we can do more community policing. We know that that lowers the crime rate, if you have properly trained police officers on the streets, in the communities, who know the neighbors and know the kids. It bans assault weapons, and it provides funds for things like drug treatment and alternative treatment for first-time young offenders, like community boot camps.

Today, I'm hoping that your presence here will help not only people in Chicago and Illinois but people all across America learn more about how the crisis in crime and violence is linked to the health care crisis in America.

Last week, physicians from Chicago area trauma centers had a news conference with the Cook County medical examiner, Dr. Edmund Donahue. They reported that largely because of the proliferation of rapid-fire automatic and semiautomatic and assault weapons, gun violence has become one of the leading health problems in the Chicago area. More than 2,500 people every year are treated for gunshot wounds in Chicago area emergency rooms, and caring for them in the emergency rooms costs $37 million in this one community. In 1987, at Cook County Hospital, gunshot wounds accounted for 15 percent of the total funds used for the care of trauma patients. By 1992, this number had increased from 15 percent to 35 percent.

At the Cook County Hospital trauma unit, from 1987 to 1992, the number of admissions for gunshot wounds increased from 449 to 1,220 and accounted for 70 percent of the overall increase in admissions. That is a stunning fact. And all across Illinois, 1992 was the first year in this State where more people were killed by guns than by auto accidents.

According to an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association, gunshot wounds are expected to become the Nation's leading cause of traumatic death this year. From 1987 through 1992, 858,000 armed attacks took place every year, and in 1991 and 1992, 16,000 people were murdered with firearms each year. This adds about $4 billion a year to hospital costs, and too often, of course, when one of us is struck with a bullet, the rest of us are stuck with the bill. About 80 percent of the patients who suffer firearm injuries aren't adequately insured or eligible for Government medical programs like Medicaid. So public hospitals cover the costs of the uninsured. Private hospitals charge higher rates for those who can pay, so the rest of us pay higher hospital bills, higher insurance premiums, and higher taxes.

This morning I want to talk with you and let you basically talk to me and tell me whatever's on your mind about what we need to do and what you have experienced. The Mayor and Chairman Rostenkowski and I have decided we'd like to hear from you first, and then we may want to ask you some questions. And I know there are some other very distinguished people here, too, in the audience who may want to say some things. But let's start with the Chicago Police Superintendent, Matt Rodriguez, a strong advocate of community policing. And I want to thank you, sir, for working with our national service program to implement our Summer of Safety, where we're going to have several thousand young people working with police forces all across America to try to reduce the crime rate and relate better to the neighborhoods of this country this year. I thank you for that, and I want to give you the microphone for whatever you might like to say.

[*Mr. Rodriguez discussed the Chicago alternative policing strategy and explained that while the homicide rate is down in Chicago, the public's fear of crime has increased.*]

The President. I think one of the reasons that's happening is the numbers I just read off. While the overall crime rate is going down, even the murder rate is dropping in many of our cities, especially where community policing strategies have been implemented, the violence among young people seems to be on the rise. And among young people who are shot with these semiautomatic weapons, a gunshot wound is more likely to end in death than it was just 5 or 10 years ago because you're likely to have more bullets in your body. I mean, there's a lot of evidence now to that effect.

So I think that the law enforcement folks in this country are not getting the credit they deserve in many cities, being able to bring the crime rate down through community strategies. But a lot of it is the sheer violence of certain particular things, and I think the widespread use of these assault weapons in gang settings.

Mr. Rodriguez. The fastest growing segment of our criminal population are the young people. They're increasingly becoming the offenders. We find it again here in Chicago and across the country. That is the same indication I'm getting from other chiefs throughout the country.

The President. Dr. Statter, Dr. Mindy Statter, is the director of pediatric trauma at the University of Chicago Medical Center. Her unit is Level I, which means she gets the most intense and vulnerable trauma cases. Would you like to make a few comments?

[*Dr. Statter discussed the increasing number of injuries caused by adolescent violence and addressed the high cost of helping these victims physically and psychologically.*]

The President. Do you have any—how long have you been doing this work?

Dr. Statter. I've been at Wyler for 2 years.

The President. Let me just say this. One of the most controversial parts of the crime bill, as you know, Mr. Chairman, in the House will be whether we can get the assault weapons ban that passed in the Senate passed in the House. I just sort of wanted to ask your opinion as a medical professional. We have a lot of police officers tell us that this is very important, not only because it winds—without doing something on assault weapons you wind up often with the police in effect outgunned by people who have these weapons but that it actually has increased the level of mortality from gunshot wounds because of the transfer from handguns, regular handguns, to assault weapons. Have you seen that?

[*Dr. Statter explained that children die more often than adults from gunshot wounds, regardless of the kind of gun used.*]

The President. Barbara Schwaegerman is a trauma nurse at Cook County Hospital who works in an emergency room and cares for hundreds of victims of violence every year. Would you like to make a few comments about your experience and what you—[*inaudible*]

[*Ms. Schwaegerman explained that the availability of semiautomatic weapons has created a 350 percent increase in deaths from gunshot wounds and stated that young people are using violence rather than communication to resolve problems.*]

The President. Thank you.

Perhaps the most important person sitting around this table today on this subject is Carol Ridley, who is an anticrime activist because her 22-year-old son was killed by gunfire in 1992. She is an active member of the Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence and the Coalition to Stop Handgun Violence.

Carol.

[*Mrs. Ridley, whose son was killed by his best friend during an argument, discussed the need for community programs and structured social activities to keep children off the streets after school. She also addressed the continuous fear children feel because of violence in their neighborhoods.*]

The President. First of all, let me thank you for being here and thank you for having the courage to keep fighting this.

One of the things that I have seen some success with around the country, that unfortunately is just being done kind of on a case-by-case basis with no consistency, is an effort in our schools to literally teach young people, who may not learn it at home or other community settings, how to resolve their differences, to really try to work through and force kids to come to grips with their aggressions, their angers, and how they deal with this.

You know, I don't know how many encounters I've had in the last 3 years with people talking about shootings occurring in schools that mostly are just impulse things. And it's something I think maybe we ought to give some thought to and make sure that in the crime bill that

comes out that some of this money for alternatives includes the ability—these things aren't very expensive—to have these courses in the schools where these kids are actually taught how people, sensible people, resolve their differences, because I think it's a real problem.

[*A participant agreed that conflict resolution should be addressed and discussed how important it is that people have a feeling of hope that something can be done to combat violence and crime.*]

The President. Congressman.

[*Representative Rostenkowski discussed the importance of restricting weapons, reducing violence in the media, and involving the community in combating crime. He then stressed the President's role in assault weapons legislation.*]

The President. Well, I don't think there's any question that, as you said, this has been one of those issues where the people were ahead of those elected officials or at least elected officials as a whole. They've been out there for a long time wanting us to do something.

Mayor.

[*Mayor Daley thanked the President for his leadership and discussed the effect that violence has on the community as a whole.*]

The President. Thank you.

Anybody else want to say something? Would you stand up and just identify yourself.

[*Eight doctors participating in the program described their experiences in treating gunshot victims and suggested ways to prevent violence and crime.*]

The President. Thank you. Is Dr. John May here?

Dr. May. Yes.

The President. You're the senior physician at the Cook County Jail, is that right?

Dr. May. Correct.

The President. I understand that you have done some violence prevention workshops with your people in the prison, in the jail. Would you talk a little about that?

[*Dr. May discussed prison violence prevention workshops and stressed the need for prevention methods such as conflict resolution and stricter gun laws.*]

The President. Is Reverend Roosevelt McGee here? Reverend McGee is the executive director of the Chicago chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. What are your observations about what you've heard today, and what can we do to prevent some of these things from happening in the first place? What can I do? What can the rest of us do?

[*Reverend McGee described community efforts to provide alternatives to a life of crime and violence.*]

The President. Thank you.

[*Dr. Bruce Gewertz, chairman of surgery at the University of Chicago, thanked the President for his leadership in fighting violence and crime.*]

The President. Thank you. I guess this would be an appropriate time to make an observation that all the medical professionals here will immediately identify with. You know, one of the big debates we're having in Washington over the health care plan now is that Americans spend about 14.5 percent of our total income on health care. The next most health-care-expensive country is Canada where they spend 10 percent; Germany and Japan are slightly under 9 percent of their income, even though their health outcomes, their indicators, are as good or better than ours in almost every major area. And they cover everybody, unlike the United States, which doesn't cover everybody.

And in the health care debate, we're examining, you know, how much of that is due to the way we finance health care, how much of that is due to the enormous administrative burden on hospitals and doctors' clinics and in insurance offices. But if we're going to be perfectly candid, we have to admit that some of the difference is what you all deal with every day. As long as we have more people who are cut up and shot and victims of violence, we're going to have a more expensive health care system than our competitors. And it has enormous economic consequences for the country. The human consequences are by far the most important; I don't want to minimize them. But I think it's important that we acknowledge here that no matter how successful Chairman Rostenkowski and I might be working on this health care thing when we go back, and even if we can get everybody in the world to agree on it, which seems somewhat less than likely, we will still have a system that costs more than all our major competitors as long as we are a more violent society than all our major competitors. Because

no matter how you cut it, you will have to be there doing what you do, and that's expensive.

I want to call on just a couple of other people, first, one of your officers. Is Officer Charles Ramsey here?

Officer Charles Ramsey. Here, sir.

The President. Officer Ramsey heads up—he's the deputy chief of police, and he's the head of the community policing program here. Could you say a little bit about what you think is the potential of the community policing program to actually reduce the crime rate and help maybe to begin to change patterns of behavior that we're talking about today?

[*Officer Ramsey stated that law enforcement officials and health care professionals must work together to find methods to prevent violence. He then discussed violence on television and its effect on children.*]

The President. Is Gina Benavides here? Gina was in her car with a girlfriend when she was the victim of random gunfire. And since that time, she's spoken out publicly against gun violence, and I thought I would give her a chance to say something here today.

[*Ms. Benavides noted that many teachers and police officers do not live in the communities where they work, so their influence is limited.*]

The President. It's a very interesting thing—several weeks ago in Washington, DC, there was a national meeting on violence in which Jesse Jackson and a number of other people were involved. And one of the principal ideas that came out of that, interestingly enough, was that local and State governments should consider giving special tax incentives or low-cost mortgages or something else to encourage police officers and teachers to actually live in the communities in which they work. That's very perceptive that you would say that.

Steven Estrada, are you here? Steven was a former mid-level management professional who was shot in the back and robbed for $9. And I appreciate your coming here, and I was wondering if you'd like to say anything?

[*Mr. Estrada discussed his reaction to his experience.*]

The President. Thank you.

Yes sir, Chief.

[*Officer Rodriguez explained that Mr. Estrada, like many victims of violence, is having a difficult time recovering both mentally and physically from his experience.*]

The President. Anything else? Anyone else want to be heard? Young man. Tell us your name.

[*William Waller, a gunshot victim, called for a ban on all weapons and stiffer penalties for criminals.*]

The President. Yes, sir. Thank you, young man.

[*Cdr. Ronnie Watson discussed the effect of violent television programs and video games on society and urged families and community members to become involved in programs that help control violence and crime.*]

The President. Thank you.

Mayor.

[*Mayor Daley stated that many foreign companies are selling drugs and weapons to the United States because they are unable to sell them in their own countries.*]

The President. Thank you. Take one more, and then I think we better wrap up. Then, Congressman, I would like to hear from you at the end.

[*Dr. Leslie Zun, chairman of emergency medicine at Mount Sinai Hospital, discussed the cost of emergency room care for victims of violence and thanked the President for his health care reform initiative.*]

The President. We also need to remember that every one of these hospitals with a big trauma bill also treats lots of other patients for lots of other things, and it imposes an enormous financial burden on the hospitals, which is one reason this health care reform thing is so important to big city hospitals with large trauma units is that it will help to even out the flow of payments so you will be able to continue to treat these other folks and not risk bankruptcy, which I think is very important. A lot of people have overlooked that connection, that all these other people that are going to these hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, you want to wrap up?

[*Representative Rostenkowski stated that many Chicago trauma centers have closed due to the high cost of health care and agreed that police officers and teachers should live in the commu-*

nities where they work. He then thanked the President for becoming involved in tough issues.]

The President. It is a tough one. But I want to thank you, Carol, and thank you, Barbara, and thank you, Mindy Statter, and thank you, Chief Rodriguez, and thank all of you for the work you do every day. And I particularly want to thank those of you who have been victimized in some way or another for having the courage to come up here and do this and to continue your interest in this.

I think the American people are ready to move on this. I believe they are. And I think maybe the rest—those of us who can help are getting the message. And your presence here today will certainly help.

Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. at Wilbur Wright College. In his remarks, he referred to civil rights leader Jesse L. Jackson.

Remarks to Students at Wilbur Wright College in Chicago
February 28, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Chairman Rostenkowski, for that fine introduction. Thank you, Mayor Daley. Thank you, President Le Fevour. It's nice to be back here at Wright Community College. I was here in December of 1992, and I asked the president, I said, "Now, how many of these people were here back in '92 when I was here?" And he said, "Not many. We were in the old place, and we only had 200 people in the room." So, I congratulate you on your beautiful new digs here. I like being here in this place.

You know, the city of Chicago and this State have been very good to me, personally, and to our administration. The best thing that Chicago ever did for me was Hillary, who's from here. And yesterday we celebrated our daughter's 14th birthday, the three of us, and we had a wonderful time. I was thinking back over her whole life and looking ahead to what her life might become and to what your life might become and trying to resolve again on that special day to spend every day that I have been given to be your President working on those issues, on the big things that really affect people's lives and their future, not be diverted by the little things that so often swallow up our politics, make us less than we ought to be, and keep us from facing our responsibilities to the future. And that's really what I want to talk to you about today.

I'm honored to be here because I think these community colleges all across our country represent our responsibilities to the future, the chance of people to learn for a lifetime, without regard to their racial or ethnic or income backgrounds, the chance for people to make the most of their lives. I'm glad to be here because I think your mayor is an extraordinary leader who has taken on the tough issues here and tried to do these things.

And I'm glad to be here in Dan Rostenkowski's congressional district because had it not been for his leadership last year, we would not have done the things which were done which have got this economy on the right course and are moving into the future, and we would not be able to do the things that we have to do to meet our obligations to the future in this coming year in health care, welfare reform, and many other areas. So, I am honored to be here, here in this congressional district and here to tell you what you already know: that last year, when I became President, we had a deficit that had quadrupled the national debt, that had quadrupled in 12 years; we had 4 years of very slow job growth; we had very low economic growth; we had low investment. And I determined that we were going to have to make some tough decisions that would not be popular in the short run, decisions for which we would be attacked and decisions which would be misrepresented to the American people, to get an economic implant in place that would reverse the track we were on, that would begin to bring down the deficit, that would bring down interest rates, keep inflation down, and get investment and jobs and growth up. And I proposed that economic plan to the Congress, and in spite of the fact that there were billions of dollars

of spending cuts in it and the taxes all went to reduce the deficit and only the top 1.2 percent of the American people paid higher income taxes—16.5 percent of the people, as they'll find out on April 15th, got a tax cut, lower income working people who deserve it because they are doing their best to raise their kids and educate them—in spite of that fact, many Members of Congress were quaking in their boots to vote for the bill. They were afraid to vote for it—they knew it was the right thing for America—because they were so terrified of the rhetoric of the last decade.

We were going to be paralyzed with the thought that the American people would not even support us raising taxes on the top 1.2 percent of our people and putting all of the money into deficit reduction to pay our obligations to the future. And that bill passed the United States Congress by one vote in both Houses. And I am telling you, if it hadn't been for the leadership of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, it would not have happened, and this economy today would not be on the right path it's on if we had not done it. That is a fact. It is not up to me to know or to make judgments about all the things that are of concern to the people of Chicago, the people of this neighborhood. But I can tell you, as your President, I know that for a fact.

I also know that we have a lot of challenges before us. We have just begun to do what we need to do. Even though our economy last year produced nearly 2 million jobs—more than in the previous 4 years, even though most of those jobs were private sector jobs; whereas for the last 10 years or more, more and more of our jobs have been Government jobs, and the private sector has not been producing those new jobs—you know we have a long way to go. There are still too many people in Chicago who want a good job, who don't have it or can't find one. There are still too many people who work harder and harder every year without an increase in their incomes. There are still too many people who get out of high school without the education and training and skills they need. There are still too many people who ought to be at least in a community college, who aren't there.

Let me tell you, we have just done a study of this, and I released it last week. You may have seen it in the news when we were talking about our education program. But here is what we know: We know that in 1992, high school dropouts had an unemployment rate over 11 percent. High school graduates had an unemployment rate of just over 7 percent. People with 2 years of community college had an unemployment rate of 5 percent. People who had 4-year college degrees had an unemployment rate of 3.5 percent. We live in a world where what you earn depends on what you can learn. And until we fulfill our responsibilities to make those opportunities available to all Americans, not just when they're young but for a lifetime—the average age at this community college is 31 years of age—until we do that, we will not have done our job for the future of this country.

We know that the earnings of high school graduates are, on average, more than $4,000 higher than the earnings of high school dropouts; that the earnings of people who have at least 2 years of post-high-school education are, on average, more than $4,000 higher than the earnings of people who graduate from high school. We know these things, and we still have a lot to do.

We know that we cannot restore order and harmony to our cities until we can free our young people of the scourge of crime and the fear of violence. When 160,000 young people stay home from school every day because they are afraid they are going to be shot or cut up or beat up, when even in cities where the crime rate is going down, often the death rate among young people from gunshot wounds is going up, we know that. And we know, as those fine medical professionals that the Mayor and Chairman Rostenkowski and I met with just a few moments ago told us—and they are here in the crowd today with the law enforcement officers and the community leaders—that unless we do something to reclaim our young people and to free them of the scourge of crime and violence, that the explosion in costs of our health care system will continue to drive up the cost of all Americans' health care and make it more and more difficult for people here in the city of Chicago and other places around the country even to keep their trauma units open because of the exploding costs of health care.

And so I say to you, my fellow Americans, we are moving this country in the right direction. You can see it from the passage of the economic program and the results of it. You can see it from the passage of NAFTA and the opening of trade. You can see it from our

making high-tech goods available for international trade. You can see it from the passage of the Brady bill, which becomes law today. Today. You can see it in these actions. We are moving in the right direction. I also want to just announce in connection with that, you know, what the Brady bill does is to make nationwide the requirement of a 5-day waiting period during which time a background check will be done. We now know from actual studies that this will save thousands of lives a year.

Today the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in Washington is also taking an assault weapon called the "street sweeper" off the open market. This weapon was developed for crowd control in South Africa, not for hunting or sporting purposes. Several years ago we banned its import, but we allowed it to be made in this country. Today the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is reclassifying the "street sweeper" and another assault weapon as destructive devices, increasing the taxes on manufacturers and dealers, and requiring extraordinary measures before those weapons can be sold. We will make it a safer America if we keep doing these things.

But as we begin a new week of work in the Congress, even though we are pleased by those measures and others that I haven't mentioned, the family and medical leave law, the motor voter bill, which makes it easier for young people to vote, a lot of other good things which were done last year to rebuild a sense of common purpose and community in our country. We know we have a lot still to do. And there are four major pieces of legislation in the Congress today I want to mention to you, because each of them, in a different way, affects you.

The first two which are being considered right now are the crime bill and the education bill. The crime bill will put 100,000 more police officers on the street to help make the mayor's community-policing initiative work, so that people will know their neighbors, know the kids. Police officers will walk the streets, and they won't just catch criminals, they'll work to keep crime from happening in the first place. We know this brings crime down. It is already beginning to work. In Chicago it will work dramatically if we can give the men and women who are working on our streets the support they need. The crime bill will do that—100,000 more police officers on the street—and we need to pass it as soon as possible.

The crime bill will do some other things. It will ban assault weapons, 28 different kinds, if it passes in the form it passed the Senate. It will have a very clearly worded "three strikes and you're out" provision, which basically says if you commit three violent crimes which are seriously damaging to people, you are not eligible for parole anymore. A small percentage of the people commit a high percentage of the crime, and it will give many, many more young people and people who are already incarcerated, who have a chance to put their lives right, something to say "yes" to. There is more in there for drug treatment; there is more in there for community recreational activities; there is more in there for boot camps for first-time nonviolent offenders.

We need to recognize that a lot of the kids that are getting in trouble have grown up in neighborhoods where there is no longer a strong sense of community, where their own families are not able to support them, and where there is not very much work. And when you have neighborhoods in which you lose family, community, and work, you're in a world of hurt. And we have to give those kids something to say "yes" to, and that is also something we're trying to do in the crime bill.

The second legislation now pending in the Congress that is important to all of you, particularly the students here, for your future, are the education bills. Our Goals 2000 bill, which will help mostly our elementary and secondary students because it establishes world-class standards for our schools, encourages grassroots reforms and changes to meet those standards, and gives the support we need to State and to local school districts to do that, including all kinds of experimentation that the Federal Government has never before clearly embraced.

The second bill is called the school-to-work bill, which attempts to create more students like you. It recognizes that the United States is the only major country that does not have a system for taking all the high school graduates who aren't going on to 4-year colleges and at least getting them 2 years of further training. It recognizes that there's an artificial distinction between what is vocational and practical on the one hand and what is academic on the other hand. The average 18-year-old will change work eight times in a lifetime. There is no clear dividing line between learning and work, between the academic and the practical; they are one

and the same. And we have to set up a system so that all high school graduates are given the chance to get further education, even as they work, so that eventually all Americans who need it will be flooding into institutions like this, not just once but as many as three and four and five times in a lifetime, so they will always be employable, always eligible to get better and better and better jobs.

And finally, on the education package, we have to change the unemployment system. I don't know how many people are here who have ever been on unemployment, but employers pay a tax, an unemployment tax, and then when you're on unemployment, you get a check that comes out of the fund where the tax receipts go. And the check is always for less than you were making and hopefully enough for you to just squeak by on. That used to be a system that worked when people were temporarily unemployed and then brought back to their old job. That's what unemployment used to be. But today unemployment is very different. Today unemployment normally means that job is gone forever and you have to go find another job. So we need to scrap the unemployment system and create a reemployment system so that from day one when somebody is unemployed, they can immediately begin, while they're drawing that unemployment check, to undergo retraining, to develop new skills, to look for new jobs, and not wait and not delay.

The next two great challenges we hope to embrace this year are welfare reform and health care reform. Let me say a word about welfare reform. I am sure I have spent more time with people on welfare than anybody who's ever been the President of the United States. I am sure of that, because when I was Governor I made it my business to find out as much as I could about the welfare system. Why do people stay on welfare generation after generation? Why do they do it? I'll tell you one thing: For the overwhelming majority, it's not because they like welfare very much. The people who hate this system the worst are the people who are trapped in it. Why do people stay on welfare? Is it because the checks are generous? No, it's because overwhelmingly the people on welfare are younger women with little children and little education and little employability. And if they take a job, it's a low-wage job. They lose Medicaid for their kids. They have to figure out how to pay for the child care, so it becomes an economic loser.

What we have to do is to end welfare as we know it, to make it a second chance not a way of life, to give people education and training and support for their kids and medical coverage and then say, after 2 years of this, there will be a job there, and you must take it. You must go to work, but there will be a job there.

Finally, and most importantly, let me tell you that none of the long-term problems of this country can be adequately addressed until we have the courage to reform our health care system. We are the only advanced nation in the world spending 14.5 percent of our income, every dollar, on health care. No other country spends more than 10, that's Canada. Japan and Germany, our major competitors for the future, spend just under 9 cents of every dollar on health care. And yet all of these other countries provide health care to everyone. And yet every year, of our 255 million Americans—every year at some point during the year, 58 million Americans have no health insurance. At any given time, 37 to 39 million will have no health insurance. Small businesses and self-employed people pay 35 to 40 percent more for their health insurance coverage and have less coverage than those of us who work for Government or who are in bigger businesses.

The cost of health care has gone up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. Most Americans have lifetime limits on their health insurance policies, so if anybody in their family really gets sick, they can run out of the limit and not have any insurance at all. An enormous number of Americans, over 80 million, have someone in their family who has what is called a preexisting condition. They've been sick before, which means that either they can't get insurance or their premiums are higher than they ought to be or they're stuck in their job they're in because if they ever try to change jobs, their new employer won't insure them. All this is because—not because we have bad health care providers, we have the best doctors, nurses, health care facilities in the world, it is because of the way we finance health care. It is wrong and we ought to change it.

These trauma units are in hospitals that have to take care of a lot of other people. They have to recover the costs of all these people coming in with gunshot wounds and other wounds into the trauma unit and pass the cost

on to somebody else. And if they can't do it, they run the risk of going broke. This is not a good system. It is the financing that is messed up. It is the unfairness of it. It is the fact that as older people stay in the work force, their insurance premiums get higher, even though older people are the fastest growing group of Americans. It isn't fair for them, just because of their age, to have to pay higher insurance premiums. This system does not work. We have to have the courage to change it. If we don't, let me tell you what's going to happen. By the end of the decade, we'll be spending 19 or 20 percent of our income on health care. None of our competitors will be over 12. How are we going to compete with them? If we don't, by the end of the decade all the new money you pay in taxes will go to health care, and it will go to pay more for the same health care.

This budget I have presented, I've heard all—people have talked for years and years and years about cutting the deficit and cutting spending. Let me tell you something. The budget I have given to Congress cuts defense and cuts discretionary domestic spending, that is, non-Social Security, non-health care payments. We cut that by billions of dollars, not adjusted for inflation, I mean real money for the first time since 1969.

So I don't want to hear people talk to me about cutting spending. But you know what's going up: health care costs, in this budget, at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And it's more money for the same health care. If you don't fix the health care system by the end of the decade, when you come to the Federal Government and you say, "We need another expressway in Chicago, like Congressman Rostenkowski used to get us money for," we'll say, "I'm sorry, there's no money for the expressway. We're spending it all on health care." You'll come and say, "We need money for another environmental technology program, like Congressman Rostenkowski used to get us money for," and we'll say, "Oh, I'm sorry, there's no money for this. It's all going to the same health care."

I'm telling you, we're going to choke this budget off if we don't do something about health care. It is complicated. People have different ideas. If this were easy, it would have been done years ago. For 60 years the National Government has tried to come to grips with the fact that we do not provide health care coverage to all Americans. But I'm telling you something, my fellow Americans, if you want me to be able to be an effective President so that we can compete in the global economy, so that we can have enough tax money to invest in education and training and new technologies, so that we can bring this deficit down, and so that we can deal with the health care problems of the country, we have got to address this problem, and we must do it now.

Just as I said before, just as it was true that last year, if it hadn't been for the Ways and Means Committee and the leadership of the chairman, there would have been no economic plan and no North American Free Trade Agreement. Remember this: Welfare reform and health care have to come through the Ways and Means Committee and have to go through the kind of terrible rhetorical divide you have been seeing filling your airways with all kinds of misinformation, trying to scare people off of dealing with health care. If we're going to cool down our rhetoric and stiffen our spines and open our minds and heart, we have got to have leadership in the Congress from people who are willing to take the tough stands, make the tough decisions, and make the right kind of future. This whole business is about getting people together and getting things done.

Five years, 10 years, 20 years from now, do you realize that 90 percent of what we are so obsessed with in the moment, no one will ever be able to remember? What this is about is getting people together and getting things done. And this is a city that understands that. That's the kind of mayor you have. That's what this community college is all about, getting things done. And if you want me to get things done, you have to say to the Members of Congress, "act." The one person you don't have to say it to is Dan Rostenkowski. It's in his bones, and he will do it, too. Thank you.

Let me just say one thing in closing. Sometimes I think Chicago works better than some other cities because you are instinctively, I think, maybe better organized. You understand community roots and deep ties and binds. I look around here and I see these health care professionals, I see these fine police officers in their uniforms. You know, there are a lot of things we have to face in this country that the President and the Congress can't fix alone. Teachers still teach kids in classrooms a long way from Washington. Police officers walk beats on streets a long way from Washington. There is nothing

I can do except to try to help you have the opportunity, those of you who are students here, to have a better education and the opportunity to have the jobs if you get the education. You still have to seize it.

So the last thing I wish to say to you is, if we are going to meet our obligations to the future, every one of us has got to ask ourselves, what do we have to do as citizens to keep these kids alive, to give them a better future, to make sure that the education is there, to invest in the areas that we have run off and left, to build a better future? We have serious obligations. We are coming to the end of a century; we are coming to the end of a millennium; we are going into a whole new era in world history. And we, we have to meet our obligations if we're going to keep the American dream alive in that era. I'm going to do my best, and I hope you will too.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:16 a.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago and Raymond Le Fevour, president of the college.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at Hillcrest High School in Country Club Hills, Illinois

February 28, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. It's wonderful to be here. I thank you for your warm reception, and I do mean warm reception. I'm sorry it's so warm, but they had to put the lights up so that the cameras will put you all on the news tonight. So see, it's not so bad now, is it; what do you think about that? [*Laughter*]

I want to thank my good friend Congressman Mel Reynolds for arranging for me to come here and to be with you today and for the leadership that he is already displaying in his career in Congress. He is a great credit to all of you here, and I think you would be very proud of the work that he does in Washington. I want to thank your principal, Gwendolyn Lee, for inviting me here and for the comments she made. She told me that her mother made dinner for Martin Luther King, when she was 11 years old. And she said her mother sent me a plate that he had dinner off of, so she sent me into a little room out here to have a snack off the same plate. So you see, even when you grow up you've got to try to do what your mama wants. [*Laughter*] I've spent most of my life doing that myself.

I want to thank Starr Nelson for being here with us. I thought she was very well-spoken. We knew exactly what she had to say, and she was brief. That makes you very popular if you're a speaker. [*Laughter*] Also I want to say I've heard good things about your music program here, so I hope before I leave I get to hear the band play. You guys have got to play a little for me. I also want to thank anybody in this whole student body who was responsible for putting together that statement up there, that letter for me. If every one of you believes that and lives by it, then I don't need to be here, I need to be somewhere else today. It's a very impressive statement and a real credit to your school.

I came here today, as I think all of you know, to talk about the problem of crime and violence in our land and especially as it affects our young people. As the Congress comes back to work this week, it will be considering some very important education bills and some very important crime legislation. We know as a practical matter that we can never really be what we ought to be as a people until we are not only free of the scourge of violent crime but free of the fear of it. For the very fear of crime keeps 160,000 young people just like you home from school every day. Every day that's how many people we estimate don't go to school because they're afraid that if they do go, either at school or going to school or coming from school, they'll be shot or knifed or beat up or hurt in some way.

I know that you understand that because last November two teens were shot and wounded within a week right outside your school. This kind of thing is happening all across the country,

and we have got to do what we can to stop it—you and I together.

The number of teens murdered by guns has doubled just since 1985. You think of that. We've been a country for over 200 years, and the number of our teenagers murdered by guns has doubled in less than 10 years. One in 20 high school students carries a gun to school each day somewhere in America. I hope not here. But it happens. Some do it for protection. Some do it for the wrong reasons.

More and more of our young people find themselves caught up in a cycle of violence. I just left the Wright Community College here in Chicago where I met a woman whose 22-year-old son was murdered by his best friend in just a fight over nothing; over nothing they were fighting. And she said when the young man was arraigned in court he said he missed his friend every day. I had another medical professional tell me that she looked into the face of a woman who had just lost her husband because his younger brother went in another room and got a gun and shot him down because they were fighting over which channel they were going to watch on television. And the guy had two little children—people dying over nothing.

I was in California a few months ago, and I did a town meeting—I'm going to that in a minute here, get rid of this microphone and just let you ask me questions—and I was in Sacramento, California, but we were hooked into three or four other towns and people all over the State could ask me questions. And this young man stood up and told a story of how he and his brother didn't want to be in a gang, didn't want to have any guns, didn't want to cause any trouble. And their school was unsafe, so they went to another school they thought was safer. And while they were standing in line to register at this safer school, some half-crazy person came into school and shot his brother standing right there in front of him in the line.

These things are happening all over the country. Today, the Brady bill becomes law. It's a bill that will save some lives. It's a bill that will require that no place in America can anybody buy a gun until they've been checked for criminal background or mental health history. And we know that it will keep thousands and thousands of people from getting guns who would otherwise get them, commit crimes, and maybe even kill with them.

We have done our best to deal with the problems, the special problems of assault weapons. We have a lot of evidence now that more and more people are hurt more grievously by guns when semiautomatics or assault weapons are involved because they're likely to have more bullets in their body. Today we banned an assault weapon called the "street sweeper" that was developed for crowd control in South Africa. To enforce apartheid in South Africa, to repress blacks in South Africa, that's what this gun was developed for—now not used anywhere, but manufactured in America so that people can get it and repress each other with it—no sporting purpose, no hunting purpose in this country.

But we have more to do. Congress is also considering, as I said, the crime bill. Let me tell you a little bit about what it does, and then I'll open the floor and you can tell me what else you think we can do. The crime bill now before Congress would permit us to train and hire, working with cities, another 100,000 police officers to work not just to catch criminals but to walk the streets, to know the neighborhoods, to go into the schools, to meet and become friends and neighbors with the young people in the schools. Last month, as Mayor Welch reminded me, Country Club Hills received a grant for three new police officers from our Justice Department to do this kind of thing. We have seen evidence all across America, even in tough neighborhoods and big cities, that if there are enough police that are really walking the streets, knowing the families, knowing the young people, working with them, that a crime rate can go down by just creating an environment in which people don't commit crimes and feel that there is somebody secure and supportive there.

So that's the first thing that this bill does. The second thing the bill does is to ban about 28 kinds of assault weapons. The third thing it does is to have a safe-schools provision which provides money to help provide security measures in schools but also to try to help young people resolve their differences in different ways. We forget—at least I say, "we," not you but me, those of us who are older, who grew up in a different time, and who stayed busy all day doing other things—we forget that there are a lot of people who see people resolve their differences hours and hours and hours a day on television programs where the differences are always resolved with a fight or a shooting, and

where there may not be someone else saying there's another way to do this. And so we're doing our best through this crime bill to give the schools and the communities of our country the means to bring good gifted people in to work with young people about how to resolve their differences, how to deal with anger, how to deal with frustration.

Let me tell you something: We all feel anger. We all feel frustration. We all feel like we're being thwarted. There are always things that happen to all of us that we wish wouldn't happen and where we want to double up our fist or pick up a stick or something. But we learn not to do that. You have to learn not to do that in a society where you're really going to be civilized and recognize one another's rights. That's what we're struggling for in Bosnia today. That's what we hope for the people of all those countries in Africa which are embroiled in civil wars. And that's what we have to hope for our own people, that we can decide that we can do that. And in the end, that's what the people of the troubled Middle East are going to have to decide: if they can resolve their differences without killing each other.

So this is a big deal. And this is what is in the crime bill. The crime bill has tougher punishment. It recognizes that most of the really serious crimes are committed by a small number of people, so if you commit three serious violent crimes that hurt people, sequentially, you won't be eligible for parole anymore. But most people who are in prison are going to get out. And most people can be helped before they commit crimes. So we try to find ways to deal with all these other issues.

I can't help saying one thing about drugs that I think is important, and that is that we see some evidence now that drug use, after going down among young people for several years, may now be on the rise again. And I just have to tell you that one of the things that I learn every day as President is to be a little humble about what I can do. That is, I get up every day and I try to do what I can to make the future better for you. My job really is about guaranteeing the future for America, preparing America for the 21st century, trying to keep the American dream alive for you. I've lived most of my life, and I hope more than I can say that none of you have lived most of your lives. I hope the vast majority of your life is still out there ahead of you. But I know that there is a limit to what even the President can do. The President can't keep anybody off drugs. The President can't keep anybody from getting in trouble with the law. The President can't keep anybody from resorting to violence. These are decisions you have to make.

And so I came here to this school today on the first day the Brady bill is effective—a bill for which people fought for 7 years to give you a better chance to be free of violence—to tell you that we're going to keep on fighting against violence. We're going to fight for more police. We're going to fight to have them be friends of the community. We're going to fight for tougher penalties, but we're going to fight for better chances, for young people to have things to say "yes" to.

But in the end, what matters more than all of that is whether you believe what's up there on that wall. And if I do my part and the Congressman does his, and the teachers and the administrators do theirs, and all these parents and others who are here today do theirs, in the end what still counts is whether you believe what's on that wall. But if we, your parents and your grandparents, will assume our responsibility to deal with these tough problems now, and you will believe what's on that wall, then I believe that you will grow up in the most exciting time this country has ever known. And if we don't, if we don't do our part and you don't do yours, then what you saw here when those people were shot outside this school a few months ago is the beginning of just how bad it can be. The choice is yours. The choice is ours. I'm going to make my choice for your future. And that's the choice I want you to make, too. Thank you very much.

Now, where are the microphones out here? One, two, three. Okay wave them. Just make sure everybody can see. One, two, three. So if you have a question or a comment, get it to the microphone. Tell us your name and what class you're in.

Health Care Reform

Q. I'm a sophomore here at Hillcrest High School. I was just wondering, if I were a graduating senior who planned to work full-time next year, what should I expect to pay in general medical expenses under your health care reform program?

The President. Good question. Good question. You should expect to pay, again, depending on

how much you make, you should expect to pay about 2 percent of your payroll out of your pocket if you work for someone else. And your employer would pay somewhere between just under 4 percent and just under 8 percent of your payroll, depending on how big your workplace is and what the average payroll of the people working there is.

Now, having said that, let me get in a little plug. I just had some statistics given to me that I'll give back to you that relate not so much to health care but to your decision to go to work after you get out of high school. In 1992, the unemployment rate among high school dropouts nationwide was over 11 percent, and that included people 40 and 50 years old. For younger people it was much, much higher. Okay? The unemployment rate for high school graduates was 7.2 percent. The unemployment rate for people that had had at least 2 years of a community college or further training was 5.2 percent. And the unemployment rate for college graduates was 3.5 percent. In 1992, the average high school graduate made $4,000 a year more than the average high school dropout; and the average person who had a high school diploma and at least 2 years of further training made another $4,000 more.

So my answer is, if you go to work when you get out of high school, enroll in a community college at night or something else and get further education and training so you can get your income up. Then you won't mind paying for health care. [*Laughter*]

And the good news is that right now, under the system we have now, you might or might not get health care, it just depends on the accident of whether your employer provides it. Under our plan, everybody will get it for the first time in the history of the country, and no one will lose it, even if somebody in their family has been sick. That's the biggest problem now: almost everybody in America is at risk of losing their health insurance if something happens to somebody in their family.

Law Enforcement Careers

Q. I'm a junior. And I'd like to know if I was interested in becoming a CIA or FBI or national security agent, what would I have to do as far as education? What would I still have to do to get there?

The President. That's a good question. I think one of my Secret Service agents should talk to you when this is over. You come down here when this is over. I'll introduce you to one of the Secret Service agents and they can tell you about it, okay? What do you think? [*Applause*]

But wait, wait, I'm going to answer the question. The answer to your first question is, though, as an absolute minimum you have to go to college and finish a 4-year college degree. And a lot of the—particularly in the FBI, depending on what they're doing, have further education over that. And a lot of people in Secret Service were once in other kinds of law enforcement. But it's not necessary for you to have a particular degree in law enforcement. A lot of them have done different things. But what I would suggest you do is to literally talk to one of my agents after it's over. But what I suggest you do: go to college, get the best education you can, do well, and keep up with what the requirements for joining these various Federal law enforcement agencies are, so that as you move toward the end of your college career, you can do what it takes to qualify. And if you have to do something else for a year or two before you get in, then that's all right as well.

But it's important that you keep up because, for example, suppose you decide to go do some other kind of law enforcement work first—under our national service proposal, you might be able to start when you're a junior in college working with law enforcement in the summertime, so you get a little leg up on that.

Funding for Education

Q. I'm a junior here at Hillcrest High School. And I would like to know, Mr. President, why is the Government cutting the cost for a college education?

The President. Wait a minute. Why are we—why aren't we cutting the cost, or why are we——

Q. Why are you cutting the funding?

The President. Well, we're not. You may be doing it in Illinois, and at the national level—I don't know that you are. I'm not accusing anybody or anything. [*Laughter*] But let me tell you this: For several years student aid levels were frozen at the national level, so that, in effect, they were being cut because inflation meant that the money didn't go as far anymore.

This year I have asked the Congress to put more money into the Pell Grant program, which is the college scholarship program for low-in-

come kids that comes out of the Federal Government and also—did you give up on your question? And also, also, we have reorganized the college loan program. This is very important. I want you all to listen to this. We have reorganized the college loan program so that now you can borrow money at lower interest rates, and you can pay it back, no matter how much you borrow, as a percentage of what you earn after you go to work. Now, a lot of people quit, drop out of school because they worry about the cost of it and they worry about the burden of paying the loans back. So now we are giving everybody who wants it an option. You can pay your loan back basically on a regular loan repayment schedule. But suppose you want to do something that doesn't pay a lot of money, at least when you begin. Suppose you want to become a schoolteacher in the beginning, and you know you're not going to be a millionaire. You could pay your loans back, but you can't pay a whole lot at once. Under our new proposal, you can borrow the money at lower interest rates and you can pay it back over a longer period of time, a smaller amount every year based on your income.

So there will never be a reason not to go to college. In addition to that, this year 20,000 young Americans, and 3 years from now, 100,000 young Americans will be able to earn several thousand dollars in scholarship money by participating in our community service program. So I am trying to make it easier for people to go to college, because it makes a huge difference, as I just quoted to you the numbers, in your employability and your income.

Go ahead.

Public Housing

Q. Hi, I'm a senior here at Hillcrest. My question is, besides giving money to the city of Country Club Hills, in the future do you foresee giving money to the less fortunate communities in the city of Chicago, such as Cabrini Green, so that they as well can fight against drugs and gang activities?

The President. Yes——

Q. And if so, how do you go about completing——

The President. Yes——

Q. ——so that we as people can work together instead of working against one another?

The President. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] First of all, in this last round of grants for law enforcement, where this small community got $238,000, Chicago got $4 million to hire more police officers.

But let me just tell you, there are two or three things that are quite important here. If our crime bill passes, then a lot more money will come to Chicago not only for police officers but also for drug treatment and for alternative activities for young people. And in addition to that, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros, which has jurisdiction over the big public housing projects, has a major new initiative to try to work with the homeless, especially homeless young people, to try to deal with that on a more permanent basis and to try to improve security and reduce drugs in public housing projects.

You know, you've had some remarkable success in Chicago, actually, cleaning out public housing projects and making them safe and providing jobs for people who live in the projects to work to help to keep them drug free and free of violence. And the truth is that we've not provided enough money nationwide to do in every housing project in the country what has been done in some housing projects here in Chicago.

So in this new round of our budget, through those two areas, through the crime bill, and through the Housing and Urban Development Department, we're going to try to give the people of Chicago and in cities like that all across America the tools they need to do the job. And that was a good question, great question.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, before I begin with the question, I'd like to thank you for sending my brother, who was in Somalia, home. I'd like to thank you from my family.

The President. Well, I'd like to thank him, and through him, through your family, for the work they did over there. We can't stay forever and solve all the problems of Somalia. We can't run the country. But what we did do was to save hundreds of thousands of people from starvation, to organize life again, and to give them at least a chance to work out their own problems. If they don't do it, they'll have to take responsibility for it. But at least we've given that country a chance to survive. And your brother can be proud of the service he rendered, and I appreciate that.

Education

Q. Welcome, President Clinton. I would like to know—I'm a senior—I would like to know how do you plan to improve the public educational system so that it's equal throughout Illinois and throughout the States?

The President. I'm going to tell you what I'm going to do and then I'm going to be honest with you on the front-end and tell you it's not enough, okay? Because let me say, most public education in America, over 90 percent of it, is funded from State taxes and local taxes, so that the President and the Congress provide a very small percentage of the money that comes to this school district. That's the way it's always been.

I don't know what the numbers are for Illinois, but if I were guessing, I would guess that probably 55 percent of the total cost of public education probably is paid for at the local level. Is that about right? Most of it comes from the State? No, most of it—well anyway, take my word for it—over 90 percent comes from the State and the local level in some relationship.

Some States pay a big percentage of it. Hawaii, for example, pays almost all; there's almost no local taxes in Hawaii. Some States pay almost nothing, and it's all local property taxes. New Hampshire is the most extreme. All the other States—Illinois, New York, everybody else is somewhere in between.

Whenever you use local property taxes to fund schools there will be unequal funding. Why? Because some school districts have more valuable property than others, right? So at any given tax rate—I mean, if you've got—you're going to have that. That is the fundamental problem with inequality in America.

Now, at the national level, we have certain programs designed to help low-income districts and low-income kids or kids from disadvantaged backgrounds, like special education programs or Chapter I programs. What we are doing with our money this year is to put some more money into programs directed toward low-income children, like the Head Start program, and to change—I'm asking the Congress to change the way we give the money out to give more money to the poorer school districts so that we can equalize the funding.

But the reason I tell you it's not enough is, if you put up 90 cents and I put up a dime, I can redistribute my dime, but it still may not overcome your 90 cents. You see what I mean? So what that means is that, in Illinois, if you think it's a real problem and you think a lot of your schools are not being properly funded and it's unequal, you have to solve a lot of this problem at the State level with the State legislature in Springfield. We'll do as much as we can, and I have asked the Congress to do more, but there's a limit to how much we can do.

Spending Priorities

Q. Hello. I'm a sophomore, and I was wondering, how do you justify millions of dollars being spent on space exploration when there are millions of homeless people in our country?

The President. Well for me, it's not a hard justification, but it's a very good question. The way I justify it is this: I think it's important for us to continue our lead in space because I think it helps our national security to be out there first and to always be in a position to shape developments in space, because space has given us a way to cooperate after the cold war with the Russians, the Japanese, the Europeans, and the Canadians. We're all working on the space station together because it creates new high-tech jobs for scientists and for engineers, and they create a lot of wealth for the rest of us, and because in space technology, a lot of things are found out that may have a lot of benefits for us right here on Earth.

I'll just give you just one example. I was down at the headquarters for the American space program in Houston, Texas, the other day, and I saw a motor that was used to pump water in space where it's gravity-free, so the motor obviously has to be very powerful to pump water and make it move where there's no gravity. And they discovered that the exact same technology could be used as a heart pump here on Earth to keep people alive, and it's lighter and better and cheaper to produce than what had been the case here. I also saw cancer cultures growing in space in gravity-free environments where the cells will grow differently, in ways that will enable all kinds of medical research to be done that may keep a lot of us alive when they get cancer here on Earth.

So I think a nation like ours has to take some of its money and invest it in the future, even though you know it may not work out, even though you can't justify every penny based on immediate benefit. It's like investing in edu-

cation, in a way. If I invest in your education, I think you're going to come out better. It may be 7 or 8 years down the road, and yet every dollar I spend on education is a dollar we don't spend on the homeless or feeding the hungry or some other problem.

So, I don't believe we're spending enough on the homeless, by the way. And under my budget we're going to spend more. So I can't defend that. But I think that if you were in my position, every one of you, one of the hardest decisions you would have to make is how much money am I going to spend taking care of problems today, and how much money am I going to spend investing in the future so we'll have fewer problems, more jobs, higher incomes, better opportunities? It's one of the hardest decisions I have to make. And like I said, I—by the way, a lot of people in Congress don't agree with me, a lot of people in Congress every year vote to cut the space program and put more money into problems just like you said. And if you were there, you might make the same decision. But as President, I always have to keep one eye on the future and one eye on the present and try to balance the needs in a proper way.

That was a great question. Give him a hand. It was a good question. [*Applause*]

Q. Hello. I'm a junior at Hillcrest High School. Mr. President, I would like to know why is it that the U.S. gives and helps other countries while we have our own people starving, nowhere to live, crime, no jobs, people on welfare, and gangs? Why don't we start helping our own country and not others? And how is it that you're going to change this around, where we'll become a more industrial country and not where Taiwan and Korea and Japan are beating us in industrial ways?

The President. Good question. Good question. First of all—that's a real good question, don't you think? Good question. First of all, that's exactly what I ran for President to do, to get us to take care of our problems at home first, because my belief is, if you're not strong at home you can't be strong abroad. So I believe that, okay?

Now, I believe that. And as a result of that, in the last year, we have changed the economic course of the country, we're bringing our deficit down; we're seeing more investment and more jobs coming into this economy; we're opening up opportunities to sell American products around the world so we can compete with these other countries.

But you need to know that last year, our economy grew more rapidly than the economy of Europe and the economy of Japan, and that we are starting to come back. We are creating more jobs than they are, and we are beginning to really compete again. And that is my first and most important job and the overwhelming priority that we have.

Now, let me say also, though, we spend a smaller percentage of our income on foreign aid than the Europeans or the Japanese do, the Japanese give more money in foreign aid than we do now. The foreign aid is not a big problem; indeed, even though we're the strongest country in the world, we haven't even—I haven't been able to persuade Congress yet to appropriate the money we owe just to pay our past-due bills to the United Nations.

And we have to spend—it's like the question this young man asked me about the space program. It's hard to—there is no easy dividing line here between at home and abroad in the sense that now a big percentage of our income depends on our ability to sell products and services overseas because we live in a global economy.

The next time you go in a store, just pay attention to everything you buy. The next time you buy some clothes, for example, just see where all it's made, and you just see what a global economy we live in.

So if the United States wants to be able to lead the world and preserve the peace and avoid a war and not have a lot of people like the lady with the microphone's brother going all over the world getting—to fight major wars, we have to maintain some leadership in the world. And that requires us to invest some money. And I think we should invest some money. But the overwhelming priority should be on the problems here at home, and that's what I'm trying to do. But we can't run away from our responsibilities abroad. We just have to put the folks at home first.

And I totally agree with you that we have not invested enough in education and jobs and curing the problems of the homeless, especially in the distressed inner city areas. If we had the same policy on getting foreign investment into inner city America that we have in getting American investment overseas, we could cure

a lot of these problems. And that's what I'm trying to do as President.

I'll take—we've got to quit. They're trying to get me to quit. Two more.

Q. I'm a junior here at Hillcrest. I was informed that the money that was granted to us was to use for gun control. Now, if we could use that money for education, to educate the people to give them a choice, not to go into gun control, why can't we do that? Not to go to gangs or to drugs.

The President. You mean the money that you got—that the city got to hire the police officers?

Q. Yes, the money that was granted to the city——

The President. You used that to hire police officers, didn't you? That money was used just to hire police officers. But the money in the crime bill—you know, I talked about the bill that's now pending in the Congress—there will be money in that bill that can be used in this community and in this school to do just what you said. In other words, I don't want to mix apples and oranges. I think it's important to hire more law enforcement officers, too, because I know if they're in the community and tied to the folks in the community, they can reduce crime. But I agree that there also has to be money spent to do the things you said.

If this crime bill passes in anything like the form we're talking about, there will be money for that purpose. And I perfectly agree with you.

That was a good question. Give her a hand. [*Applause*]

Homelessness

Q. I'm a junior here at Hillcrest. I was wondering, as we see, in the United States there's an increasing amount of homelessness. And I was wondering why have there been cuts in welfare?

The President. Well, to the best of my knowledge, unless you've done something here in Illinois I don't know about, I don't know that there have been cuts in welfare unless there was a State program that got cut. At the national level, there's been no cut in welfare, but the welfare check has not kept up with inflation. However, that's not the primary problem with homelessness. One of the things that we find is, increasingly, you've got families that are out of work that are homeless as well as people who have some terrible problem in their lives. And what I think we've got to do is not only improve the welfare system, which I want to do—that is, I want to spend—people on welfare I believe should be required to work but only after they've had education and training and until their children are supported with health care. Then I think you can require them to work.

So I think that is very important. But the homeless problem is a different one. One of the things that I'm most proud of about my Government now is that the person in charge of this, Henry Cisneros, who used to be the mayor of San Antonio, has really spent an enormous amount of time trying to figure out all the different reasons people are homeless and why getting homeless people off the street involves a lot more than just building shelters where people come in and spend a night or two, and then they're homeless again.

And what we're trying to do this year is take an approach to the homeless problem which will really give us a chance to go in and, family by family, person by person, examine why are these people homeless, what would it take to put them in control of their own lives again, and what do we have to do to do it. And I believe that within a year or so, you will be able to see some real results from our efforts with the homeless.

I keep telling our Cabinet, if we could just do one thing, just one thing that would make America feel better about itself, it would be to get these folks off the street and into a constructive life. People in our country want that, I think. I think all kinds of Americans want that. I think it breaks America's heart to see all these folks trapped in a life that they can't really seriously want to live forever. And we're going to do our best to do better. I'm glad all of you care so much about that. Thank you.

They say we've got to go. I'm on my way to Pittsburgh. It's an interesting story. You talked about the rest of the world—I'm supposed to meet with the Prime Minister of Britain tonight, Great Britain. His grandfather worked in a steel mill in Pittsburgh, and his father was a circus performer in the United States; just shows you what a small world it is.

I really have loved being here. I wish I could stay all day and answer your questions. You asked great questions, those of you who asked questions, and I wish we could have taken some more.

Please remember what I said. If you have other questions like this, you ought to bring these concerns to your Congressman. That's what he's here for, to bring them to me in Washington. I feel a lot better about the young people of the country just being here with you and listening to you ask these questions and knowing how much you care. And I will say again, I'll try to do the best I can on the issues we've talked about today. And you do the best you can to stick with what's on the wall. And we're going to do fine.

Thank you. Good luck. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:15 p.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Starr Nelson, senior class vice president, and Mayor Dwight Welch of Country Club Hills. He also referred to a sign addressed to him expressing the students' commitment to make the world a better place.

Remarks Welcoming Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

February 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Senator Wofford, Congressman Coyne, Mayor Murphy, Commissioners Foerster and Flaherty, and my friends. I'm glad to be back in Pittsburgh. I want to thank the band for their wonderful music and the Scouts for your fine salute and your fine work, thank you. And I want you to join me in welcoming Prime Minister John Major back to the United States of America.

It's funny how this trip came about. Last July in Tokyo of all places, John Major and I were sitting around at night talking, and he said, "You know, my grandfather worked in the steel mills in Pittsburgh, and my father lived and worked here a while in the late 1800's before moving back to England." So I thought the next time John Major came to the United States, he ought to see America and come to Pittsburgh.

I want to emphasize to all of you here in the heartland of America how important the relationship between the United States and Great Britain is. We worked together to support reform in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the cold war, in Russia and in all those other former Communist states, to try to give democracy a chance. We worked together for a new world trade agreement to bring down trade barriers and open world markets to the products that American workers make. We worked together to make NATO stronger and more adaptable, to reach out to all those nations in the former Communist world and give them a chance to work with us to unify Europe in peace and democracy, in ways that will make America a safer and more prosperous place for decades to come. We're working together today to respond to the terrible tragedy in Bosnia, to try to bring an end to the killing and to bring peace and to keep that conflict from spreading in ways that could threaten the interests of the United States and Great Britain as well as the conscience of the civilized world.

And we do have a great partnership, as Senator Wofford noted, right here in Pittsburgh between British Air and USAir. It's been a good thing for the people of this town. Tomorrow we'll have a chance to talk about that and talk about some of the other tough issues that we face—the state of reform in Russia. The Prime Minister and I have both been in Moscow in the last couple of months. A struggle over the future of reform in Russia is underway. We have a vital stake in the outcome. We have to continue to encourage democracy, respect for neighbors, and real economic reform in that country. It's in your interest and mine.

We also hope we can continue to press for peace in Bosnia. Britain is the second largest contributor to the United Nations troop effort in Bosnia, and over the last year, I want to say to all of you that the British have saved thousands of innocent civilians' lives there by their presence. We intend to continue working with them until we get a just and fair peace in Bosnia.

We're going to discuss what we want to do with NATO. We're going to discuss the political

courage and the vision shown by Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Reynolds of Ireland in working toward peace in Northern Ireland together. Their historic joint declaration offers new hope for that goal of peace. And as the President of this country, a country full of Americans of British descent and full of Americans of Irish descent, I again urge an end to the use of violence as a means of solving political problems and achieving political aims. It has no place in that effort.

The next time I see John Major after this trip, I'll be visiting Britain in June to commemorate the 50th anniversary of D-day and to affirm for a new generation of Britons and Americans the importance of our enduring partnership. We must continue to build on it, economically, politically, strategically. We have benefited immensely from our ties to Britain, and they have benefited from their ties to us. We are working together in ways that I think will benefit the children in this audience. The agreement on world trade concluded at the end of last year is perhaps the most concrete recent example of what we are trying to do for future generations.

In the months and years ahead, we'll have to continue to work on our issues of common concern. Not very long from now, we're going to have a jobs conference with Great Britain and other European powers in Detroit to discuss the difficulties that the United States and all the powers of Europe and Japan are all having creating new jobs in this difficult global environment and what things we can learn from each other to create more opportunities for all of our people.

Well, now I'm going to introduce the Prime Minister and say, after he speaks, we're going to look around Pittsburgh.

When John Major's grandfather and father were here, this city was the heart of America's industrial might. Today, it's the center of its high technology and economic innovation. It's a city of the future as well as a city with a past. And so in the spirit of renewal that is the story of Pittsburgh today, I ask you to join me in reaffirming the bonds between the American and the British people in welcoming to the microphone the Prime Minister of Great Britain, John Major.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:44 p.m. at the Air Force Reserve base at Pittsburgh International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Tom Murphy of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County Commissioners Tom Foerster and Pete Flaherty.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom in Pittsburgh

February 28, 1994

Northern Ireland

Q. Mr. President, do you think granting a visa to Gerry Adams paid off in terms of progress toward peace in Northern Ireland?

The President. It's too soon to say. I'm supporting, very strongly supporting the initiative that Prime Minister Major and Prime Minister Reynolds have undertaken in the joint declaration. I hope it will; it's too soon to say. I'm pulling for them.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, you obviously saw it differently, or your government did, as far as Adams—[*inaudible*]—this weekend, Sinn Fein has not indicated any willingness to call for an end to the arms struggle. What is your reaction to that, and what is the President's reaction?

Prime Minister Major. Well, we both want the violence to cease. That's what the joint declaration is about. It provides an opportunity for the violence to cease and for Sinn Fein to legitimately enter the constitutional talks. Now, I think that is a sensible way ahead. It's a highway ahead that wasn't there before. It is there now. And I think when you look at the opinion expressed by Irishmen right across the whole island of Ireland, by an overwhelming majority, they believe that that option should be taken. You have to wait and see whether it is.

Thank you.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Q. Do you like that [microphone], Mr. President?

The President. I wish there were a hunting season on these. [*Laughter*]

Prime Minister Major. I'm going to wake up one morning, and there will be one of those things on the pillow. [*Laughter*]

Q. And what will you say?

The President. Whatever it is, it will be known to all of England. I told the press once that there had been this raging debate for 12 years in America over the constitutional right to privacy and what it meant, whether we should keep it and what it should extend to, and all while, the boom mike had been abolishing it with no one noticing. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:05 p.m. in the Tin Angel Restaurant. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Nomination for Deputy United Nations Representative
February 28, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Edward William Gnehm, Jr., a career member of the Senior Foreign Service to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. He would succeed Edward S. Walker, Jr.

"I am confident Mr. Gnehm's extensive foreign affairs background and foreign service experience will provide a valuable contribution to our representation abroad," the President said, adding, "I am delighted to nominate him to the post of Deputy Representative to the United Nations."

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

Nomination for the Agency for International Development
February 28, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Sally Shelton-Colby as the Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research at the Agency for International Development, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency.

"I am pleased to nominate Sally Shelton-Colby to the position," the President said, adding, "Her foreign affairs experience and educational background will be a great asset to the Agency for International Development."

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

Nomination for the Research and Special Programs Administration
February 28, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Dharmendra K. "Dave" Sharma as the Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) at the Department of Transportation.

"Dr. Sharma's broad experience in the areas of science and technology will be a great asset

to the Administration," the President said, adding, "I look forward to his appointment."

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

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom

March 1, 1994

The President. We'd like to just make a couple of brief remarks, and then we'll answer some questions.

First of all, I want to again say how pleased I was at this visit the Prime Minister made. We had a wonderful time yesterday in Pittsburgh, and it turned out to be a pretty good idea that just sort of grew out of a conversation we had last summer in Tokyo. And I'm glad that he came, and I'm glad that we had a chance to go there and to do what was done there.

We've had an opportunity to discuss, as you might imagine, a lot of issues. I might just mention a few. First of all, with regard to Bosnia, we are committed to continuing to work for a resolution of the crisis. We're encouraged by both the ongoing negotiations between the Government, the Bosnian Government, and the Croats and the willingness of the Russians to work with us and others trying to bring the Serbs into a final peace agreement. And so we're quite hopeful about that.

Secondly, I wanted to particularly emphasize the commitment that we share to strengthening and broadening NATO through the Partnership For Peace and to having tangible evidence of that Partnership coming forward this summer.

Thirdly, with regard to Northern Ireland, I want to reaffirm the support of the United States for the joint declaration, for the process it envisions, and for an end to the violence. I wish the Prime Minister and Prime Minister Reynolds well as they seek to carry this out.

And let me just mention a couple of other things. You knew yesterday, I think, that we sent a joint message to Mr. Mandela and Chief Buthelezi, and we are looking forward to their meeting today. We hope it will be successful. And we want to strongly encourage all the parties in South Africa to responsibly participate in the election.

The last thing I'd like to say is we join the United Kingdom in their position with regard to Hong Kong, in supporting Governor Patten's efforts to have a genuine, long-term strategy for economic and political success in Hong Kong. And I have been very admiring of what he's done and what the Prime Minister has done there.

Those are some of the things that we discussed. And I'll now turn it over to Prime Minister Major to make a few remarks, and we'll answer some questions.

Q. Are all your differences wiped out?

The President. Well, let me give the Prime Minister a chance to make some remarks first.

Prime Minister Major. Can I firstly say how enjoyable this visit has been and thank the President for his hospitality and also the people of Pittsburgh. It was a memorable day and a memorable evening yesterday, and I thoroughly enjoyed every moment of it.

I don't want to add a great deal to what the President has had to say, perhaps a word or two about Bosnia, in general, and Sarajevo, in particular.

One of the things we've agreed over the last couple of days is to send a joint civil planning mission to Sarajevo, the cease-fire there holding. That's been a very successful operation. I think it has been universally recognized as such. But the circumstances that exist within Sarajevo are still very serious. The utilities aren't working, the electricity, the water. So we've agreed to send a joint civil planning mission there to have a look at what needs to be done and then to see to what extent we can contribute and can encourage other people to contribute to deal with the civil difficulties that are actually faced there in Sarajevo.

The President mentioned the message we sent yesterday to Nelson Mandela and Chief

Buthelezi. They meet today at Ulundi, and clearly, that's an extremely important meeting. It's our wish that everyone participates in the South African elections. It's a remarkable event, the first multiracial elections across South Africa, and we wish to see everyone take part. We very much hope, as a result of the message and, more relevantly perhaps, the meeting between Mr. Mandela and Chief Buthelezi today, that that will certainly happen.

We spent some time discussing trade matters as well as foreign affairs. I think there are two areas of that that I would just briefly touch upon. We agreed that it would be desirable to see if we could bring forward the start date for implementation of the GATT agreement to the first of January 1995. We'll need to consult with other people to see if that's practicable, but if it is practical, clearly an agreement has been reached and the sooner that agreement can be implemented, the better it will be.

We spent some time also discussing open markets. We both share a wish to support the growing measure of opinion that exists in Japan, for example, for the further opening of Japanese markets. This is a matter of concern to the United States; it's a matter of concern throughout the European Union as well. And we spent some time discussing that particular issue.

There were one or two rather more technical issues we discussed, a replacement of COCOM, that old relic of the cold war. That needs to be replaced. There are official discussions to do that, and we spent some time just looking at that.

Beyond that, I think I'd simply wish to endorse the points that the President made, those about Bosnia and about Russia. I think there's no doubt that we see the problems of Bosnia very much in the same light. Our policy is heading exactly in the same direction, and I think we've had a very useful discussion on that particular issue. I don't think for the moment I wish to add any more.

United Kingdom-U.S. Relations

Q. Can I ask you what in the new world order does the Anglo-American relationship mean to both of you?

Prime Minister Major. Shall I start, or will you?

I think it's a partnership of shared interests and shared instincts. If one looks at problems around the world, overwhelmingly, we are likely to take the same view of those. That has been the case in the past and is the case now. And I think it's those shared instincts and interests that actually underpin the long-term relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States.

The President. I agree with that. I think it's a great mistake to overstate the occasional disagreement and understate the incredible depth and breadth of our shared interests and our shared values. It's still a profoundly important relationship, I think, to both countries and, I also believe, to the future of the world.

Balanced Budget Amendment

Q. Could you tell us a little bit—in this country today, the Senate is beginning to take up the balanced budget amendment—what your view is on that, where you think it's going?

The President. I don't know where it's going, but I hope that it won't be passed because if it is passed, it runs the risk of endangering our economic recovery by requiring excessive tax increases or very damaging cuts in defense or in investments in technology and job training or Medicare and Social Security. If it is disregarded—there's a provision in there to disregard it if 60 percent of both Houses want to do it—it amounts to turning the whole future of America over to 40 percent plus one of each House of the Congress. In an intensely partisan atmosphere, that's a recipe for total paralysis. Also, unlike all these State and local balanced budget amendments, this one makes utterly no distinction between the long-term investment and annual consumption. So for those reasons, I hope it won't be adopted.

Finally, we're proving you can bring the deficit down. The deficit is now going to be about half the percentage of our annual income that it was when I took office if this new budget is adopted. So we're going to keep bringing it down.

I think the administration has credibility on cutting spending. We presented the first cuts in discretionary spending since 1969 in this budget. So I think we've got a record; I think we're on the right track. And I think this remedy, while it's a very serious problem—what's happened to the deficit—this remedy is the wrong one. I hope the Congress will reject it.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia, you've agreed to send some civilians. Does that—[*inaudible*]—that you might prefer to see other civilians help monitor the cease-fire, and are you still adamant you won't send troops in at all at the present?

The President. Well, our position has always been that we would be prepared to help enforce an agreement if we could work out a peace agreement, that in the absence of the peace agreement we would confine our involvement to the support we're giving through NATO in our air power and to, essentially, the technical personnel who are there now and others that might be able to do that kind of work. That is still our position.

But let me say that I think we have a terrific opportunity here to try to build on what happened in the situation involving Sarajevo, to try to keep the Russians involved in a very constructive leadership way, and to try to work on these talks now underway here in Washington between the Bosnian Government and the Croatians, to move to that kind of settlement. If we can get that, then I think all the responsible countries of the world have got to try to help make it work.

A question for the Prime Minister?

Northern Ireland

Q. Could I ask the Prime Minister, then, has the President given you a promise about future conditions for the readmission of Gerry Adams? Will he have to renounce violence to get another visa to get into the United States?

Prime Minister Major. I think everyone has seen what has happened with regard to this. I think the important issue is to look forward and see how we produce a solution to the Northern Ireland problem. I'm not interested in looking back. And I think as one looks forward, one only has to look at the very remarkable expression of opinion that we've seen over the last few days of support for the joint declaration. Now that joint declaration is there. It is now a living fact. It is a series of principles upon which we hope to base a solution to the problems that have bedeviled Northern Ireland for too long. Now, that is the main issue that I want to address, and those are the issues we've been discussing.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, to follow—you're talking about following on the progress that you've made in Bosnia. Did you talk about any steps to end the fighting in other places beyond Sarajevo, perhaps extending the ultimatum to Tuzla or Srebrenica or other areas?

The President. Well, we feel pretty good about where things are in Srebrenica now. We think that the troop exchange will be able to occur between the Canadians and the Dutch, and we're working on Tuzla. We do believe that we should keep working to fulfill the commitment that NATO made at its last meeting in January to try to see what can be done to open the Tuzla airport. But there are ongoing negotiations there now.

Again, we have sought the involvement of the Russians in this regard, and we think that there's a chance that we'll be able to have some success in Tuzla. We've discussed what our options are, and I think you'll see more about that in the days ahead.

Q. Are you concerned about the recent NATO air strikes that resulted in increased bombing of the Tuzla area? I mean, your message is that you're not going to tolerate violation of the no-flight zone, but how do you reinforce that to prevent the increased activity?

The President. Well, right now our authority beyond what's going on in Sarajevo is confined to enforcing the no-fly zone. And we did that. But I want to say again what I said yesterday: It was based on the authority vested through the United Nations last April. It was something done in the course of business to do what we are required to do. It should not be read in any way as a departure of strategy or tactics because of what's going on now generally. And I think it should only serve to make people want to resolve this more quickly, to go on with the negotiations now. That's what I'm hopeful of.

Q. To follow up, if I may, sir, though—if there were indeed other bombing missions and the attacks step up on these other areas outside of Sarajevo, what can NATO do to prevent the spread of this violence?

The President. Well, right now, I'll say again, the authority we had with regard to artillery, that is, on the ground attacks, is the authority to remove artillery from around the Sarajevo area to create the safe zone. All other authority

is related to stopping the war from spreading into the air. And we're talking about what we can do in Tuzla now. That's what you'll see, I hope, unfolding in a very positive way over the next few days.

Prime Minister Major. I have something to add. I think what people have to realize is that what is developing is developing on a twin track. There is the track of seeking a political settlement. And some progress has been made between the Muslims and the Croats here in Washington over the last couple of days. And then of course, there's the second track of what is actually happening on the ground. And I think one saw in Sarajevo a classic illustration of how an agreement can be reached on the ground that leads in due course to the corralling of weapons. So I think both those tracks will continue.

But as far as the no-fly zone is concerned, the incident that occurred yesterday, where I think it was entirely justifiable to shoot down the planes that were intruding in the no-fly zone, could have happened at any stage in the last year. It certainly isn't a departure from accepted policy. At any time in the last 12 months that could have occurred.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 50th news conference began at 9:20 a.m. in the Diplomatic Entrance of the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mangosuthu Buthelezi, leader of the South African Inkatha Freedom Party; Nelson Mandela, president of the African National Congress; and Governor Chris Patten of Hong Kong. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Members of the House Budget Committee

March 1, 1994

The Economy

Q. How do you like the economy, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I'm encouraged by the growth figures and by the fact that all the indicators are that there's no significant increase in inflation. So it's good to have that information.

I think it's plain—if you look at what happened in the fourth quarter of last year, we had the normal increase in consumer spending because of the holidays, and the accumulated impact of low interest rates bringing more and more investment. And so what we've got to try to do is to keep working to bring the deficit down, to keep interest rates down, to make targeted investments with public money where our country needs it the most, and to try to keep this climate down. We have more investments coming in so we've created more jobs. It's very encouraging. It's a good sign.

Northern Ireland

Q. Have you given any second thoughts about having Gerry Adams come to this country since what he has said, since he has made his comments, since——

The President. No, I don't know yet, I don't think we can draw a conclusion yet that it will in the long run be a positive thing for the peace process, but I don't think we can say it's negative, either. I think that we made a judgment call that we ought to try to encourage them to move towards the joint declaration and to try to make peace. I think it was a good judgment call. I think it was well-founded, and I still believe that.

Health Care Reform

Q. Are you beginning to have a sense of where Congress is going now on the health care plan? And do you have any ideas about where some of the major compromises are coming right now?

The President. No, because they're still in the subcommittees. I don't, but I will before long.

Balanced Budget Amendment

Q. Have you got the votes to beat the balanced budget?

The President. I don't know. We've got a record that ought to defeat it. I mean, the problem with the amendment if you read it is, on its terms, if it's carried out, it will require either a large tax increase or big cuts in defense and domestic programs critical to our job growth or both. And if it's ignored, it will—by ignoring it, that is if you say, "Well, we can't do this; we're going to suspend it," then you put the whole future of the country in the hands of the 40 percent plus one vote in both Houses of Congress. And I don't think that's a very good thing.

Under the plan we're now following, if the Congress adopts this budget with its spending limits, we'll have the first 3 years since the Truman Presidency a declining deficit. We're moving in the right direction. I think that's very important. So I hope that the Senate will not adopt it. I know it's politically popular, but I don't think it's good policy.

And I'd like to point out for the point of view of the American people who say, "Well, State and local governments do it," all State and local governments make sharp distinctions between long-term capital investments and current expenditures. And this balanced budget amendment makes absolutely no distinction. So it would be far more severe than State and local balanced budget laws and with a very uncertain economic impact. So I'm hoping the Senate will reject it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:21 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the Super Bowl Champion Dallas Cowboys
March 1, 1994

I'm glad to be here with the people who are negotiating my next year's salary. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, it's a great honor for all of us at the White House to have the Dallas Cowboys back here for a second year in a row. Coach Johnson, your team has a knack for coming to the White House.

I said they were negotiating my next year's salary. I really—until you hired Bernie Kosar, I sort of wanted to be the backup quarterback. [*Laughter*] I'm the right height.

I want to congratulate Troy Aikman and Emmitt Smith and Russell Maryland and Michael Irvin for being selected to the Pro Bowl and for their brilliant play.

I also want to say that I really identify with the season the Cowboys had this year. They lost their first two games; they were even behind in the Super Bowl, but they kept coming back. Now the decade is not even half over, and they've already won two Super Bowls. There's no telling what this team can do. It's young. It's aggressive. It has a good attitude. It has great leadership.

And I have to say, a little bit of parochial pride on behalf of my State, that I'm really proud of the work that Jerry Jones has done with the Cowboys in such a few years and proud of the remarkable achievements this team has already seen. I think that it is just the beginning of what will doubtless be years and years and years of stunning achievement if they can just keep their goals high and keep working for them.

It's a great honor to have them here and I'd like to invite them to say a few words. Who's going first? Jerry?

Let's give them a hand.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:53 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dallas Cowboys coach Jimmy Johnson and owner Jerry Jones.

Message to the Senate on the Chemical Weapons Convention
March 1, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

On November 23, 1993, I transmitted the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (the "Chemical Weapons Convention" or CWC) to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. As stated in the transmittal message, I now submit herewith an Environmental Impact Review (EIR) of the Chemical Weapons Convention for the information of the Senate. This EIR summarizes the documented environmental effects that could result from the entry into force of the CWC for the United States. Considerable study has already been devoted under related Federal programs to examining and describing the environmental impacts of activities that are similar or identical to what the CWC will entail when it enters into force. This EIR is a review of published information and, as such, should not be considered an analysis of data or a verification of published conclusions.

United States ratification of the CWC will result in a national commitment to the CWC requirements that will modify the existing chemical weapons stockpile demilitarization and nonstockpile programs, as well as create additional declaration, destruction, and verification requirements. The CWC ratification and entry into force will have both environmental and health benefits and adverse effects for the United States because of the actions the United States and other parties will need to take to meet the Convention's requirements.

The report consists of six sections. Section 1 is the introduction. Section 2 provides an overview of the current U.S. chemical weapons destruction program, which can be thought of as the environmental baseline against which the potential environmental consequences of the CWC must be measured. It includes discussions of the Chemical Stockpile Disposal Program (CSDP), the Non-Stockpile Chemical Materiel Program (NSCMP), the environmental consequences of these programs, and the environmental monitoring program currently in place. Section 3 contains documentation on the possible environmental consequences of each component of the existing chemical weapons program—all of which would occur regardless of whether the United States ratifies the CWC. Section 4 is a discussion of environmental consequences that could result from U.S. ratification of the CWC, including both the benefits and potential adverse consequences for the physical and human environment. Section 5 contains a discussion of three options that could be selected by the United States instead of prompt ratification of the CWC and a discussion of the possible environmental consequences of each option. Finally, Section 6 contains the endnotes.

I believe that the Chemical Weapons Convention is in the best interests of the United States. Its provisions will significantly strengthen U.S., allied and international security, environmental security, and enhance global and regional stability. I continue to urge the Senate to give early and favorable consideration to the Chemical Weapons Convention and to give advice and consent to its ratification as soon as possible in 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 1, 1994.

Nomination for the Small Business Administration
March 1, 1994

The President today nominated Helen Dixon as the Regional Director for Region V at the Small Business Administration.

"I am pleased to nominate Helen to the position of Regional Director," the President said, "Her firsthand experience with small business

will be a great asset to our SBA programs in the Midwest."

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

Statement on the Bosnia-Herzegovina Framework Agreement
March 1, 1994

I warmly welcome the signing today in Washington of a framework agreement establishing a federation in the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with majority Bosnian and Croat populations. This framework agreement also provides the outline of a preliminary agreement for a confederation with the Republic of Croatia. This is a major step in the search for peace in Bosnia. I am especially pleased with the tireless efforts of my Special Envoy, Charles Redman, and those of Croatian Foreign Minister Granic, Bosnian Prime Minister Silajdzic, and Mr. Kresimir Zubak, representing the Bosnian Croats.

I spoke this evening with President Alija Izetbegovic of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I congratulated him for his leadership and the critical role he has played in this achievement. All of us are heartened by the courage that he and the Bosnian people have shown in their struggle for peace.

I also spoke with President Franjo Tudjman of Croatia to convey my admiration for the statesmanship he has shown in forging this agreement. I underscored the support of the United States for the sovereignty and integrity of his country.

A great deal of work remains to be done to bring a full peace to Bosnia. The United States will continue to work closely with the parties throughout this process. I urge the parties to continue to demonstrate the flexibility and statesmanship that has brought them to this point. I urge them to persevere over the coming weeks to help ensure that today's accomplishments lead to the peace so long overdue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on NATO Action in Bosnia
March 1, 1994

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

In my report to the Congress of February 17, 1994, I provided further information on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia-Herzegovina, as authorized by the U.N. Security Council. The United States has conducted air operations along with other participating nations for these purposes since April 12, 1993. I am providing this supplementary report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, on the NATO military action conducted by U.S. aircraft in the airspace over Bosnia-Herzegovina on February 28, 1994.

During enforcement operations in the early morning hours of February 28, U.S. F–16 aircraft on air patrol for NATO shot down four Galeb fixed-wing aircraft that were violating the no-fly zone near Banja Luka, Bosnia-Herzegovina. After NATO airborne early-warning aircraft detected the unauthorized aircraft, two U.S. F–16s proceeded to the area and reported visual contact with a total of six Galeb aircraft. In accordance with approved procedures, the NATO airborne early-warning aircraft issued warnings to the violators that they would be engaged if they did not land or leave the no-fly zone airspace immediately. After several minutes passed with no response from the Galebs, the U.S. fighter aircraft again warned them in accordance with approved procedures and, once again, noted no response from the

violators to heed the warnings. Soon thereafter, the U.S. F–16s received permission from the NATO Combined Air Operations Center to engage the violators. Just prior to the engagement, the flight leader of the U.S. fighter aircraft saw the Galebs make a bombing maneuver, and then he saw explosions on the ground. We have since received reports confirming that facilities in this area were hit by bombs during this time frame.

Having received permission to engage the violators, the lead U.S. F–16 fired air-to-air missiles and destroyed three Galeb aircraft. One of two other U.S. F–16 aircraft, which had been sent to the area to provide support, fired a missile and downed the fourth Galeb. The two remaining violators left the area.

This action, part of the NATO effort to enforce the no-fly zone, was conducted under the authority of U.N. Security Council resolutions and in full compliance with NATO procedures. Responding to the bombing of villages and other violations of the ban on unauthorized flights established by the Security Council in late 1992, the Security Council acted in Resolution 816 (March 31, 1993) to authorize Member States, acting nationally or through regional organizations, to take all necessary measures to ensure compliance with the no-fly zone. NATO undertook to monitor the no-fly zone to ensure that the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina does not spread to the air.

Since the commencement of no-fly zone operations last April, nearly 12,000 fighter, tanker, and NATO airborne early-warning sorties have been flown. Military personnel from 12 NATO member nations have participated in this effort, which has been highly successful in preventing significant air threats by the parties to the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Although we have no reason to believe that there will be further violations requiring the use of force, U.S. aircraft will continue to serve as part of this important NATO enforcement effort. As always, our forces remain prepared to defend themselves if necessary. U.S. Armed Forces participate in these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I remain committed to ensuring that the Congress is fully informed about significant activities of U.S. Armed Forces in the region. I appreciate the continued support of the Congress for U.S. contributions to the important multilateral effort in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 2.

Teleconference on Health Care With Family Caregivers

March 2, 1994

The President. I want to thank you all for joining me today and for setting aside some time so that we can speak together and that together we can speak to the country about the long-term care problems in America. As we just heard, we have people from California to New York on the line, people for whom long-term care is not just a health reform issue but a real job.

One of the most important things that our health care plan is attempting to do is to make your job easier by creating a new home- and community-based long-term care program that gives people in need of assistance new choices and gives more options for long-term care, doesn't automatically push people into nursing homes to get some public assistance, and encourages people who are trying to take care of their family members to do it by giving them some help to do it. If this portion of the plan passes, for the first time we'll have a nationwide program that will give Americans, regardless of their income, some long-term care services tailored to their needs and provided in the place that they want to be most, in their own homes.

But the main purpose of this conversation today is not for me to talk but to hear from you, the people who are real experts, to understand how the approach we're taking here in Washington will affect homes and communities

like yours around the country. I think it's very important that people in the Congress and the decisionmakers understand just how many Americans there are who are in the situation that you're in.

And so, let's start with Eve Lefkowitz in Langhorne, Pennsylvania. Eve is a visiting nurse who provides care for both her parents. Eve, why don't you talk to us a little bit about——

[*At this point, Ms. Lefkowitz discussed her parents' health problems, her desire to keep them at home, and the cost for both in-home care and ongoing medical treatment.*]

The President. Thanks, Eve. Before I respond, let me say, can all of you still hear me?

Q. Yes.

The President. One of you has been talking to somebody else while Eve was talking. You may not be able to hear her talk, but we can hear you. So if you talk while someone else is talking, then we won't be able to hear the person who is talking. So please be careful about that.

Let me say, the situation that you have outlined is one that a lot of American families are struggling with. They want to keep their parents in the home. They want to keep them around the grandkids. But they have huge out-of-pocket costs. They know if the parents go to a nursing home, especially if they just spend their resources and go to a nursing home, they can get some help.

Now, under our plan, your parents would be able to stay in your home and get many of the services that they now have to pay for themselves, including adult daycare, some help with home health services, and medications. People would have to make a contribution, all right, based on their ability to pay. So it's not free for everybody regardless of their income, but there would be a support program. In almost every case, this would be cheaper for the Government than providing nursing home care. But it will give people who have certain health problems and disabilities much greater choices about how and where they get the care. And it would enable families like you, yours, that are really close-knit, where you've tried to keep your family together, to be able to do that and succeed.

So we are going to do our best to help you. And I must say, I really admire you for doing this.

Eve Lefkowitz. Thanks.

The President. Beth and James Crampton, are you all there from Omaha?

Beth Crampton. Yes, we're here.

The President. Beth is a 23-year-old recent college graduate who, along with her father, takes care of her mother. Why don't you talk a little about your situation?

[*Ms. Crampton explained that her mother has Alzheimer's disease and discussed the family's efforts to care for her at home.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. You said your father was able to attend your graduation. Did someone come in and care for your mother during that time?

Ms. Crampton. We did. The senior companion program here in Omaha has allowed us to have a volunteer who comes in and is familiar with my mother and can help care for her. So she made special plans and came in that morning so that he could come; otherwise there would have been no way he would have seen that graduation.

The President. I really identify with this. I've had an uncle and an aunt with Alzheimer's, and I've seen what it can do to a family. And I admire you so much for staying committed, you and your father, to taking care of your mother.

One of the things that I think is important to point out, that you have just illustrated with the story that you had, particularly for families where maybe there's only one person who is caring for an Alzheimer's victim, is that there needs to be some respite care for family caregivers, so people like you and your father can at least take a break and know that you can have a lot of confidence in people who are with your mother. And our plan would provide some help to do that, would make it possible for people who are caring for family members with Alzheimer's to have people come in on a regular basis, like the person who came in for you, all across the country to provide respite care so that you would never have to fear at least having some basic normalcy in your life, that you were hurting your mother.

There are people, as you know, all across the country who are doing this now, and Alzheimer's is an issue we have to confront head-on in other ways. We also, in our health care plan, invest more than $20 billion more into preventing and combating diseases that disable older Americans, including Alzheimer's along with breast cancer and heart disease.

So I hope that all these things will be helpful to you. And again, I want to thank you for the example you've set. I really appreciate it.

Is Goldia Kendall there?

Goldia Kendall. Yes, I'm here.

The President. From Jonesboro?

Ms. Kendall. Yes.

The President. My home State. Well, it's nice to hear your voice.

Ms. Kendall. It's good to hear you, too.

The President. Are you really 85 years old?

Ms. Kendall. I'm 85. I'll soon be 86. My husband is 89.

The President. And she's worked all her life as a cook and a nurse, and her husband is a retired factory worker and a carpenter. And he had a stroke a few years ago.

Why don't you tell us about your situation, Ms. Kendall?

[*Ms. Kendall explained that her husband also has Alzheimer's disease and described her efforts to care for him by herself.*]

The President. Yes, what we want to do is to basically reward people like you who have the courage to do what you're doing. I mean, to take your husband out of a nursing home and start caring for him all by yourself at your age is an astonishing thing. And when I was Governor of our State, I worked to try to help give people more choices in long-term care. But with the way the Federal programs work today, there is a limit on what you can do. So our plan would give people like you a chance to get some help from nurses and other assistants who could give personal care to your husband in your home while you go out and run errands and get a little break from time to time. And again, it would be helping you, but it's also less expensive for us than if your husband were in a nursing home.

Ms. Kendall. Well, yes.

The President. So, I sure admire you. I hope that I'm in half the shape that you are if I get to be 85. I really think it's very impressive that you're doing this, and it's a real tribute to your commitment to your husband. I appreciate you so much.

Ms. Kendall. Well, I'm proud of you, too. He's helpless, completely. He has a feeding tube in his stomach. I have to take care of him. He has a motor to keep air in his mattress; the doctor wanted him on an air mattress. And he's been taken care of real good. The nurse comes every week, and the aide comes 5 days a week, and Doctor Owens watches over him very close. And they all are very pleased of me and my work, the way I take care of him.

The President. The hospital has good outpatient services there. I know about that, and that's good.

Ms. Kendall. Yes.

The President. Well, thank you very much, ma'am.

Ms. Kendall. Well, it's good to talk to you.

The President. Thank you.

Ms. Kendall. Thank you. I voted for you.

The President. Well, thank you, I appreciate it.

Ms. Kendall. I watched you on the television, every program I can.

The President. Thank you so much. It's nice to hear your voice, and good luck to you.

Ms. Kendall. May God bless you in your work.

The President. Thank you.

Is Gene Hayes there, from Fresno?

Gene Hayes. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Gene. Gene is a victim of Parkinson's disease who's caring for his wife who suffered a heart attack. And I think you also are caring for your father.

Mr. Hayes. That's right.

The President. Why don't you tell us a little about that? How old is your father?

Mr. Hayes. He's 93. He'll be 94 come May.

The President. Well, tell us a little about your situation.

Wait a minute. Ms. Kendall, hold on one moment. We hear somebody talking on the line here. Everybody, please be quiet.

Okay, Gene, go ahead.

No, we can hear you talking, Ms. Kendall. Be real quiet, so I can hear Mr. Hayes.

Ms. Kendall. Oh, I see. Oh, thank you.

The President. Bless you, that's all right.

Go ahead, Gene.

[*Mr. Hayes described efforts to care for his wife after a stroke that left her comatose.*]

The President. Do you have out-of-pocket expenses for help that you have to pay?

Mr. Hayes. Yes, I sure do. I have to have help around the clock, and there's 10 hours that we take care of her solely by ourself. But other than that, I have a day person and a night person, and then I have a relief person that kind of helps.

The President. And you have to pay for them out of your own pocket?

Mr. Hayes. Yes, I do.

The President. You don't have any health insurance that covers that?

Mr. Hayes. No. When this happened, she was 61, and we didn't have no Medicare. We wasn't eligible for it; we was too young. And insurance, I just dropped it 6 months before; we had no insurance. So we kind of sifted right through the cracks at that point. And we've been having our retirement savings put up, and we've been using that, but it's begun to kind of dwindle away. And we had to sell several things, like our motor home and things like that. But we just take it one day at a time and just trust this will be the day that she'll get better.

The President. And you've got your father there with you too, right?

Mr. Hayes. Yes. Dad's 93, and he has heart problems. We have to give him medicine a couple times a day, and we help him with his bath. I've got to help him with his bath, and at times we help him with his clothing. But Dad's a big help, too. He sits in his wheelchair, and he watches her all the time. He never lets us forget when it's time for her medicine or it's time to turn her. He's always there to say, hey, it's a certain time. And I don't know what we would do without Dad, because he helps us, too. But the three of us just make out fine because we have a lot of help, and it seems like things have been going real well.

The President. Good for you.

Mr. Hayes. I'm thinking about a little later on, it might come to mortgaging; but we're going to take that one day at a time.

The President. I wish you would. I wish you'd come see us. Take care of yourself, sir. And thank you for your example.

Mr. Hayes. Thank you.

The President. Is Mary Hammer there from Blacksburg, Virginia?

[*Ms. Hammer, who lost both her legs in an accident 20 years ago, explained that following a recent stroke she was placed in a nursing home which she did not like, but that assistance from church members and social service agencies enabled her instead to be cared for at home.*]

The President. Thank you. You know, we wanted you to be on this call today because the local department of social services where you live has done a good job in providing the kind of personal care and companion services that you have. And I appreciate you saying such good things about them.

Mary Hammer. They're wonderful.

The President. Because what we're trying to do is to make sure all the people in the country, especially elderly people or people with children with disabilities, have access to that kind of help. We don't propose to create a whole new program or a whole new system but to build on the good things that are out there, these adult daycare services, the senior center program, the home health services, the personal care services, all these things that are working out there in the country. What we're going to try to do is to make sure that each person who needs the help can have whichever of these services they need and that they know they will be able to get the help if they need it. And you're an example of how someone can live independently, even with some significant difficulties, if that kind of help is there. And I think the kind of thing you've described ought to be available to every American citizen.

Ms. Hammer. I sure do agree with that. I've been listening to all these calls, and I'm telling you, I agree with what you're trying to do. And I just pray that this funding will keep on coming so we can keep getting this kind of help.

The President. Thank you. Well, we're going to do our best, and thanks for talking to us today. You really made a great statement, and we appreciate you.

Ms. Hammer. It's been a real pleasure. I feel honored for you to call me, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. Well, the honor was ours today. Thanks.

Is Donna Lyttle there?

Donna Lyttle. Yes, I'm here.

The President. From South Ozone Park, New York?

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, that's correct.

The President. Thank you. Bye, Mary.

Donna, tell us a little about your situation. I think you care for your mother, who has Alzheimer's, and you work at Harlem Hospital. Is that right?

[*Ms. Lyttle explained that she was the primary caretaker for her dependent mother because she could only afford limited in-home assistance and respite care.*]

The President. So you have a lot of personal expenses that you just have to pay for to keep her there?

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, because the transportation back and forth to the center is a cab service that I pay for for her to go twice a week. And you have to pay for her to be taken and to be picked up.

The President. Anything else?

Ms. Lyttle. Well, I'm paying for the home attendants to come in to take care of my mother, and any other expenses that she needs are definitely coming out of pocket. Her medical expenses are definitely coming out of pocket also. But it's only through the Alzheimer's Association that I found out about the respite center. They've really been a godsend for me.

The President. And how much do they come in and help you? Because otherwise you just put your life on hold, I guess.

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, well, my life is completely on hold. The Alzheimer's Association has been a resource for me in terms of finding channels that I need for assistance. It was through them that I found the lady that takes care of my mother during the day and about the daycare center for her. But they are——

The President. But you're paying for that.

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, I'm paying for all of it.

The President. Well, under our program, you'd have access to this kind of respite care, and you'd have a chance to at least have more of a life while keeping your mother, and the Government would provide some help based on your income. I just think that we have so many people—you've heard these other people's stories—we have so many people out here in this country who are doing their best to take care of their family members with Alzheimer's. And I think it's—clearly, with the fastest growing group of Americans being people over 80, the number of problems that elderly people have is just going to explode in this country. And we, I don't think, can afford to have everybody institutionalized. And when people want to support their families and keep them together, I think we ought to be providing some help for it.

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, I agree. It's also pretty frightening for me because I have two additional family members that have Alzheimer's. My mother's sister was diagnosed in Barbados with Alzheimer's, but she has been placed in a nursing home. And my mother's uncle just passed in March after being home for, I believe, it's been about 15 years with his wife taking care of him and paying out-of-pocket expenses for all of his care.

The President. And you're a nurse at Harlem Hospital?

Ms. Lyttle. No, I'm executive assistant.

The President. Is that where you work, there?

Ms. Lyttle. Yes, I work at Harlem Hospital.

The President. I've been there.

Ms. Lyttle. Oh, yes, I've seen the picture.

The President. I enjoyed my trip there.

Ms. Lyttle. Oh, I hope you come back.

The President. If we pass this health care plan, we're also going to make your life simpler there, less paperwork, more care.

Ms. Lyttle. That's great.

The President. Thank you very much.

Ms. Lyttle. You're quite welcome.

The President. Vera Teske, from Wheaton, Kansas, are you there?

Vera Teske. Yes, I'm here, Mr. President.

The President. And you care for your husband, and I think he has Alzheimer's also.

Ms. Teske. That's right.

The President. And you live on your family farm?

Ms. Teske. Yes, we do.

The President. Tell us a little about your situation.

[*Ms. Teske discussed the problems of coping with a potentially violent Alzheimer's patient and the prohibitive expense of in-home care for someone with a long-term illness.*]

The President. I appreciate your statement. I don't think I can add much to it except to point out that it's an even bigger issue for people like you, a farm family in a rural area. We have really worked hard in designing this approach to make sure we're taking care of providing care in rural areas as well as more urban ones, because you've made a statement about why we need it as eloquently as anyone could.

I think—I'd just like to emphasize one more time—at a time in America when we're so worried about our young people and we say we've got to rebuild the American family and strengthen the American family, you've got all these dedicated family members who are out there who could have walked away from their family members and didn't. And it seems to me that given the fact that we're going to have more of these kind of problems as we all live longer,

that we ought to be out here supporting family members and helping them to succeed and have a life, not have to give up their whole life while they take care of the folks that they love. I really respect what you've done, and we're going to do our best to provide some help in this health care plan.

Ms. Teske. I appreciate my family members. They help a lot.

The President. Yes, I know you've got kids and grandkids, and that must help some. But it's still—if you're out on the farm, you need somebody to come in and give you some consistent help, too.

And you made a great statement. I wish you'd been giving it to a congressional committee. It was terrific. Send us a copy of it, will you? We took a copy of it. I'm going to send it up to the Hill. It's great.

Ms. Teske. Thank you.

The President. Is Marge Garrison there from Houston?

Marge Garrison. I'm here, Mr. President.

The President. You and your husband, I think, are caring for your daughter. Is that right?

Ms. Garrison. Yes, we are.

The President. Why don't you tell us a little about that.

[*Ms. Garrison discussed the problems of raising an autistic child.*]

The President. Well, I appreciate your just sharing your circumstances with us. And I appreciate the fact you've kept your child. And what you've done, I know it's been an enormous burden. You shouldn't feel bad about saying you need help. And we shouldn't have an all-or-nothing situation. I mean, it seems to me that the people this country ought to be rewarding are people that are willing to take this level of responsibility, willing to pay something according to their ability to pay, but just shouldn't be asked to bankrupt themselves on the one hand or on the other hand just give up their entire lives. I really, really appreciate what you said. And more importantly, I appreciate what you've done.

Ms. Garrison. It may be difficult for you—you need to come spend a couple days in our home, Mr. President, and you can really see what it's like living in the house with the type disabilities that our child has.

The President. I wish I could.

Ms. Garrison. I wish you could, too. Thanks for having us today.

The President. Thank you. I want to thank all of you, Eve and Beth and James and Goldia and Gene and Mary Hammer and Donna Lyttle and Vera Teske and you, Marge. I thank you all.

In a lot of ways you're truly heroic people because you've lived by your values of hard work and commitment to your families. And I hope that your stories as they go out across the country will help us to pass a health care reform bill that will build on a lot of the good services you talked about today, those of you who have them, but make sure there aren't the waiting lists that Marge talked about and make sure that we can actually give some help to people who are trying to help themselves and their loved ones.

We can begin to do this. It will take some time to get it exactly right in America, but we've got to begin now. And that's what our plan does. And you have inspired me to keep fighting for it. I'll guarantee you, this has been a wonderful day. I thank you very much. I wish you well. And we're all in your debt.

Thank you, and goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:36 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Exchange With Reporters
March 2, 1994

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the polls that show that your health care—going down the drain—you may not be——

The President. That's not what they show. One of the polls shows the serious concern level going up. How could it be otherwise? Look at the millions and millions and millions of dollars that have been spent by interest groups to trash

the plan, people that don't want to assume any responsibility for their employees, people that don't want to assume any responsibility for providing basic health care, and people that think they can get just a little better deal.

It's no accident—I will say this: We've tried for 60 years to join the ranks of the rest of the world and give everybody good health care in this country, and it's no accident that it hasn't happened. It's because change is difficult and the people who are doing well in the present system devote a lot of money and time to stopping the change.

But I'm still actually pretty optimistic about this because what happened is, every time I get a chance to speak to the American people about it, support goes back up, like it did at the State of the Union. Then we go through a long period of where nothing is happening in the Congress and everybody is kind of maneuvering for position legislatively and we're being attacked. And we don't have as much money to spend as those who are spending money against us on the ads and all that sort of stuff. So these things will happen.

The thing that encourages me is I talk to more and more Members of Congress that seem to have a very practical attitude about this and want to find a way to give everybody health security, some system of guaranteed insurance on health care without taking away the good things that we have now. And that's what we're going to do. And I actually feel, based on my conversations with Members of Congress and the impact that we still get whenever we go out and talk about this specifically, like when we went to Connecticut and talked about the medicine, a good feeling about it.

There is nothing I can do in the short run to overtake the fact that I don't have as much money to run television ads as the health insurance industry.

Q. So you are going to get a plan—you think you will get——

The President. Oh, absolutely. I think that Congress will do this. They know it's important. They know it's the responsible thing to do, and I believe we'll get a good plan out of the Congress. But it's going to be—you know, this is a long and painstaking process. The legislative process is just about to begin, and a lot of people get frustrated, and they want results now, and they hear all this stuff in the air. So you're going to see the polls go up and down, but in the end, it's clearly a major concern of the American people, and they want us to do something, and they want to provide health security. And I think we'll get it done.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, is the reauthorization of Super 301 a warning shot to the Japanese?

The President. First of all, we haven't made a final decision about how exactly to proceed on that. But what we are trying to do is to—since the framework agreement may well not be carried out, we have to figure out what our options are to proceed now. But let's wait and see what we do on that specifically. I wouldn't—warning shot—I don't want to characterize those things. We're trying to move the markets. We're trying to open the market to American products, but to the rest of the world's products and services as well.

Ames Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, all these revelations in the Ames spy case seem to suggest a much more massive penetration of the U.S. intelligence community than earlier had been suggested. How deep did this go? How widespread is the investigation? And how concerned are you about ongoing covert operations that could endanger the lives of U.S. agents and those who work with them?

The President. Well, I think what I should say now is that we put a very high priority on this over the last several months, and we're doing our best to get to the bottom of it. And we will proceed to do that. In the meantime, we're going to do our best to secure Americans who are working to represent their country. But I can't say any more than that now. I think that you can be confident that we are doing what we should be doing to find out everything we need to know.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Are you somewhat resigned to the fact that it doesn't look like you're going to be able to get Mideast peace talks going anytime soon?

The President. No. Mr. Arafat said that he would join the talks here in Washington, but I know he's under a lot of pressure at home, and I understand that. The only thing that I would say to the Palestinians who are pressuring Arafat not to resume talks is that that is the surest way to hand a victory to the madman

who killed all the Palestinians in the mosque. Why should they do something that would hand a victory to the extremists on both sides?

But he is under pressure. We are working on it. I talked firstly to Prime Minister Rabin. We've been in touch with Mr. Arafat. I'm hoping to have a conversation with King Hussein today, and I've talked to President Mubarak, and we're all working on this hard. But I think that they want to come back. And I am not resigned to the fact that it won't happen.

Q. Do the pressures realistically mean you've got to wait a while? I mean, you had hoped to resume—or to start the talks this week.

The President. Well, we'll see. We'll see what the timing is. But I think we can get them back on track. I think Prime Minister Rabin's speech and the steps he's taken were a good beginning, a really good beginning on his part. and we'll just have to see what happens. But again I say, if the peace talks don't get back on track, then we are rewarding the damage and the death wreaked by the extremists. We don't want to do that. We want to keep going. And you know, these ethnic and religious difficulties are very deep and profound, but you just have to keep working at them. And we got some good news yesterday on Bosnia, and we just keep working at these things and do our best to try to bring them to a successful conclusion.

Hugh Rodham

Q. Are you supporting Hugh Rodham?

The President. What? No, what did you say? I couldn't hear you.

Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Are you supporting Hugh Rodham in his campaign?

The President. Well, I don't—first, he hasn't filed. And secondly, we don't know if he's got any opposition in the Democratic primary. I'll be out there in the fall helping all the Democrats. But that's a decision for him to make. He's got to make that decision. I can't make it.

Herschel Friday

Q. Did you want to say something about Herschel Friday, your old staff member?

The President. Well, he was a friend of mine, you know, for 30 years. He did remarkable work in my State. I used to make fun of him for flying just back and forth from—to Little Rock. And he lived a very full life, was a good man and a great citizen. And Hillary and I talked about it this morning and our thoughts and our prayers are with Beth and his family.

Q. Are you going back there, sir?

The President. I don't know. I don't know what the facts are yet. I just heard about it this morning. I actually—right before I went to work early this morning I heard about it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:20 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Department of Transportation
March 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 308 of Public Law 97–449 (49 U.S.C. 308(a)), I transmit herewith the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Department of Transportation, which covers fiscal year 1992.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 2, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee
March 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 108(b) of Public Law 98–373 (15 U.S.C. 4107(b)), I transmit herewith the Fifth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1992, to January 31, 1994).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 2, 1994.

Nomination for Ambassador to Bahrain
March 2, 1994

The President today named David M. Ransom as the United States Ambassador to the State of Bahrain.

"David Ransom's extensive background in foreign affairs and dedicated service to the United States will be a great asset to this Nation," the President said. "I am pleased to announce his nomination, and I look forward to his appointment."

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

Nomination for the Federal Communications Commission
March 2, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Rachelle B. Chong as a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

"I am confident that Rachelle Chong's experience and commitment in the area of telecommunications will prove invaluable to this most important committee," the President said. "I am happy to nominate her to the position."

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

Appointment for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities
March 2, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of the Chair and Vice Chairs of the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities. Appointments include Tony Coelho as Chair of the Committee, Neil Jacobson as Vice Chair, and Karen Meyer as Vice Chair.

"I am pleased to announce these appointments," the President said. "I believe the designation of such a dedicated and experienced group of people will provide valuable perspective to the administration and emphasize our strong commitment to the community of people with disabilities."

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

Statement on the Attack on Jewish Students in Brooklyn, New York
March 2, 1994

This afternoon, I spoke with the family of Aaron Halberstam, the Lubavitcher student who was critically wounded by gunfire in Brooklyn yesterday. My prayers are with them, with their son, and with all of those affected by this spasm of brutal violence. It is an outrage that this crime, which has overtones of a hate crime, could occur in our American community. And it is a tragedy that such a tender, intelligent boy could be the victim of such brutality and immutable violence.

For American Jewry, as for all of us, our country's unique tradition of tolerance and religious freedom makes us a refuge from the hatred and inhumanity that divides so many other cultures in this world. We respect the humanity we find in each other, and anything which attacks the bonds of community which unite us is an attack on us all.

I commend the New York City Police Department for its swift and apparently successful investigation of this crime, and I would appeal to all men and women of good will—shocked as we are by this violence—to be calm and respectful of our system of justice. Those of us fighting for the safety and security of our neighborhoods, and for America's religious and cultural freedoms, will prevail.

Appointment for the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise
March 2, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Laura Kalman as a member of the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise. The Committee was established to prepare a history of the Supreme Court of the United States, to finance an annual lecture or series of lectures, and to prepare and publish a memorial volume containing the writings of Justice Holmes.

"Laura Kalman's extensive background in law and American history will be a great asset to the Committee," the President said. "I am delighted to announce her appointment."

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

Remarks on the National Performance Review and an Exchange With Reporters
March 3, 1994

The President. Good morning, everybody. Please sit down. I'm sorry we're starting late, but I had to have a conversation with Prime Minister Hosokawa of Japan, and it was getting very late there, and I couldn't put it off until after this meeting. And we'll have more to say about that later in the day. I apologize, but it was unavoidable. We had to make the call.

One year ago today, I asked the Vice President to conduct a review of our entire Government, to find out how we could do more and do better with less. Six months ago, he presented his report to me and to the American people. Today, we tell the American people that we are keeping our commitment. This report is not gathering dust in a warehouse. It is still our blueprint for building a Government that gives the taxpayers real value for their hard-earned dollars.

Here's the most important reason why this report is different from earlier ones on Government reform. When Herbert Hoover finished the Hoover Commission, he went back to Stanford. When Peter Grace finished the Grace Commission, he went back to New York City. But when the Vice President finished his report, he had to go back to his office—[*laughter*]—20 feet from mine, and go back to working to turn the recommendations into reality.

Throughout the Government, agencies are talking to their employees, involving their unions, and improving services and cutting costs. Eighty percent of the recommendations in the Vice President's report have already been started on the way to implementation. And almost every dollar of the savings this report recommends has been built into the 1995 budget to help us make the tough budget reduction targets. I'm pleased that throughout the Government people are asking themselves how they can meet the challenges in the report: put customers first, cut redtape, empower employees to provide better services at lower cost.

Yesterday I signed performance agreements with Secretary Cisneros, Secretary Reich, Secretary Babbitt, and Ambassador Bowles of the Small Business Administration, Ambassador Roger Johnson of the General Services Administration—Administrator Roger Johnson of the General Services Administration. All these agreements set specific goals for their Departments to improve the quality and efficiency of service.

I'm pleased that Congress is also answering this challenge. Legislation to offer the early retirement incentives to Government employees whose jobs are no longer necessary has now passed the House and the Senate. As private industry has learned, buyouts are the best way to streamline a work force while keeping it both productive and diverse.

And when Congress passes the crime bill, we'll take the savings from reducing the Federal bureaucracy by a quarter million and use it to put 100,000 more police officers on our streets. I'm also pleased by our progress in getting more value for taxpayers' money in the goods and services Government buys. Americans have a right to be angry when they hear their Government is spending too much for a hammer or a toilet seat. They have a right to demand that tax dollars be spent with discipline and judgment. From now on, Government's going to do what ordinary citizens do, comparison shop for goods and services we buy and get the best value for every dollar. That's common sense, and it needs to be more common in Government.

You know, just last night, there was a story on the evening news about some defense contractors billing the Government for Caribbean travel junkets and season boxes for baseball seats, even after all the cutbacks in defense. That story underscores the need for reform of our procurement system. The procurement reform bills being considered in Congress make it a violation of Federal law to bill the Government for entertainment expenses and knowingly submit unallowable costs. Government contractors are entitled to a vacation just like anybody else but not at taxpayer expense.

Finally, we're working to reform the civil service, to create a modern, flexible work force. As the first step, the Office of Personnel Management has already gotten rid of the hidebound and hated 10,000-page personnel manual. Step by step, we're cutting the redtape and removing the reams of paper from the forklifts the Vice President and I stood in front of just 6 months ago. We're finding new ways to make Government serve the taxpayers better and less expensively.

And now I'd like to introduce him in the way that he often introduces me, "the person who made this all possible"—[*laughter*]—the Vice President of the United States.

[*At this point, the Vice President discussed progress made by the National Performance Review. He introduced Roger Patterson, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and Joan Hyatt, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, who described streamlining efforts in their agencies.*]

The President. Thank you. First let me say, I think that the Vice President has done a terrific job. I want to thank Elaine and all the people who have worked on this. I want to thank Leon Panetta and the folks at OMB and Roger Johnson and the people at General Services Administration, and Jim King and the folks at the Office of Personnel Management for the progress that they have made and the work that they have done to make this possible.

And most importantly, I'd like to thank the people who work for the Federal Government. These two employees who stood up here today, I think, reflect what most people who work for this Government are like. They want to do a good job. They want the taxpayers to be proud of the work they do. And they don't want to spend all their time wading around in paperwork and unnecessary rules and regulations. They represent our Government at its best. And I thank both of you, and I thank all of you for coming. Thank you.

You all relax now, we've got to do a few questions. [*Laughter*]

Go ahead, Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about the appearance of impropriety of these meetings between Treasury officials and the White House?

The President. Yes.

Q. Have you been able to find out if there have been any other meetings other than the one that was reported? And what will be done about it?

The President. Well, first of all, the answer is, yes, I'm concerned about that. Nearly as I can determine, no one has actually done anything wrong or attempted to improperly influence any Government action. But I think it would be better if the meetings and conversations hadn't occurred.

I think now that there is an actual formal process underway, everyone will be much more sensitive. But I have directed Mack McLarty to prepare a memorandum about how we should handle and respond to any such contacts coming our way in this office so that we will bend over backwards to avoid not only the fact but any appearance of impropriety. It is very, very important to me.

I was a Governor for a long time, and there was never a hint of impropriety or scandal in my administration. And to the best of my knowledge the people who come here to work every day in this administration, there has been no suggestion of abuse of power or anyone pursuing some personal advantage. And I want the American people to feel that. So I have told Mr. McLarty that we have to—we've already talked to people here in the office to make it clear that they understand that I—first of all, I feel that this—all these investigations, they should go forward, unimpeded and as quickly as possible. And I have every confidence in what the facts will reveal. So I think that it's very, very important that while all this is going on, that the activity around it should be handled in such a way as to avoid even the appearance of a conflict.

Later today, I think, we will have the memorandum for you, and we'll be glad to answer any questions surrounding that.

Q. Well, shouldn't your lawyer be more sensitive to this——

The President. I think there was a difference—what we have to do—let me say, we are also researching exactly what the actual rules are for what kinds of meetings can occur when. And I don't want to get into all the hypotheticals, but for example, if the press asks questions one place that are known in another place—the answers might be known in the White House but someone's asked in the agency, can they talk or not, I mean, that was one of the meetings that was discussed in the morning paper.

I want to make exactly—I want to make it clear that we know what the rules are, but as I said—and so I can't answer all those questions, in fact, right now. But in addition to what the rules are, what I want the people here to understand is, never mind what the rules are, bend over backwards to avoid the appearance of it. Let's let this thing go forward. There is an investigative process. The records are in hand, as far as I know, for the investigators to do their work. Let it go forward. We don't need to have any implication that we are in any way trying to manage or affect this process. We are not. We must not. And I don't want the American people to give it a second thought.

So the memorandum today should make that clear. And I don't think there will be further problems on this.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, can you elaborate for us on your conversation with Prime Minister Hosokawa?

The President. Well, I called him to discuss the trade issue. And the Trade Ambassador will have an announcement on that later today, and then we'll be glad to answer questions about it. But I think I should let him make the announcement first.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—was it a friendly conversation——

The President. It was a friendly, a forthright conversation. It's consistent with the tone that we've established in our relationship. But it was one that I had to have today.

Q. Are we ready to reimpose Super 301?

The President. We'll have an announcement about that later today.

Q. Actually, can I just ask on this subject——

The President. Yes.

The Vice President. How refreshing! [*Laughter*]

The President. Wow—[*laughter*]—I was beginning to think that we were the only two policy wonks in the world that love—[*laughter*]. There they go again.

Reinventing Government

Q. When this report was released 6 months ago, you were predicting, I think it was $108 billion in savings——

The Vice President. $106 billion. Be careful not to inflate that number. [*Laughter*]

Q. ——and over 5 years—I mean, are you confident that the targets can be met?

The Vice President. Absolutely. There was a fundamental misunderstanding about the difference between savings and CBO scoring. If you have savings and the caps are not adjusted, then the CBO says that's zero, but the savings are real. And that is the case for every single one of the savings in the report.

I'll give you a quick example. We recommended the closing of a uniformed military medical school. The savings involved each year in closing that are about, what, $200, $300 million per year. Under the arcane rules of scoring, that's called zero, because the caps aren't changed. But in the real world where the money is spent, that is a real savings.

And when this all plays out, you'll see that they're real. For example, in the '94 budget year, which was only—we only caught part of that because we were well into it when the report was released—but in that part of the '94 budget year and in the '95 budget year, we called in the report for the portion of the $106 billion in savings reflected there for $12.6 billion. Out of that amount, $12.5 billion will be gained. Those savings are in the budget, so give us time. We'll demonstrate how and where the savings occur, and they will be real.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Elaine Kamarck, Senior Policy Adviser to the Vice President.

Statement on the National Performance Review
March 3, 1994

We are changing the way Government works. We're cutting redtape. We're empowering employees to get results, and we're treating each and every citizen as if they were our most valued customer. It's an ongoing commitment that this Government has made to its citizens, and it starts at the top.

The National Performance Review is not another boring Government reform report that sits gathering dust on the shelves of the White House. It is the blueprint for change that's taking place right now.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement on reinventing Government.

Statement on Disaster Assistance for Alabama
March 3, 1994

My heart goes out to the people of the South who have suffered from these recent storms. I know how difficult this winter has been, and I am confident that FEMA Director James Lee Witt will do all he can to assist the people of Alabama, and those throughout the rest of the South, to recover from these damaging storms.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing disaster assistance for Alabama due to winter storms that began January 14 and continued through February 14.

Statement on Presentation of the Presidential Citizens Medal to Representative William H. Natcher
March 3, 1994

Congressman Natcher has served the people of Kentucky and this Nation with distinction since 1941. He is revered by friends and opponents alike, and I can think of no person who deserves our recognition more. He represents the model of leadership to which we should all strive.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing that the President presented Representative Natcher with the medal at Bethesda Naval Hospital, Bethesda, MD.

Statement on the Executive Order on Identification of Trade Expansion Priorities
March 3, 1994

This administration is committed to opening markets for high-quality goods and services produced by competitive American workers. That was the goal of NAFTA, the GATT negotiations, the APEC conference, the U.S.-Japan framework talks, and a number of other steps my administration has taken. Today I have signed an Executive order reinstituting Super 301. This action will help us reach our objective: open markets that will create better jobs and increase wages at home and abroad.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq
March 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of August 2, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is

submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq), then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. U.S. persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. member states temporarily to transfer to a U.N. escrow account up to $200 million apiece in Iraqi oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq. These funds finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a nonpartisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds will also fund the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which will handle claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the member states that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No member state is required to fund more than half of the total contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders Nos. 12724 and 12817. The report covers events from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994.

1. During the reporting period, there were technical amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations relating to notification of transfers into blocked accounts and registration of persons holding blocked property, 58 *Fed. Reg.* 47643 (September 10, 1993). A copy of the amendments is attached for reference.

2. Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. These are intended to deter future activities in violation of the sanctions. Additional civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi Sanctions Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. Three penalties totaling nearly $54,000 were collected from three banks for violation of the prohibitions against funds transfers to Iraq, and noncompliance with reporting requirements and an Office of Foreign Assets Control directive license.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to the Office of Foreign Assets Control's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Iraq.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12817 implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778, on October 26, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order. On July 20, 1993, following payments by the Governments of Saudi Arabia and Denmark of, respectively $40,589,419.00 and $674,360.00, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778 Escrow Account, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $41,263,779.00 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-controlled account. Similarly, on August 2, 1993, following the payment of $1,765,138.33 by the Government of

the United Kingdom, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $1,765,138.33 to the United Nations-controlled account; on September 11, 1993, following payments of $1,547,054.35 by the Government of Canada, $276,000.00 by the Government of Greece, $3,196,897.72 from the Commission of the European Community, and $1,006,614.89 from the Government of Denmark, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $6,026,566.96 to the United Nations-controlled account; and on December 15, 1993, following payments of $5,223,880.60 by the Government of the United Kingdom, $621,426.80 by the Government of Germany, and $1,219,941.98 from the Government of the Netherlands, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of $7,065,249.38 to the United Nations-controlled account. Total transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 have amounted to $107,613,270.99 of the $200 million for which the United States is potentially obligated, on a matching basis, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 778.

5. Since the last report, there have been developments in one case. In *Campia et al.* v. *Newcomb et al.,* a settlement was entered into by the parties addressing payment of back rent to the landlord and return to the landlord of premises leased by the Matrix Churchill Corporation. To implement the settlement, certain blocked property owned by Matrix Churchill was sold, with the proceeds placed in a blocked account. Matrix Churchill's remaining property and records were placed in secure storage.

6. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 444 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Since my last report, 53 specific licenses have been issued. Licenses were issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, for legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, and food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq, and the protection of pre-existent intellectual property rights in Iraq.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6 month period from August 2, 1993, through February 1, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported at about $3.1 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near East and South Asian Affairs, the Bureau of International Organizations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

8. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's invasion and illegal occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime, despite international will, has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. Nonetheless, we see a pattern of defiance: repeated public claims to Kuwait, sponsorship of terrorism, incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors, and ongoing widespread human rights violations, among other things. The U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continued to violate basic human rights by repressing the Iraqi civilian population and depriving it of humanitarian assistance. For more than 2 years, Baghdad has maintained a complete blockade of food, fuel, and medicine on northern Iraq. The Iraqi mili-

tary routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" Kurdish, Turcoman, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq continues to launch artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, and its efforts to drain the southern marshes have forced thousands to flee to neighboring States.

In 1991, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolutions 706 and 712 that permit Iraq to sell up to $1.6 billion of oil under U.N. auspices to fund the provision of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies to the people of Iraq. Under the U.N. resolutions, the equitable distribution within Iraq of this assistance would be supervised and monitored by the United Nations. The Iraqi regime so far has refused to accept these resolutions and has thereby chosen to perpetuate the suffering of its civilian population. In October 1993, the Iraqi government informed the United Nations that it would not implement Resolutions 706 and 712.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter Iraq from threatening peace and stability in the region, and I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 3, 1994.

Nomination for Ambassador to Cambodia
March 3, 1994

The President today nominated Charles H. Twining of Maryland as the Ambassador to Cambodia with the rank of Minister-Counselor.

"Charles Twining is a talented professional who has focused a good part of his career on efforts in Cambodia," the President said. "I am confident that he will represent our interests well in that country."

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

Message to the Congress on Trade With Ukraine
March 3, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add Ukraine to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, and particularly Ukraine's level of development and initiation of economic reforms, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to Ukraine.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

March 3, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 4. The related proclamation of March 3 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine
March 4, 1994

Q. Mr. President, do you think Mr. Nussbaum should resign?

The President. I'm here with President Kravchuk to discuss a lot of very important issues. I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday. If I have anything else to say, it will be later today. I have nothing to say.

Q. ——they'll follow through on the dismantling of the nuclear warheads?

The President. Yes, I think they will do exactly what they said they'd do. President Kravchuk has had a good deal of success working with his Rada to secure approval of a continued denuclearization of Ukraine, and we will have some things to discuss about that today and some further announcements at our public statement in a couple of hours—we'll have some more to say about it.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Mr. President?

The President. I hope they will, and I think they're working toward that.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

The President. This is the Ukraine press.

[*At this point, a question was asked in Ukrainian, and a translation was not provided.*]

President Kravchuk. We're just recalling our meetings, but we haven't started talks yet. But we recalled our Kiev meetings.

Q. What is the opinion of this meeting, Mr. Clinton?

The President. I thought they were very good meetings. We made, as you know, a very important agreement which we then signed in Moscow the next day. And I also very much enjoyed being in your country a brief time. We also had a wonderful meal. And we'll have a good meal today, but there won't be so many courses as there were when we were in—[*laughter*]

President Kravchuk. And the newspapers were covering it for a long time.

The President. Yes.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:42 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. President Kravchuk spoke in Ukrainian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine
March 4, 1994

President Clinton. Good afternoon. It's a great pleasure for me to welcome President Kravchuk and his entire delegation from Ukraine to the White House today. Before I go forward, I think I should acknowledge the presence in the Ukrainian delegation of two of the Ukraine's Olympic athletes, Viktor Petrenko and the Olympic gold medalist in skating, Oksana Baiul. Welcome to the United States. Please stand up. [*Applause*] Thank you. I'm pleased that President Kravchuk brought them with him today. We all enjoyed meeting them, and we're looking forward to the entire American Olympic team being here in just a couple of weeks.

When I first met President Kravchuk in Kiev on January 12th, the hour was late, and the weather was icy. But at that brief meeting we marked the dawn of a new and warm era in relations between the United States and Ukraine. Two days after that meeting, we signed an historic accord with President Yeltsin to eliminate some 1,800 Soviet nuclear warheads left in Ukraine. Since then, Ukraine's Parliament has approved the trilateral agreement and unconditionally ratified the START Treaty and the Lisbon Protocol. And last month, Ukraine joined the NATO Partnership For Peace. These steps represent a tribute to the statesmanship and

leadership of President Kravchuk and to the vision of the Ukrainian people, who understand that integration into a broader, peaceful, and democratic Europe is Ukraine's best path to lasting security and prosperity.

In our meeting today, I strongly reaffirmed American support for Ukraine's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. I urged President Kravchuk to continue to work to achieve Ukraine's accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We shared views on developments in Russia and their impact on Ukraine. We discussed ways to expand cooperation between our two nations. At the core of our agenda is developing a closer economic relationship.

While Ukraine is going through a difficult period of transition, it remains a nation with enormous economic potential, endowed with abundant natural resources and human talent. To develop the full measure of these resources, Ukraine's most promising future clearly lies with market reform. That's why I was pleased that President Kravchuk today expressed his determination to move forward toward comprehensive market reform.

As Ukraine proceeds with reform, the United States is prepared to mobilize support from the G–7 nations and from international financial institutions. We're also prepared to increase our bilateral economic assistance to $350 million this year for privatization, small business creation, and other priorities. And to help Ukraine dismantle nuclear weapons, we've committed $350 million in Nunn-Lugar funds. Total U.S. assistance available to Ukraine this year will, therefore, be $700 million. This represents a major increased commitment to an important friend in the region.

Ultimately, the best way to bolster Ukraine's reforms is to facilitate private trade and investment. I told President Kravchuk today that the United States will support Ukraine's membership in GATT and will lower tariffs on a number of Ukrainian products.

We've also signed treaties to promote investment and prevent double taxation. And we established a joint commission on trade and investment that will strengthen further our commercial ties. These ties are part of a richly woven fabric that binds our two nations.

From the time of our own revolution, Ukrainian immigrants have helped to shape the United States. Now America and Ukraine are dedicated to building a new relationship, to shaping a better future for all our people and for all the world. I look forward to working with President Kravchuk in that endeavor.

Let me again thank the President for coming here with the entire delegation, including his Olympians, and to say to all the Ukrainians, and to you especially, Mr. President, thank you for giving us the opportunity to work together and to make a better future for our peoples.

President Kravchuk. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have just signed a number of important bilateral documents which lay down the legal foundation for cooperation in the areas of economy, trade, and other areas. That—what happened several minutes ago before your eyes could be, without exaggeration, called a historic moment in relationship between our two states.

Today we, in fact, turned the page of a still brief history of our bilateral relations which seem to have linked us forever with colossal and complicated problem of nuclear weapons, which Ukraine inherited from the former Soviet Union. Although the problem remains to be as complicated today, we managed to get closer to a successful resolution of this problem today.

The new balance of forces on the political map of the world clearly indicates the need to create a global security system which would be based on entirely new principles. We understand that the complicated processes of international security and peace are intertwined and cannot permit gaps and vacuum to exist in this or that part of the world, especially on the European Continent. Therefore, President Bill Clinton and I agreed that the political and economic security of Ukraine, which is playing an important stabilizing role in its area—and this idea is shared by many others—has an exceptional significance for both the people of Ukraine and for the people of the United States of America. Proceeding from this basic idea, we believe that relations between Ukraine and the United States should develop as relationships of friendly states which have much more common interests than controversies.

During our talks with President Clinton we became confident that the American side understands the problems that we have and is concerned over the serious economic situation in Ukraine. We saw that the administration in the United States does not only welcome steps of the Ukrainian Government to overcome the economic crisis but also expresses readiness to provide necessary assistance to Ukraine in the main

areas of economic transformation, which the President indicated.

Today we signed a package of economic accords and agreements which I hope will help Ukraine considerably facilitate and speed up its progress towards the market and ease the tension in the economy and also the daily life of the people. We are convinced that we found the right friend at the right time in America. Today Ukraine is a friend in need, but it is a friend, indeed, as your saying goes. I believe that the day will come when we will be remembering these days as the era of the birth and formation of a true friendship between the two nations and states, Ukraine and the United States of America.

Thank you very much for attention.

President Clinton. Thank you, Mr. President.

Now, we'll attempt to alternate between the American press and the Ukrainian press on questions. So we'll start with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, is Mr. Nussbaum leaving your staff, and have you decided how you're going to approach these daily spate of stories concerning Whitewater—been likened in Post cartoons to torture, Chinese torture, and so forth?

President Clinton. Well, I think that's a decision more for you than for me, whether there will be a daily spate of stories. Most of the newspapers in the country asked me to have a special counsel appointed. That's what I have done; I did it so that I could go on with my work. It's been an interesting thing since no one has still accused me, as far as I know, of doing anything wrong in this whole encounter. So we have a Special Counsel, and I intend to let the process unfold.

Yesterday, I said what I had to say about the meetings that had occurred or the conversations that had occurred. I think we have constructed a clear and appropriate firewall between the White House and any Federal regulatory agency that might have anything to do with this, as I think it is absolutely imperative to do. And I have told again everybody on my staff to just bend over backwards to be as cooperative as possible. I want a full investigation. I want this thing to be done fully, clearly, and to be over with. That is my only interest, and I intend to pursue it with great vigor.

Q. How about Mr. Nussbaum?

President Clinton. I have nothing more to add to what I said yesterday.

Ukraine

Q. The Voice of Ukraine, the parliamentary newspaper of Ukraine. It was said that the moment is historic in the history of Ukraine. Is this historic moment different from any other historic moment in the history of Ukraine?

President Kravchuk. I do understand your question. Every country lived through a historic period of—the time that we are living through is very complicated. It's a period of transformation, of transfer from one system to another. Ukraine is in a very bad, very difficult situation. And friendly relationship with the United States of America, the good neighborly relations in all areas of political and economic life, is really the true historic moment. And the fact that United States of America and Ukraine signed documents which open up the way to market reforms and stronger democracy, which still have to take place on the territory of the former republics of the former Soviet Union, this is truly a historic moment.

Yes, the word has its own history, but it cannot be interpreted as an archaic word. This is the word of a very high, lofty sounding.

Q. President Kravchuk, the Ukrainian Parliament has failed to ratify the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Are you confident that it will ratify this treaty? And will the $700 million of aid that you talked about today go forward if the Parliament fails to take that step?

President Clinton. First, I am confident it will ratify the treaty. Perhaps I should let President Kravchuk speak for himself on this. I believe that because the Parliament has supported the trilateral agreement, the START Treaty, the Lisbon Protocol, which is the first step toward becoming a nonnuclear—I mean, agreeing to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I'm also confident because this country has already begun to implement its commitment to reduce the nuclear presence. And the Nunn-Lugar funds, in particular, as you know, are tied to making sure that countries can afford to do it and can reduce their nuclear capacity in a technically competent and safe way. So I feel a high level of confidence in this.

President Kravchuk again assured me today that he thought the NPT would be acceded to by the Rada and that the real problem, the

reason it hasn't happened just before his coming here, is because so many people are out campaigning, something that we all understand in this country. But I think it would be good to let him make a comment about this.

President Kravchuk. The thing is that having ratified START I and removing the reservations as to Article V of the Lisbon Protocol, the Ukraine has committed itself, the political commitment, to accede to the NPT as a nonnuclear power. This question is now open as a committing task for Ukraine. So you shouldn't have doubts about the ratification or nonratification of the NPT. As to the money which is allocated to Ukraine, that money is allocated for dismantling the weapons. And we have already started dismantling the nuclear weapons in Ukraine.

Q. This is a question to President Clinton. You have already landed in Ukraine, and that was a very short stopover. Are you planning an official state visit to Ukraine?

President Clinton. I would very much like to come back. This year I have a full schedule of travel, perhaps as much as I can accommodate this year. But I certainly wouldn't rule it out. I had such a good time on my brief stay, I wanted to do more and to see more.

Trude [Trude Feldman, Trans Features].

Q. Mr. President, I have a question for both Presidents. Are you satisfied with the progress on removing nuclear missiles from the Ukraine under the January Moscow agreement?

President Clinton. I personally am. I think they're making good progress and proceeding just as they agreed to do. Obviously, there are always technical details to be worked out. And this is a delicate matter that has to be handled with great care. But I'm personally well satisfied.

Mr. President, do you want to answer that question?

President Kravchuk. As I've already said, answering to the part of that question, the Ukraine has already begun the practical implementation of that issue. But speaking more definitely, a whole trainload of nuclear warheads is on the way to Russia. The treaty has been signed between Russia and Ukraine because this is a joint issue of removing the weapons to Russia. And Ukraine will fulfill its commitment. I also believe that other sides, other parties, would fulfill their obligations. And Ukraine would certainly stick to its commitments.

President Clinton. If I might just add one other thing, too. I think that it's important for us here in the United States to note that one of the big issues when I went to Ukraine and to Russia in January has been resolved, and that is the question of how Ukraine will be compensated for the highly enriched uranium in its nuclear arsenal.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—your recent statement about the resurrection of the Russian imperialism, would they bring damage to Ukraine?

President Clinton. Well, the United States supports the territorial integrity of Ukraine. And I personally have been very impressed that all the parties involved in the Crimean issue seem to be very responsible in their comments and their policies recently. So I think you're asking me a hypothetical which doesn't seem too probable in light of the policies and the statements which have been made.

Ann [Ann Compton, ABC News].

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, the defendants in the World Trade Center bombing were all convicted today. Do you think Americans have any reason to feel any more secure against terrorism now than they did one year ago?

President Clinton. Well, I think the authorities did a terrific job in cracking the case. And I'm glad to see that it has been handled in this way. I think that the signal should go out across the world that anyone who seeks to come to this country to practice terrorism will have the full weight of the law enforcement authorities against them, and we will do our best to crack the cases and to bring them to justice, just as they have today. This will send a very important signal around the world. And I am very gratified by the work that was done.

Ukraine

President Kravchuk. I didn't answer the question which was raised previously. I believe that our integration within the limits of the CIS does not contradict the integration in the political and economic area with the countries that make up the New Independent States. This has been foreseen by many documents in the CIS.

Ukraine does not make a task of leaving the CIS or curtailing relationship with the countries that have been created on the territory of the former Soviet Union. We believe that the joint efforts of the CIS countries and their cooperation with the Western states will give an opportunity to avoid the burdensome and heavy proc-

esses which are now taking place in Russia and in many other countries.

We cannot limit the process towards the process in Russia or Ukraine. These are universal processes, and we have to interact on them. But there is a tendency of creating difficult processes including the extremist or expansionist character. There are such tendencies, but if we act together we would be able to avoid such developments.

Q. Mr. President, this is the Ukrainian wire service. Did you discuss today with the President of Ukraine a question of providing additional material assistance to Ukraine except for the provision of assistance for the denuclearization?

President Clinton. Yes, we did. And the United States agreed to do two things. One is, we are increasing the assistance that we had previously pledged not only in the denuclearization area but in economic assistance as well, so that we will have about $350 million in each category.

Now, over and above that, we agreed to send an economic team to Ukraine as quickly as President Kravchuk says you are ready to receive them to discuss what we might do to get more countries involved in assisting Ukraine, and to speed up the timetable by which Ukraine can receive assistance from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, in Annapolis today, Republicans were calling upon Speaker Foley to hold hearings on some of these latest meetings. Would you object to such hearings? Do you think they're necessary? And secondly, do you think a stronger signal needs to be sent from the White House that you are, indeed, so sensitive to these ethical distinctions? Do you need to make other changes beyond the memo that was issued yesterday?

President Clinton. Let me say, first of all, it's up to the House to do whatever they think is appropriate to do, not for me to tell them what to do. I think that it is clear that the Republicans have behaved in a fairly blatant, bald, and totally political way in this regard. And since there is no evidence of abuse of authority on my part as President, or any of the kinds of things for which their parties and administrations were accused, and since they have often complained in the past of political motivation, I think that they would show a little more restraint and judgment in this case.

All I can tell you is, even the editorial writers, you know, they say, "Well, there is no evidence Bill Clinton did anything wrong; we're spending millions of dollars to dig around in all of this, but no one has ever accused him of doing anything wrong. We're just going to do it anyway. Now, they better not mess up the process." So I sent the message to the people who work here, "Don't mess up the process. Nobody thinks we've done anything wrong, but we, because I'm President, have had to launch this massive, hugely expensive, unusual inquiry, while everybody says, 'I really don't think anything happened wrong, but let's have this massive inquiry. Now, let's make sure they don't mess it up, and if they do, let's find them.'" So I said, "Let's don't mess it up."

I mean, I've made it as clear as I can: Bend over backwards to avoid any appearance of conflict; set up a firewall between the White House and any of the appropriate agencies; have a central point of contact if anyone calls us. You know, one of these disputed meetings arose out of press questions, for example. We have to be careful.

I think I have sent a very clear and unambiguous signal that there is no point in letting a process mess this White House up when we have not yet been accused of any wrongdoing. Since there was no wrongdoing on my part, I want a full, complete, thorough investigation. And I want it to go forward unimpeded and then to be over. I think that is in the national interest. And I'm going to do my best to make it abundantly clear that that is precisely what happens.

Yes, sir?

Ukraine

Q. Mr. Clinton, the newspaper Kiev Herald. Has there been a change in the last 5 years of your understanding of the Ukrainian situation in Europe? And if there has been a change, please present your arguments.

President Clinton. Well, I'll attempt to answer the question as I understand it. I certainly, over the last half year, have come to have higher hopes for the prospect of a full Ukrainian partnership in a democratic Europe where all the countries respect each other's territorial integrity and work together in an atmosphere of free

markets and respect for democracy and human rights.

I think that is due in no small measure to the leadership of President Kravchuk in concluding the nuclear agreement with the United States and Russia and in the efforts in Ukraine to support the START Treaty and Lisbon Protocol. I also know what a very difficult economic time Ukraine is going through. And I see the beginnings of a real effort to restructure the economy. And I believe the United States should support that.

Finally, let me say one point which has not been made yet: I was very pleased that Ukraine so quickly accepted the invitation from NATO to join the Partnership For Peace. This is just what we conceived could happen, that we could literally build a united Europe where the parties respect each other's borders and integrity and commit to work with one another to promote the peace and to protect the people of all the countries involved.

Yes, sir.

China

Q. Mr. President, Secretary of State Christopher is heading to China soon. Isn't the Chinese Government basically thumbing its nose at the U.S. by rounding up dissidents on the eve of his visit and, of course, with Congress getting ready to kick around the most-favored-nation status?

President Clinton. I wouldn't presume to know what motivated the Chinese Government. All I can tell you is that we have sent a very stern statement. We strongly disapprove of what was done, and it obviously is not helpful to our relations. I have done what I could to make it clear that the United States does not seek to isolate China economically or politically and that we want a constructive and strong relationship with them, but that the observance of basic human rights is an important thing to us, along with nonproliferation, along with fair trade rules. And that was certainly not a helpful action.

Ukraine

Q. Mr. President, this is Ukrainian Television. I have a question to both President Kravchuk and President Clinton.

Mr. Kravchuk, the Ukraine is living through a very difficult period of time. We are very active in the denuclearization policy, and Ukraine is called at the same time the stabilizing factor. What is your opinion on that? What would be the development of that issue?

President Kravchuk. We should take a look at Ukraine, not only from the position of today but also take into consideration its great economic, spiritual, human, and natural resources. The relations which are now developing between the United States and the Ukraine and the understanding which President Clinton showed and the administration of the United States demonstrated, show that they take into account exactly that perspective view, not the view of today but the view of tomorrow.

From that point of view, Ukraine can play a great stabilizing role in the future; that is one thing. Secondly, Ukraine can, with the help of rapid economic and political reforms, can introduce such principles of coexistence which are in the limits of highest standards. For instance, we do not have any problems with human rights or ethnic or interethnic or international conflicts in the Ukraine. We preserved the political calm and stability in the conditions when we are getting ready for the elections.

The most important is the economic situation. If Ukraine, by itself, and with the help of the United States and other states, will manage this economic crisis, it would be ready to use the economic potential that it has and will be able to perform its role in Europe.

President Clinton. I agree with what President Kravchuk said. I might just add one point. The United States recognizes that it is very important to be supportive as Ukraine tries to reform and get through this period of economic transition. One of the things that we've been able to do in the last year or so is to take a broad view of the need for defense conversion measures as the denuclearization occurs.

So, for example, tomorrow the President and the Ukrainian delegation will go and meet with the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Perry, to talk about what kinds of defense conversion things, that will help the long-term Ukrainian economy, can be done as part of the process of denuclearization. And that, I think, is some evidence that the United States believes that the potential of Ukraine is enormous and that we have to have a long-term view of our partnership.

Yes, sir.

Singapore Caning of Michael Fay

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you a question about a human rights case. An American young man living in Singapore has been convicted of petty vandalism there and sentenced to a caning, a punishment that is said to leave permanent scars. This would seem to outweigh the crime. And since Singapore is an ally of ours, is there anything the United States can do about this?

The President. This is the first I've heard of it. I'll look into it.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Thank you for bringing it to my attention.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. President Clinton, just a little while ago, Nabil Shaat, the envoy from the PLO, said that the United Nations is close to agreement, with U.S. backing, on some kind of international security force in the occupied territories. Can you tell us a little bit about that and what the U.S. participation in that would be?

President Clinton. I can't because we haven't made the agreement yet. I can say that there is—I believe we have some more movement in the Middle East. There is still some—I am encouraged in a way by what he said, but I wouldn't overstate it. We are continuing to inch ahead, but I don't want to jump ahead of actual developments. And I think I'd better wait and see what actually is agreed to before I can comment.

Ukraine

Q. Mr. Kravchuk, supplies of Russian gas are supposed to be cut off today because of Ukraine's inability to pay. Did you discuss this issue today with Mr. Clinton? And, Mr. Clinton, did you have any suggestions; were there any moves to help Ukraine in this instance?

President Kravchuk. Yes, I informed President Clinton about this case. We discussed this matter together, but it's hard to tell you any definite steps. But I believe that we would find a joint resolution of that process because it is related not only to the economic issues but also related to a number of treaties, including matters related to the production in the Ukraine. So far, it is very hard to answer your question.

President Clinton. Yes, we discussed it and we discussed it in some detail. I said that I would have the United States explore two or three options to see if we could find some way to avert an even worse crisis. It's a serious problem. We didn't achieve a total resolution today.

Thank you very much.

Senate Majority Leader

Q. Mr. President, have you heard about George Mitchell?

Q. Do you think you can work without him, sir?

President Clinton. I have. I would like to make a statement about Senator Mitchell, if I might.

We had a long talk about this last night. He came over for dinner and asked if he could stay afterward, and asked if I would not tell anybody. So I didn't, and it didn't leak.

I didn't know George Mitchell very well when I became President, and therefore I didn't know what to expect. After the last 14 months, I can tell you that I think he is one of the finest, ablest people I have ever known in any kind of work. There is no doubt in my mind that we would not have had the success we had last year had it not been for his incredible persistence and patience and strength. And he will be very difficult to replace. But he made this decision, I am convinced, for exactly the reasons that he will say, as he goes home to Maine to make this statement. And I think I should let him speak for himself.

He is a wonderful man. He has made a very personal decision. I will miss him a lot, and America is deeply in his debt.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 51st news conference began at 2:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. President Kravchuk spoke in Ukrainian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint Statement on Development of U.S.-Ukrainian Friendship and Partnership

March 4, 1994

On the occasion of their March 4, 1994 meeting in Washington, D.C., the President of the United States of America, William J. Clinton, and the President of Ukraine, Leonid M. Kravchuk, agree to open a new era in relations between their two nations.

In doing so, they agree to undertake to broaden the context of bilateral relations on the basis of partnership and mutual trust and respect; shared commitment to democracy, human rights and the rule of law; common goals in preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and, in the joint interest of promoting free trade, investment, and economic cooperation between the two countries.

By embracing these principles, the United States and Ukraine agree to work in friendship in the interests of the mutual well-being of their peoples and in pursuit of an enduring global peace. Embarking on this new era, the two leaders agree to work actively to implement the following comprehensive program of cooperation:

I. Security Assurances

President Clinton and President Kravchuk discussed security assurances for Ukraine and agreed on the importance of such assurances. The sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine are of key importance to the United States. In this regard, as agreed in the January 14 Trilateral Statement, the United States and other nations are prepared to extend in the form of a multilateral document security assurances to Ukraine once the START I Treaty enters into force and Ukraine becomes a non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

II. Nuclear Arms Reduction Assistance ("Nunn-Lugar")

Under the framework of the Agreement Between the United States of America and Ukraine on the Elimination of Strategic Nuclear Arms, and the Prevention of Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction of October 25, 1993, the United States of America has committed 177 million dollars in assistance to Ukraine. The United States intends to provide an additional 175 million dollars in Fiscal Year 1994 and Fiscal Year 1995. Of this, 100 million dollars will be made available in Fiscal Year 1994 for projects in the following areas:

—the conversion of the defense industry of Ukraine to civilian activities;

—the elimination of strategic nuclear arms;

—the establishment of a system of export control for the prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and,

—the development of state systems of control, accounting, and physical protection of nuclear materials.

The United States will also seek an additional 75 million dollars in "Nunn-Lugar" assistance for Ukraine in Fiscal Year 1995.

The Government of the United States of America, in consultation with the Government of Ukraine, shall expeditiously decide on the appropriate allocation of proposed assistance among these four areas. Once this decision has been made, the two sides shall expeditiously seek to conclude an agreement and three amendments specifying this proposed increase in assistance.

For defense conversion assistance, the two sides shall work to conclude a new implementing agreement between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Engineering, Military-Industrial Complex and Conversion of Ukraine.

For additional strategic nuclear weapon elimination assistance, including assistance for the elimination of SS–19 and SS–24 missiles and silos, for additional export control assistance, and for additional assistance relating to control, accounting, and physical protection of nuclear materials, the two sides shall work to amend the respective implementing agreements concluded in December 1993.

III. Economic and Commercial Cooperation

The two leaders agree that expanded bilateral economic ties and commercial cooperation can make a significant contribution to strengthening U.S.-Ukrainian relations and developing free markets, economic growth and jobs in the two

countries. In this regard, both countries attach great significance to their bilateral Agreement on Trade Relations which came into force on June 22, 1992, and are committed to carrying out its full provisions. The United States and Ukraine also agree to establish a special Bilateral Commission on Trade and Investment to expand commercial relations.

Both countries will work to reduce barriers to trade and investment in order to expand access to each other's market. The United States appreciates the importance of market access for economies in transition, such as Ukraine. The United States has already extended to Ukraine the benefits of the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences. In their efforts to expand trade, both sides will be guided by the principles of the GATT. The United States supports Ukraine's interest in formally applying for GATT membership and is prepared to provide technical assistance to help Ukraine implement a trade regime consistent with GATT rules.

U.S. private investment in Ukraine can make an important contribution to Ukraine's transition to a market economy. Both sides agree that the signing of an Avoidance of Double Taxation Treaty and a Bilateral Investment Treaty, providing comprehensive protection for investors, are important steps to stimulate private capital flows, but that they need to be accompanied by Ukrainian actions to improve its overall investment climate if the full potential for foreign direct investment is to be achieved.

Both sides agree on the importance of cooperation and information exchange in the area of science and technology. The conclusion of a bilateral Science and Technology Agreement will help formalize government-to-government cooperation in this area. In addition, the U.S. and Ukrainian governments agree to establish a special Joint Commission to facilitate cooperation in high technology and scientific research and development. The two governments agree to cooperate in the field of outer space and to hold early meetings of experts to consider specific issues and areas of cooperation in this field.

The two leaders continue to place the highest priority on the success of political and economic reform in Ukraine. The United States will provide up to 350 million dollars in bilateral economic assistance in Fiscal Year 1994 to support Ukraine's transition to a market-oriented economy and a democratic society. The United States and Ukraine also agree that international financial institutions, particularly the IMF and the IBRD, have an essential role to play in providing financial resources to facilitate Ukraine's transition to a market economy. The United States encourages Ukraine to work closely with the IMF and the IBRD in implementing a program of bold economic reforms. The United States, for its part, is prepared to exercise leadership within the G–7 to mobilize additional, multilateral assistance to support a comprehensive reform program.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Joint Statement on Economic and Commercial Cooperation
March 4, 1994

The United States and Ukraine believe that expanded bilateral economic ties and commercial cooperation can make a significant contribution to strengthening their relations and developing free markets, economic growth and jobs in our two countries. Both countries are committed to making greater efforts to develop commercial projects based on trade, joint ventures and foreign direct investment, recognizing that individual commercial and investment decisions must be made by the enterprises concerned.

Trade

Both countries attach great significance to their bilateral Agreement on Trade Relations which came into force on June 22, 1992, and are committed to carrying out its full provisions, including those covering the protection of intellectual property.

The United States and Ukraine have agreed to establish a special Bilateral Commission on Trade and Investment, chaired on the U.S. side by the Department of Commerce and on the

Ukrainian side by the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations. The Commission will prepare an action plan for promoting bilateral trade and investment. The two countries will set a date for the first meeting of the Commission early in 1994. The Department of Commerce also intends to organize a trade promotion mission, including U.S. company representatives, to Ukraine.

The two countries recognize that measures taken to reduce tariffs and non-tariff barriers can provide an important stimulus to bilateral trade. The United States appreciates the importance of market access for economies in transition, such as Ukraine. In this regard, the United States, on March 3, 1994, extended to Ukraine the benefits of the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences. This provides Ukraine with duty-free access into the U.S. market for some 4,400 products. During 1994, U.S. technical experts will visit Kiev to provide Ukrainian exporters and officials with information on the operation of the GSP program.

The United States and Ukraine desire to provide liberal and reciprocal access to each other's market for goods and services. The two countries are committed to avoiding trade frictions and to facilitate access consistent with fair trade practices and their respective trade laws. They also intend to review and seek to remove technical barriers to trade related to standards, certification and testing of products.

In these efforts, both sides will be guided by the principles of the GATT. The United States is a contracting party to the GATT and supports Ukraine's interest in formally applying for GATT membership. The United States is prepared to provide technical assistance to help Ukraine implement a trade regime consistent with GATT membership and to consult with Ukrainian authorities concerning the process and terms of GATT accession.

The United States and Ukraine will also continue their ongoing discussions regarding the establishment of an effective export control regime that will allow Ukraine increased access to U.S. goods and high technology and allow Ukraine to participate fully in the COCOM Cooperation Forum. The U.S. is ready to provide technical assistance to help Ukraine create a national export control regime.

The two leaders noted Ukraine's interest in acquiring the status of a full and equal partner in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). The United States and Ukraine will cooperate closely to help to achieve this goal, which will make an important contribution to international efforts to stem proliferation of ballistic missiles.

Investment

U.S. private investment in Ukraine can make an important contribution to Ukraine's transition to a market economy by providing capital, jobs, improving product quality and manufacturing efficiency and introducing management and technical know-how. Both sides agree the Avoidance of Double Taxation Treaty and Bilateral Investment Treaty, providing comprehensive protection for investors, are important steps and could stimulate private capital flows. Such agreements need to be accompanied by administrative, tax, regulatory and legislative changes in Ukraine to improve the overall climate for investment and to provide the necessary security and stability that investors seek. Identifying barriers to investment and exchanging information on ways to improve the investment climate in Ukraine will be an important objective of the Bilateral Commission on Trade and Investment.

The U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation has agreed to organize a conference on investment in Ukraine to be held in Chicago in July 1994. This will follow up on an OPIC-organized investment mission which visited Ukraine in 1993.

Science and Technology Cooperation

Both sides agree to continue with exchanges of information in the area of science and technology and to cooperate in identifying opportunities for scientific and space research collaboration. They agreed to conclude a bilateral Science and Technology Agreement to formalize government-to-government cooperation and to establish a coordinating mechanism to foster bilateral science and technology cooperation. With the October 25, 1993 signing of a protocol for a Science and Technology Center in Kiev, both sides place a priority on getting this Center operational as quickly as possible. The two governments agreed to cooperate in the field of outer space and to hold early meetings of experts to consider specific issues and areas of cooperation in this field.

In addition, the leaders agreed to establish a special Joint Commission to facilitate coopera-

tion in areas of high technology and scientific research and development.

Cooperation in Defense Conversion

The United States and Ukraine recognize that defense conversion is a priority task for each country and that cooperation will enable each country to meet that task more efficiently and effectively. To advance this cooperation, the two countries have established a United States-Ukraine Committee on the Conversion of Defense Industry, co-chaired by the U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Minister of Engineering, Military-Industrial Complex and Conversion of Ukraine. On January 5, 1994, U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense Perry and Ukrainian Deputy Minister of Engineering, Military-Industrial Complex and Conversion V. Pavylukov signed a statement of principles governing the work of this Committee. According to this statement of principles, the Committee will serve as a channel of communication between the Governments of the United States and Ukraine on the most important questions of cooperation in defense conversion.

Support for Ukrainian Reform

The two leaders continue to place the highest priority on the success of political and economic reform in Ukraine. The United States will provide up to 350 million dollars in economic assistance in Fiscal Year 1994 to support Ukraine's transition to a market-oriented economy and a democratic society. The United States extends this assistance with the understanding that full disbursement of this assistance will be contingent on Ukraine's proceeding with its process of reform, without which this assistance cannot be fully effective.

The United States and Ukraine also agree that international financial institutions, particularly the IMF and the IBRD, have an essential role to play in helping Ukraine create and implement a comprehensive reform program. The international financial institutions can provide significant financial resources to support such a program. The United States encourages Ukraine to work closely with the IMF and the IBRD in implementing a program of bold economic reforms. The United States, for its part, is prepared to exercise leadership within the G–7 to mobilize additional, multilateral assistance to support a comprehensive reform program.

Both sides recognize that the extent of commercial and economic cooperation currently existing between the two countries is far below its potential. They agree that the principles and objectives elaborated in this statement are the best basis upon which to expand rapidly trade and investment. The United States and Ukraine acknowledge, however, that before the full potential of their trade and economic cooperation can be realized, Ukraine must intensify adoption of a free-market system, including such elements as a dynamic private sector, the freeing of prices, and a fully convertible currency. The United States and Ukraine agree to work together to achieve these goals and to continue a process of reform which will provide the basis for the future prosperity of the Ukrainian people.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

The President's Radio Address
March 5, 1994

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about what we're doing to put America back to work and to have more good-paying jobs.

When you sent me to Washington, you entrusted me with the responsibility of turning our Nation's economy around and improving the lives of hardworking, middle class Americans, the people who were hit hardest during the recession and the jobless recovery that followed. So this administration took action, took responsibility. And in the last 13 months, we've worked to change the economic course of our country from recession-weary to healthy and growing. And that began to change the mood of our people, making us more confident again in ourselves and our possibilities.

We had to break gridlock in Congress to get discipline into the budget and to begin bringing

down our Nation's deficit. We created a healthier climate for business, leading to more investment and more jobs coming into the economy. We began to level the playing field in global trade, opening up opportunities to sell American products and services around the world. And at the same time, we began to expand access to education and training at home so that more of our people can compete and win in the world economy.

When I took office as your President, I said our goal was to create 8 million jobs in 4 years. Critics said it couldn't be done. But it can if we have the right economic strategy and if we stick with it.

The Department of Labor has just confirmed that in the first 13 months of our administration, the economy has created an additional 2,090,000 jobs, more than 90 percent of them in the private sector, so we're well on our way. In just 13 months, the economy has generated nearly twice as many private sector jobs than the total for the entire previous 4 years.

Of course it's heartening that more people are collecting paychecks and many Americans are personally feeling the economic turn for the better, maybe with a first home or a new car financed at lower interest rates. But still there are too many Americans hurting, without jobs, or people settling for part-time work, many too discouraged to even look for work, and millions and millions of Americans working harder every year for the same or lower wages. I say to those Americans, don't give up. I promise all of you, when it comes to lifting our economy and creating opportunity, we won't let up, not for an instant. When it comes to jobs, we want to create 2 million more in '94. We'll keep building on the firm foundations already set in place.

Last year Congress passed the first phase of our economic plan. It's already had a major impact on the deficit. The 1995 deficit projection has gone down $120 billion, that's 40 percent lower than it was estimated to be when I took office. The next installment of the plan is now before the Congress. It cuts spending in more than 350 nondefense programs, eliminates 100 of them outright. We are keeping faith with our goal to reduce the deficit by $500 billion in 5 years. This is the first serious effort by any recent administration to attack this deficit. And it set the stage for much of the economic progress that's been made.

Because of this progress, because of the lower interest rates, we're in a better position to compete in the world. It's a fact, once again, from agricultural products to technology and services, America is making the products the world wants to buy. Our challenge is gaining access to the markets of our competitors, and we're taking that challenge head-on, too. We've torn down trade barriers with NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, with the worldwide General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to negotiate open markets everywhere and at our conference with the Asian and Pacific nations where so much of the world's growth is occurring.

In one year, we've done more to open markets than any other recent administration, but where unfair barriers to our exports remain, we still have work to do. So this week, I signed an Executive order reviving a process to open markets called Super 301. It will help us to set priorities for opening markets around the world by identifying those practices, wherever they occur, that erect unfair barriers to American products and to the products of other countries as well. It will help us tailor our responses to these barriers to trade. And this is the payoff: 20,000 jobs for every $1 billion we sell in American exports, jobs that pay, on average, 22 percent more than other American wages. And because these jobs require the most up-to-date skills, we're moving to make our workers the best trained in the world. Next week, with the support of business and labor, we will introduce the "Reemployment Act of 1994" to bring our training programs into the 21st century, replacing the existing unemployment system with a reemployment system, recognizing that most Americans don't get called back to the same jobs they lose, and the average American will change work seven times in a lifetime.

Then later this month, I'll be in Detroit to meet with the ministers of the G–7 nations. The subject will be jobs: How can the wealthy countries create more jobs and make sure our people are trained properly for them?

Let me be clear: Of all the many important responsibilities of this office, putting America to work takes priority. Welfare reform is an important part of this picture, too. And reforming health care goes hand in hand, assuring our people that they need not fear they'll lose their medical coverage when they move from welfare to work or from their old jobs to new ones.

Make no mistake, more than 2 million jobs were created last year because we took responsibility and began to get our economic house in order. Now we have to keep our commitments to reduce the deficit, grow the economy, and create jobs. We can do that by passing this tough new budget, adopting our programs for skills, new jobs, and new opportunities. Thanks for listening.

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

Letter Accepting the Resignation of Bernard W. Nussbaum as Counsel to the President

March 5, 1994

Dear Bernie:

With deep regret, I accept your decision to resign as Counsel to the President. Your friendship and advice have meant a great deal to me over the years.

During your tenure, this Administration named the highest percentage of women and minorities to the Federal Judiciary in history, while meeting, in a vast number of cases, the highest standards set by the American Bar Association. These Judges and Justices will leave a lasting imprint on our case law, and their places on the federal bench will be clear and abiding signs of encouragement to those long excluded from administering our system of justice. Those serving, and those who can now dream of being considered, owe you a great debt of gratitude.

You played an especially significant role in the selections of Attorney General Janet Reno, FBI Director Louis Freeh, and Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—people who will make our streets safer and our society more just for years to come. They are pioneers, and yours was the lamp that lit their way.

It has been said that the best a man can give is his living spirit to a service that is not easy. And we have worked together in Washington at a time when serving is hard. But you gave this Administration one of its liveliest spirits and keenest minds, along with your special reverence for duty and friendship. For these contributions, I will be forever grateful; for your accomplishments, I hope you will be forever proud.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

Dear Mr. President:

It has been a great honor and privilege to serve you as Counsel to the President. I am proud of the accomplishments of this Administration and those that I know will be achieved in the months and years to come. I am also proud of the many contributions my office has made to the wide array of policy initiatives of your Administration.

It was also an honor to have assisted in your choice of Janet Reno to be Attorney General of the United States, Louis J. Freeh to be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Ruth Bader Ginsburg to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States. I am particularly proud of assisting in your selection of more than 60 men and women of the most distinguished and diverse backgrounds ever to serve on the federal bench.

As I know you know, from the day I became Counsel, my sole objective was to serve you as well and as effectively as I could, consistent with the rules of law, standards of ethics, and the highest traditions of the Bar. At all times I have conducted the Office of the White House Counsel and performed the duties of Counsel to the President in an absolutely legal and ethical manner. Unfortunately, as a result of controversy generated by those who do not understand, nor wish to understand the role and obligations of a lawyer, even one acting as White House Counsel, I now believe I can best serve you by returning to private life. With this letter I am therefore tendering my resignation. It will

be effective April 5, 1994, to assist you in arranging for an orderly transition in the Counsel's office.

I will always value your friendship and that of the First Lady, and will always be grateful for the opportunity you gave me to serve. I wish you both the very best.

Very respectfully,

BERNARD W. NUSSBAUM

NOTE: Originals were not available for verification of the content of these letters.

Remarks at a Habitat for Humanity Dedication Ceremony
March 7, 1994

Thank you so much, Frank. And thank you all for being here, Mayor Kelly, Carol Casperson, Mr. Walker, Reverend Weathers, and others, and especially to Vivian and Theron Miller. I have really looked forward to coming here today because, as Frank said so eloquently, this house, the work, the love, the concern that made it, reflects what I think we have to do as a people to rebuild the American community and to give this country back to our children and to the future.

I have cared a lot about and tried to support Habitat for Humanity for a long time. Millard and Linda Fuller are good friends of Hillary's and mine, and I received a letter from Millard this morning explaining that he couldn't be here today because he's speaking at the Kansas State prayer breakfast. He might have said he couldn't be here today because he's heard me give this speech so many times before—[*laughter*]—but we really owe all of this to their vision and their lifetime of commitment to service.

In the summer of 1992, on my birthday, which is also Tipper Gore's birthday, the Gores and Hillary and I worked on a Habitat project with President and Mrs. Carter in Georgia. It was one of the most memorable birthdays of my life.

I like Habitat because it makes the American dream of homeownership possible for good people who are working hard and doing their best and who themselves have to work to make this work. I like it because it involves giving and because it doesn't involve the Government, although in a place or two, for example, down in Florida after the terrible hurricane, we're trying to do a few things which will make it possible for Habitat to do more.

We're also trying to help, as Mayor Kelly said, under the able leadership of Henry Cisneros, the former mayor of San Antonio. The Department of Housing and Urban Development is working directly with Habitat affiliates all over the country to get HUD-foreclosed properties into the hands of low-income buyers. When you think about how many boarded-up houses there are in America and how many people there are living on the streets, when you think about how many boarded-up buildings there are in America and how many Vivian Millers there are out there who would give anything to have a chance to work with her friends and her neighbors and her church to get a home, it is unconscionable that we do not do more. Secretary Cisneros is committed to carrying out this administration's mission to do more, to make it easier for local governments to make more use of the HOME program, which provides block grants for affordable housing, and to put the Federal Housing Administration back into the business of helping folks buy their first loans.

Last year, FHA had its second best year in its 60-year history, insuring more than a million mortgages including 400,000 mortgages for first-time home buyers, most of them young folks in their twenties and thirties, an age group that still has a harder time buying a home today than it did in the previous generation. But we know that Government cannot do this job alone. And I have to tell you, I was very moved by what Frank Belatti said today. I have eaten a lot of his chicken over time—[*laughter*]—I think I eat more now. And I'm glad they didn't buy that ad at the Super Bowl, aren't you? And instead they purchased this home.

You know, during my Inauguration—Frank ought to give himself a little more credit, he

had already decided to build 100 homes through Habitat for Humanity. But because of the spirit of the moment, which he has so eloquently recounted, he decided that he would double it and do 200 homes and make millions of dollars in contributions to dreams for people like Vivian and Theron Miller. And it's not only the largest financial contribution in Habitat's history, it mobilized, because of that money, the volunteer efforts of young and not-so-young Habitat volunteers all across America, people who want to give something to their country, who can't afford to pay for the materials to rehab it but are more than happy to come and roll up their sleeves and work on weekends with people like Vivian Miller to make homeownership a possibility.

So today, thanks to Habitat and to this wonderful corporation and its leader and the people here in DC, Vivian Miller joins the proud ranks of America's homeowners. Before you know it, she'll be complaining of all the junk mail in her mailbox, just like everybody else. [*Laughter*] Vivian, I congratulate you and your two sons, including the one who is in college and can't be here today. Congratulations to this community and all those who made it possible. I want to once again thank your pastor and your church for supporting you and all the others who volunteered to work on this project.

I believe that Habitat has the capacity to literally revolutionize the sense of community and responsibility, caring about one another in this country. And I hope that Frank Belatti's example will be followed by business leaders throughout the country. I hope more and more people will be doing this. And I assure you that we are committed to moving these properties that can be restored and can be made living places with happy homes and happy families and stronger communities. If we can do our part, we're going to do it.

But all of you have made this possible today. This is a great day for the American spirit, and I hope all over America tonight, when people see this, they will draw renewed strength and pride and ask themselves: What can I do to make more of these things happen?

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 a.m. in Southeast Washington, DC. In his remarks, he referred to Frank Belatti, chief executive officer, America's Favorite Chicken Co. and owner of Church's and Popeye's; Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly of Washington, DC; Carol Casperson, executive director, Washington, DC, Habitat for Humanity; Wayne Walker, member of the International Board of Directors, Habitat for Humanity; Rev. Eugene Weathers of Galilee Baptist Church; Vivian Miller, a single mother who received a house through Habitat for Humanity, and her son, Theron Slater; and Millard and Linda Fuller, president/founder and co-founder of Habitat for Humanity International, respectively.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us whether you or the First Lady were ever briefed after those meetings that have now been brought under question by the Special Counsel?

The President. I'm going to have a question-and-answer session after Chairman Shevardnadze and I have our meeting, and I'll be glad to answer some questions then.

Q. Would you answer that question later for us?

The President. I'll be glad to answer questions, yes.

Republic of Georgia

Q. What can you tell us about your meeting today with Mr. Shevardnadze? Are you able to offer more help? Are you concerned about recent developments in Russia and what threat they may provide to his country?

The President. Well, the United States has strongly supported Chairman Shevardnadze and the territorial integrity of Georgia. We've done

our best to be good allies, and last year we tried to help with aid and we will do so again this year.

We want to talk a little about what can be done to help with peacekeeping efforts there and about other matters that affect their destiny in Georgia, including, obviously, events in Russia and other countries in the region. So I've really looked forward to this meeting for a long time. And I have many questions; I'm going to be listening hard today.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—U.N. troops there? U.N. troops to Georgia?

The President. Well, we want to talk about that today. We're going to have a visit about that.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:05 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

The President. It's a real pleasure and an honor for me to welcome Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze to the White House today. Few leaders in our time have earned the degree of international respect that Chairman Shevardnadze enjoys. He's a statesman whose vision and diplomacy have played an immeasurably important role in bringing a peaceful end to the cold war.

This was our first personal meeting, although we've talked by phone on other occasions. It was a productive one. We discussed the great political and economic challenges facing Georgia. We discussed the steps the United States can take to help Georgia to meet those challenges.

I reaffirmed in very strong terms America's support for the independence, the sovereignty, and the territorial integrity of Georgia. And I expressed support for the efforts sponsored by the United Nations to find a lasting political settlement to the conflict in the Abkhaz region of Georgia. I'm hopeful that the parties to that conflict can achieve in their negotiations and maintain an effective cease-fire. If they can, the United States would be inclined to support a U.N. peacekeeping operation in Georgia, an operation that would not involve U.S. military units. We've already begun consultations on this issue with the Congress, whose views and support will be important. And Chairman Shevardnadze will have the opportunity to discuss this and other matters with Members of Congress during his stay here with us.

In our meeting today, we also discussed Georgia's efforts to expand cooperation with other nations in the Caucasus region. We agreed that both our nations have a tremendous stake in the success of reform in Russia, that a democratic and market-oriented Russia at peace with its neighbors is in the interests of Georgia and the United States.

I made it clear in our talks that the U.S. is committed to encouraging greater political freedom and economic renewal in Georgia. That commitment is outlined by the joint declaration and bilateral investment treaty we've signed today.

Our commitment is also underscored by the $70 million in assistance the U.S. has allocated to Georgia so far this year. Most of these funds are dedicated to humanitarian efforts. As Georgia moves toward peace and proceeds with reform, we're prepared to increase our technical and economic assistance as well.

This is clearly a difficult time of transition for Georgia. But throughout its rich history, Georgia many times has met and overcome adversity. I'm hopeful that the renowned resilience of the Georgian people will serve them well as they build a more stable and prosperous future. As they face that work, the Georgian people are indeed fortunate to have a leader with a vision, the stature, the leadership, and the courage of Chairman Shevardnadze. And I look forward to working with him in the days ahead.

Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Shevardnadze. Dear Mr. President—President Clinton, ladies and gentlemen. Each of my sessions and meetings with the press is connected to one or another event. For instance, I appeared here before you when the INF agreement was signed and when the Soviet troops were brought out of Afghanistan. There were very many interesting historical events, *perestroika* and democratization. We had a root change in the relations between our superpowers. This meeting with you, Mr. President, is also tied to a very significant event.

It's possible that I and my country in this first, my official visit to the United States, could be one of the largest. President Clinton has just signed, and I have just signed, a declaration on the principles of relations between the United States of America and Georgia. As leaders of our governments, we have affixed our signatures and say that Georgia will adhere to the NPT.

We have made a very large, at least for Georgia, a very large step. In a series of discussions, have been talking about a whole series of important events, important for Georgia. Georgia is a very small country, but it is large in its attitude toward big political issues related to all of the other countries that now exist and that came out of the former Soviet Union when the Soviet Union passed. And I think what we now are seeing are very important events regarding the future of all of us countries in this region. As many of the other independent and sovereign countries of that region, Georgia, too, needs a lot of assistance.

The integration within the CIS calls upon us to overcome many, many problems and obstacles. But I am convinced that assistance from the West is also very important to help us go the way. No one country will be able to make it to democracy and to market economy without assistance from the outside.

One of the many conflicts on the territory of the former Soviet Union and in Georgia as well—these are horrible conflicts, but we can say that this conflict on our territory is yet only one of a whole arc, a great arc of conflicts that is taking place in our region. This is a big threat to international peace. And we should do like you said, Mr. President, today in all of our discussions, we should be very careful of our actions and our attitudes.

We have touched upon a whole series of issues related to our Partnership For Peace, the initiator of which is Mr. President Clinton. I say that Georgia actively supports you and hopes to be just as active in the implementation of the partnership of peace. That's the most important thing.

I informed President Clinton of our approach in the political settlement of the Abkhazian conflict. On the 9th of March, I'm going to appear at the Security Council session of the United Nations, and there I'm going to attempt to explain my views on this issue.

Within the visit also that's planned, where I plan to meet the heads of a variety of international financial institutions, we're going to set forth some of the greater priorities for Georgia, the investment of funds into Georgia to a stabilization fund, a democratization fund, if necessary, to help us move toward reforms.

We discussed also with President Clinton the events in Russia. As usual, I am always coming out in favor of supporting President Yeltsin and the policy that he has set forth. And I have spoken with President Clinton about some of the trends that we are seeing taking place in Russia. We are very much interested in seeing that Russian democracy flourishes, also, in other countries around Russia, and I think all of us will be working toward that success. Otherwise, the events in Russia should be viewed very closely, in very close relationship to what happens in other states and other countries.

I'm very appreciative to President Clinton for all of his support which he has shown and continues to show to Georgia, now experiencing a very, very tough time. Right now, Mr. President has just announced the necessary funds of humanitarian assistance to Georgia. I must say that if it were not for the assistance of the American people and your support, Mr. President, our people, our Georgian people, in the fullest sense of the word would be starving. Thank you. Thank you so very much.

And to the press that's here, I would like to, in your presence, to invite President Clinton to come to Georgia at any time that is convenient to you, Mr. President. Thank you so much.

The President. Let me say what I would like to do now. I'll recognize Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], and then we will try to alternate to give the Georgian press a chance to ask questions. We'll recognize the American press, the Georgian press in the alternate.

Go ahead, Terry.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, there were at least three occasions where White House officials were briefed by Federal regulators about the status of the Whitewater investigation. Were you and Mrs. Clinton aware of those contacts, and what were you told about the content of those discussions?

The President. Well, there were no briefings, and I didn't know about, for example, Roger Altman's meeting until he testified to it on the Hill. And one of the other contacts, I think, was a press contact of some kind. I was unaware of that one.

Sometime in October, I was—I became aware of—I don't know when, but sometime in October, I became aware of the RTC finding with regard to the question—the referral, I think it's called, on the question of whether my campaign benefited improperly from checks which allegedly came from the S&L, and I knew about that. That was—I don't remember when I knew about it or who told me about it, but it was just sort of presented as a fact, a decision that had been made by the Government. And I didn't think much about it at the time. It was just something that I absorbed. It was told to me just as something that the Government had decided to do. Otherwise, I was not aware of any of these things.

Now, let me remind you of what we have done in the last few days. First, to avoid any question arising in the future of the propriety of any of these actions, we have literally erected a firewall between the White House and other regulatory agencies so that any contact, in or out, relating to any of these matters would have to be cleared by and approved by the Counsel's office, so that all of these matters will be clear and proper.

Secondly, we have committed to fully support and cooperate with the Special Counsel's subpoenas to look into this. On Friday night, as soon as the subpoenas were received, the White House Deputy Counsel, Joel Klein, sent a memo to all the White House staff describing the documents called for and a procedure to fully comply. This morning, the Chief of Staff, Mr. McLarty, has sent a detailed compliance memo from Mr. Klein to all the staff setting forth the procedures that the staff must follow to make sure that compliance is full and complete.

Second, we have begun in earnest—I have, personally—a process to select a new White House Counsel. And I want to make it just exactly clear what I'm looking for. Number one, I want someone of unquestioned integrity and a lot of experience in dealing with the kinds of issues that have to come into the White House, someone who can establish processes that everyone will acknowledge are appropriate to deal with all the legal matters that the White House deals with. And finally, someone who will inspire confidence in me and in you, the press, and most importantly, in the American people that we are going the extra mile not only in this case but in all cases to deal with all matters in the appropriate way. So I think that we're doing everything we can. We certainly intend to do that. And we'll be aggressive in pursuit of it.

Yes, anyone over here? Yes.

Republic of Georgia

Q. Mr. President, I want to ask you about your feeling. What do you feel when you hear such words, "Thank you very much for your helping because your helping helped us not suffer." What do you feel when you hear such words?

The President. I didn't have my earphones on, excuse me.

Q. Mr. President, she says what do you feel when people tell you that you have saved our people from hunger and starvation?

The President. She asked: What do I feel when people say that the United States has saved many people in Georgia from hunger and starvation?

I feel a sense of gratitude that we had the opportunity to do it. Most of the people in our country understand that we are very fortunate to live here, to have the system that we have, to have the economy that we have, and that we have responsibilities and opportunities around the world that we discharge as well as we can. The people of Georgia have carried on an historic and courageous struggle. Chairman Shevardnadze has become the embodiment of that struggle for us here in America and for people all over the world. And I'm glad that, last year on a couple of occasions, the United States was able to move rapidly and to be helpful. We long for the day when you will not need it anymore. And we know that you do, too.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International.]

Hillary Clinton

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel now that your wife is becoming the focal point of the Whitewater investigation, and the Washington Times quotes three couriers as testifying that she ordered the shredding of documents? I know this is all very painful, but I wonder how it affected you in your household and——

The President. Well, let me say that the only thing that I want to say on behalf of both of us is that we want to support the Special Counsel's work and we want to ask the American people to let the process work.

Law firms dispose of their documents all the time. And I did not read the article, but I understand the article didn't purport to say what the contents of any of the files were. I can tell you this: I believe I'm a better authority than anybody else in America on my wife; I have never known a person with a stronger sense of right and wrong in my life. Ever. I could cite you chapter and verse over 20 years-plus now that I have known her when it would have been very easy for her to take a shortcut, to take an easy way out, to do something else, when she has unfailingly done the right thing. And I do not believe for a moment that she has done anything wrong. I have—I just—If the rest of the people in this country, if everybody in this country had a character as strong as hers, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got today. Now people can ask whatever questions they want, and we will do our best to comply. But I'm just telling you, the American people can worry about something else. Her moral compass is as strong as anybody's in this country, and they will see that.

Abkhazia

Q. Mr. President, the most painful problem for Georgia today is the Abkhazian issue. How do you see a specific role of the United States in the settlement of this issue, specifically? Thank you.

The President. Well, that's what Chairman Shevardnadze and I talked about, mostly, at our first meeting. The United States should support Georgia's efforts to secure a United Nations peacekeeping effort and to have the kinds of conditions that will permit the peacekeeping to succeed, for example, a clear strategy for returning the refugees to their home. The United States would not be called upon to provide troops but would want to see that the troop force was a good, balanced U.N. troop force mix, and I think we should be prepared to contribute some of the cost of operating the peacekeeping mission.

I have already opened conversations with the Congress about that. And as I said, the Chairman is going to talk to Members of Congress, and because of his long and distinguished relationship with the United States, going back to his days as foreign minister of the former Soviet Union, he has a lot of friends in the Congress, and he might well be able to have a very positive impact. He might be able to get more money out of them than I can. [*Laughter*] But together we're going to do our best to get the support.

Chairman Shevardnadze. Maybe I'll convince them to give me some money for other purposes, too.

The President. Maybe you can lobby for my health care plan. [*Laughter*]

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, your Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, said that he knew about one of the meetings with the Treasury officials. Can you tell us why he didn't seem to understand that that kind of meeting would give the appearance of impropriety? And does the fact that he didn't, diminish your confidence in him?

The President. No, because I didn't know until yesterday, I guess, that the ethics counsel for the Treasury Department had apparently approved the Altman meeting.

Let me tell you what I've told him to do. Let me just tell you what—I have instructed the staff not only to fully comply with this subpoena but to examine the records and the memories of everyone for any conceivable contact during this time period, so that any facts that need to be disclosed can be fully disclosed and completely evaluated. I think the evidence that we have certainly makes it clear that no one tried to influence any governmental procedure or do anything improper. But as I said before, last week, it would have been better if at least some of these meetings had not occurred. And we now have the firewall established which will guarantee that it won't happen in the future.

I do ask you for some sense of balance about what's going on here. I did not see it, but I understand Sam Dash was last night on television and pointed out that, unlike some previous administrations, we were fully cooperating. We were giving the records, we were giving whatever we were asked to give not only to Special Counsel. We weren't resisting, we were supporting subpoenas. This administration is determined to have a standard by which anybody else in the future will be judged in how we deal with this sort of inquiry. I just want the inquiry to proceed. I want it to have a chance to succeed. I have no reason to believe at this time that anybody did anything to influence a Government process they should not have done. But if you look at it going from here forward, I think we have procedures in place, and I will pick a White House Counsel that will assure that there's a high level of confidence about how we're operating this.

Looking backward, we are fully complying with all of these subpoenas, and we're going to find any other facts that need to be found and need to be disclosed, and we will do that, too.

Russia

Q. [*Inaudible*]—cases of democratization of Russia where they're having difficulties and where democracy is not really moving along as fast. How is some of that affecting relations between United States and Russia and maybe other countries within the CIS?

The President. Well, as you know, the United States has worked with and supported President Yeltsin because we believe that he followed policies supporting democracy, supporting reform, and supporting respect for the territorial integrity of Russia's neighbors, all three things. That is still our policy; we are interested in supporting those things. And we believe that there are ways for Russia to continue to manifest its leadership in the world and in the region and still acknowledge the importance of democracy, market reform, and respect for neighbors.

I'm very hopeful, just to take one example, of what happened in Bosnia recently, where the Russians played a very key role in helping us to create the safe zone around Sarajevo, getting the Serbs to support it. Now that we have the outline of an agreement between the Croats and the Muslims, we hope the Russians will continue to be active with us to push right through to a solution to the crisis in Bosnia.

So, am I concerned about some developments in Russia and some of the things that some of the people say in Russia that reflect ultranationalism and an extremist view and would make more difficult our future relationships with them? Of course I am. But I knew when this started that it would not be an easy course. Democracy is a difficult system to develop and to keep going. But I think basically our interests are clear, and we'll just continue to pursue our interests and our values and hope that our policy works.

Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

Republican Criticism

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering what goes through your mind when you hear critics—I guess, especially Republican critics—compare this current controversy to Watergate, and what goes through your mind when you hear someone like Senator Gramm formulate a statement by starting with the statement that "If the President wants to finish up his term . . ."?

The President. Well, I wonder why you let him get away with it. I mean, frankly, when they say things, it doesn't really bother me. They have been, on the whole, blatantly partisan, and it's obvious that they want to do something that I don't think the American people ought to let them get away with, which is to deter this administration and the entire Federal Government from meeting its responsibilities to the people. I mean, it's a good excuse for why you don't have a health care plan. Go down and have a health care retreat; you can't agree on a plan; come back and jump on this issue. And the American people will be outraged if anybody uses this as an excuse not to keep going and doing the people's business, first of all.

Secondly, the Speaker of the House was very eloquent about this last weekend. There is a huge difference here. Number one, we're not covering up or anything, we are opening up. We are disclosing. We are giving you information. Number two, no one has accused me of any abuse of authority in office. That's what Watergate was about. Number three, there is no credible evidence and no credible charge that I violated any criminal or civil Federal law 8 or 9 years ago when most of these facts that are being bandied around are discussed. I mean, this is really about a real estate investment I

made almost 16 years ago now that lost money and sputtered to a not successful conclusion several years ago. So there is no analogy except any hysteria that they can gin up around it. That's why I say I have been forthcoming; I will continue to be forthcoming. You're going to be confident in the way we handle this. There will not be a coverup. There will not be an abuse of power in this office. And there is no credible charge that I violated any law, even way back in the dark ages or years ago when this happened.

And I would just remind you, I was Governor of my State for 12 years; there was never a hint of scandal in my administration. So this is going to be a very different thing. And I think that what they do today as Republicans, as a party, may look good today. It may not look very good when the independent counsel finishes his work. And I think, you know, they ought to think long and hard about whether this sort of partisan clamor and careless use of language and careless use of the facts is really not only in the best interest of the American people but in the best interest of their party. All of us got hired here to work for the American people, not to throw off on each other. I know a lot of people in this town like to do it, but it's a very unproductive use of time.

If I did something wrong, it will come out in the Special Counsel. That's what the Republicans said they wanted. That's what most of your media outlets said you wanted. I am fully cooperating with the Special Counsel. They will find the truth. Let them do it. And let the rest of us go on with our business. That's what we got the Special Counsel for.

Russia

Q. To you and Mr. Shevardnadze, how do you feel vis-a-vis the latest events in Moscow? Is there a possibility of a rebirth of the period of the cold war?

The President. I'll give him the hard question on the theory that he hasn't talked since I have.

Chairman Shevardnadze. I've had a lot of occasions to get out and speak about this. I don't want to create an impression that we are discussing Russia's future here. It's very important to be very tactful, maximally tactful here, and let the Russians themselves figure out what they want to do in the processes in their own country.

Now, as far as the alarm, well, naturally, every honest citizen of the planet has that fear, has that alarm relative to all the events that have taken place there recently. But I very much hope that the Russian people and everyone else there in Russia will figure this out. Is there a danger? Yes. If the forces that you have in mind come to power, this is a great threat not only for Russia but also for the whole planet at large. That's what I would say.

The President. Let me answer the question and make two points, one positive, the other not so positive.

You ask, is it possible that we will recreate the cold war. In one respect, it is unlikely for sure, and that is the nuclear respect. That is, you know, yesterday the first nuclear warheads went across the border from Ukraine into Russia, as Ukraine continues its commitment to become a nonnuclear state. Kazakhstan has done the same. Belarus has done the same. We and the Russians have negotiated two major nuclear reduction treaties, and we are not pointing our weapons at one another. I think it is unlikely that that will be reversed. You never can say "never," but I think it is unlikely. So the prospect of total destruction of two great civilizations arising out of a conflict which triggers nuclear war I think is very remote now, thanks in no small measure to this man and what he did.

Now, the second thing is, how likely is it that out of frustration with the pace and the pain of economic and political reform in Russia, the Russian people will turn to leaders who will say the best way to go for the future is to find greatness the way we found it in the past, by the reimposition of some sort of empire, that if we had an empire we would be viewed as a greater nation and we would be a richer nation, and your life would be better? Anyone would have to say that given how many people are saying that in Russia, that is somewhat more likely. All I can say is that we have to—as Chairman Shevardnadze said, that is a question the Russian people will have to answer for themselves.

My job is to try to do what I can to demonstrate that it is in the interests of the Russian people to define themselves as a nation and to define their greatness in terms that will be appropriate to the 21st century, not to the 19th century and the early 20th century. And that is the best I can do, in my great hope.

Mark [Mark Halperin, ABC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, as part of your commitment to fully cooperate with the Special Counsel, will you instruct your staff that you don't wish to invoke attorney-client privilege or executive privilege, and will you ask them not to, in preparing for a grand jury, invoke the fifth amendment? And if you ask them to do that, do you see any conflict between their individual rights and your attempt, your commitment to get all of the information out?

The President. Well, I can't answer any of those questions because I haven't even thought about it. I mean, I'm telling you, no one I know, no one I have talked to believes anything violative of any law has occurred by anybody. I mean, a lot of these hypothetical questions which have been raised have been literally bewildering to me based on my understanding of the facts. And again, I will say I refer you to what Sam Dash said last night: This administration is cooperating with the Special Counsel.

When I finally realized it was—the only way to continue the work of the administration would be to have one, I was happy to have one. Even though arguably on the evidence, the criteria for having one weren't met, I was still glad to do it so that we could go on with our work. And the only thing I ask you to do is, if you can become satisfied that we are fully cooperating and that we now have procedures in place which will prohibit any improper contact of any kind and there is no evidence that any improper influence was sought to be exercised by me or anybody else over any official decision, then let the Special Counsel do its job so that we can go forward with the work of the American people. That is the important thing we have to do.

Has anybody not had a question, any of the Ukraine press not had a question—I mean, Georgian press. I'm sorry. He told me to mention something about Ukraine; I forgot. Maybe I'll remember in a minute.

Abkhazia

Q. I represent the Voice of America but Georgian service, broadcasting in Georgian language. And I would like to ask both the question. After the agreement that you reached about Abkhazia, you know that there are more than 250,000 refugees from Abkhazia from the atrocities and genocide there by Abkhaz separatists? And would you please answer me, do you think that it is enough, U.N. peacekeeping forces in Abkhazia to deploy to ensure, to guarantee the safety of Georgians in Abkhazia when they return back?

Chairman Shevardnadze. We discussed this with Mr. President Clinton in very, very great detail, all the aspects of the settlement of the Abkhazian conflict. I would even say that most of the time we dedicated to this issue. It seems to me that right now there is no other than a political way of solving this. There is just no other way. I am very appreciative to the President for the fact that he, in principle, gave his agreement to looking into this issue at the Security Council of the U.N., to have the U.N. send troops to that. This has a tremendously important meaning to Abkhazians, to Georgians, to the whole region.

I told you that I intend to come out and speak at the Security Council and explain to everyone there about my own views and my positions. Peacekeeping troops should have a certain mission. What I mean is, the safe return of refugees, guarantees of safety. Otherwise, there is no sense in sending peacekeeping forces, because new conflicts will start, new clashes.

So I think here we have a full mutual understanding with the President. It seems to me that tomorrow in my meetings with the Congressmen and Senators and other interested parties, I will be able to convince them of the way that this should be resolved. Everything else really depends on the Security Council.

Q. Because we are broadcasting today and I think the Georgian audience will be very thankful to you, to listen to your words in Georgia.

Singapore Caning of Michael Fay

The President. Thank you very much.

I don't see Gene Gibbons [Reuters] here, but the last time we had a press conference here last week, he asked me about the young man in Singapore that was sentenced to a caning, and I told you that I did not know about it. I went back and immediately read the press report in, I think maybe it was the Los Angeles Times, one of the newspapers. And then I got a report from our national security staff. We have since filed a strong protest with the Government of Singapore. We recognize that they have a certain right to enforce their own crimi-

nal laws, but we believe that, based on the facts and the treatment of other cases, similar cases, that this punishment is extreme, and we hope very much that somehow it will be reconsidered.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 52d news conference began at 2:33 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Samuel Dash, professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center and former chief counsel and staff director for the Senate Watergate Committee. Chairman Shevardnadze spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint Declaration on Relations Between the United States and the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

At their meeting at the White House, President of the United States Bill Clinton and Georgian Parliament Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze agreed on the need to accelerate the building of close and mutually beneficial relations on all levels between the United States of America and the Republic of Georgia.

The United States was the first country in which a Georgian Embassy was established after independence. This official visit by Chairman Shevardnadze marks an important further step demonstrating the significance which the United States and the Republic of Georgia attach to broadening and deepening their relationship.

The United States recognizes that the Republic of Georgia faces new challenges in ensuring its national security and is ready to work closely with Georgia to assist it in finding ways to meet these challenges. The United States and the Republic of Georgia further expressed their desire to facilitate contact between appropriate government officials with a view to broadening defense cooperation and expanding their dialogue on security issues of mutual interest.

The United States reaffirmed its full support for the territorial integrity of Georgia and pledged its continued backing for United Nations efforts to facilitate a peaceful settlement to the conflict in the Abkhaz region of Georgia.

International security can no longer be achieved through the efforts of individual states by acquiring ever increasing amounts of weaponry. Rather, security must be based on reduced levels of armaments among all nations, and on a multilateral commitment to uphold shared values, especially democracy, the inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, and peaceful resolution of disputes. The United States and the Republic of Georgia agreed that working together in multilateral institutions like CSCE and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council is an important means of promoting these goals and values.

The United States welcomes the announcement that the Republic of Georgia has decided to move forward on participation in NATO's Partnership For Peace. The Partnership provides a framework for enhanced political and operational military cooperation, including joint planning, training and exercises for multilateral crisis management activities.

The Republic of Georgia and the United States reaffirm their commitment to comply fully with the obligations of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The United States stands ready to provide technical assistance, advice, and expertise to assist the Republic of Georgia as it continues to meet these obligations. President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed that the two governments should continue to work together—and with other concerned governments—to explore ways to minimize the cost of meeting these commitments.

President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed that the independence of the Republic of Georgia and its commitment to democracy and market economic reform could make an important contribution to stability in a region of Europe that has known great tragedy and upheaval. The United States and the Republic of Georgia underscored their intention to cooperate actively to achieve this goal. The President and the Chairman agreed to protect and promote the values that bind together

the democratic community of nations, including free and fair elections, freedom of emigration, the rule of law, respect for human rights, including free speech, free press, and respect for the rights of individuals belonging to minorities. The United States strongly supported the commitment of the Republic of Georgia to develop in full accordance with these principles and its efforts to build a just and stable society where the fundamental freedoms of all peoples are guaranteed.

The United States and the Republic of Georgia expressed their determination to advance the values of economic freedom, without which democracy cannot succeed and prosperity cannot be attained. The Republic of Georgia reaffirmed its determination to build a market economy through appropriate macroeconomic stabilization policies and structural reforms to promote market development, economic recovery and growth, and to create conditions attractive to foreign investment, which will contribute to the restructuring of the Georgian economy. The United States will assist the Republic of Georgia to promote economic reform, free trade and foreign investment. Both sides recognize the importance of improved market access for their firms, and the need to ensure economic progress and to deepen economic cooperation.

President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed to work together to remove all unnecessary barriers to bilateral trade and investment. The President and Chairman signed the U.S.-Georgian Bilateral Investment Treaty today. They also agreed on the advisability of completing preparations on a treaty to avoid double taxation.

The United States reaffirmed its intention to continue providing assistance to the Republic of Georgia in the areas of agriculture, food, medicine, fiscal and monetary policy, and other areas to promote reform in Georgia. The United States expressed its commitment to continue its assistance to the Republic of Georgia in meeting the needs of the persons displaced from the Abkhazia region of Georgia.

The United States and the Republic of Georgia are also ready to expand their relations in such areas as science, energy, culture, arts, education, law, sports, tourism, youth exchanges, and new information technology.

By agreeing to cooperate to advance common political, economic, and security interests, the United States and the Republic of Georgia have laid the foundation for a strong and diversified relationship.

Remarks to the American Society of Association Executives
March 8, 1994

Thank you very much, Bob, for that fine introduction. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the warm welcome. This is the biggest stage I've been on in quite a while. I'm told it's so big because you're having the Oak Ridge Boys tonight. That made me wish I'd been invited later instead of earlier. [*Laughter*] I want to thank your president, Bill Taylor, for the invitation to come here and Bob Elsner for that fine introduction, especially what he said about health care. I guess if it were easy, it would have been done a long time ago. I look out in this crowd and see many friends of mine from across the country. I saw my good friend Neil Offen, the president of the Direct Selling Association, a minute ago. And I've already spotted five or six people in the audience that I've known for years. I thank you all for inviting me here and for giving me a chance to talk about health care today.

I'd like to just begin by trying to put this very briefly in the context in which I view it as your President. I think my job is to do everything I can to help every American reach his or her God-given potential and to try to bring the American people together to make our country stronger. In other words, even though you often don't read about it in these terms, the real purpose of our political system, when it's working properly, is to get people together and to get things done.

In the last year, we have been able to bring the deficit down, keep interest rates down, see economic growth come back into this country.

In the last 3 months of last year we had the highest growth rate in a decade, the biggest increase in productivity from American workers in 8 years. If our budget is adopted, the one I have presented to the Congress, we'll have 3 years of decline in the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President and the first real reduction in discretionary nondefense spending since 1969, if this budget is adopted. At the same time, we're moving the money around so we'll be investing more in Head Start, more in medical research, more in new technologies to support defense conversion and to rebuild the American economy. We are beginning to turn this situation around and to make this Government work for the American people.

But this year we have a lot of other challenges we are facing. The Congress is working on a very important crime bill to put more police officers on the street, to stiffen penalties appropriately, to provide alternative punishments to first-time youthful offenders, to provide some ways for kids to stay out of jail, to take assault weapons off the street. They're doing a lot of important things. That's a big issue. And the Congress is dealing with that as we speak.

The Congress will take up welfare reform, a subject on which I have worked for well over a decade now. And I hope they finally will make welfare a second chance, not a way of life, for all Americans and enable us to bring children up in a better fashion. The Congress is going to have a chance now to finally pass a campaign finance reform bill, which will increase the confidence of the American people in the way we do our business here, and a lobby reform bill.

There are a lot of issues out there. But I can tell you that if over the long run we expect the American people to be a stronger community, if we expect our economy to have the funds necessary to invest in the growth opportunities of the 21st century, and if you want your Federal Government to be able to respond to the challenges of today and tomorrow, we must address the health care crisis. It is not just a problem for individual American workers and families, it is a problem for the Federal budget and for the national investment patterns.

I can tell you, just to give you two examples, in addition to the fact that almost every American, at least those who don't work for larger businesses or for the Government, is at some risk of losing his or her health insurance or of having the inability to change jobs because someone in the family got sick, and almost every small business is at risk of having their premiums explode or their deductibles and copays explode, you also should know that this is a serious competitive problem for us. We are spending 14.5 percent of our income on health care. The Germans are just a little bit over 8 percent of their income. That's about where the Japanese are. Only the Canadians are at 10 percent of their income. If you think about spotting our competitors 5½ cents on every dollar spent, that is a significant issue. And almost all of you represent a group of business people who have personally experienced that. And as this economy becomes more global, that will become more relevant.

Now, should we spend more money than other countries on health care? I would argue we should and we must, because we invest more in medical research and technology. And we lead the world in that, and that generates jobs, opportunities, and incomes. We have these great academic health centers. Every American, just about, would be happy to pay a premium for that. Must we spend more? The answer to that is, yes, we must; as long as we have higher rates of violence and AIDS and teen pregnancy than other countries, we'll have higher bills. Does that account for all of the difference? Not even close. Not even close. A lot of it is directly related to the way we finance health care.

The second big problem you should know is this: In the budget we are adopting, we are cutting defense this year for the first time since 1969. If my budget's adopted, we'll cut nondefense spending. Social Security will go up, but only by the rate of inflation, and it's paid for by the Social Security taxes, which are in surplus. We'll have to pay more on interest on the debt as it accumulates, although not as much as we would if interest rates weren't low. The only thing in this whole budget that is really going up by more than the rate of inflation in the Federal budget is health care costs, 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And if we don't do something about it, then the rising cost of Medicare and Medicaid will mean that 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, none of you, no matter whom you represent, will be able to come to Washington and say, "How about a new airport, how about a new port, how about a new highway program? How about a new technology investment? How are you going to

keep up with our foreign competitors in the seven, eight areas of new technology that will control the future?" because we will be spending all of the money you give us in revenues on health care, while we cut everything else.

This is a huge problem. And I believe that after 60 years of false starts, we actually have an opportunity to do the right thing, that is, to give every American and every American family health security and have it be the right thing for the American economy and for the future of the United States.

For individuals, health security means freedom from fear and the freedom to prosper and the freedom to make choices that now are becoming narrower and narrower for most Americans in health care. For the Nation, it means the ability to bring health care costs within inflation, to have the chance finally to control the deficit, and to allow many businesses now struggling with this problem to be able to invest, to become more productive without having to make the decision to basically terrify their own employees by cutting back health care so much. Is this an easy problem? No. Does anybody have all the answers? No. If it were easy and someone had all of the answers, it would have been done before.

You represent more than 22,000 members who serve millions of Americans, tens of millions of Americans, engineers and teachers, pharmacists and farmers and bankers and Red Cross volunteers. Those are the kind of people served by the American Society of Association Executives. Next year you will turn 75, and for three-quarters of a century you have shown the importance of representation, of what can be done when people honestly seek to represent the genuine interest and feelings of their members and come together in a spirit of fairness and openness and try to achieve a common goal.

Well, I feel that I almost ought to be a member of this group. I could have a little tag that said the "Association of All the American People." [*Laughter*] And the members of my group want us to deal with the health care problem, and we're trying to do it. The American people want health care to be there when they need it, and they want it to be there at a reasonable price. That's what health insurance used to mean, what it can mean again.

I know that because of the opposition of various interest groups and because some of them have changed their position under withering political heat, there are some who have already said, "Well, we won't get health care reform; yet again, the people against it will prevail." Well, I say to the naysayers and the pessimists that, not quite so fast. I have seen a lot of endeavors in which I was involved over the last 15 years given up for dead, including my own endeavors, political endeavors. But it's a funny thing about our system here in America. The American people and their representatives, in the end, more than half the time, do the right thing when given the chance. Congress is starting today. I don't know how many Members of the Congress I've had tell me privately in the last week that they are actually becoming more optimistic that we will get a genuine health reform bill out that will provide health security to all Americans.

The reality is, and everyone knows this, that while we have the best health care in the world, people who have health insurance today might not have it tomorrow. People who can afford it today might not be able to afford it tomorrow. People who have choices with which they are satisfied today might lose all those choices tomorrow. Preexisting conditions today leave 81 million Americans at risk. It means they can be denied coverage or their rates can be raised or they can't leave the job they've got for a new one because they won't be able to carry insurance with them.

A lot of you represent small businesses. A lot of people would like to leave a bigger business and start their own business or might want to seek a better career opportunity that is in a smaller business than the one in which they are in. But if they have some member of their family that's been sick, they're literally trapped where they are, and they cannot do that. Three out of four Americans have lifetime limits on their policies which means that, for many of them, they can lose their coverage just when they need it the most. Two million families lose their health insurance every month, 100,000 of them permanently. We've seen an increase in the number of Americans without health insurance from 37 to 39 million just in the last 2 years.

The health care we have is good, if we can get it. But the health care financing system does not serve the American people well. It is broken. It is unfair. It leads to massive cost-shifting. It leads to, by far, the biggest paperwork burden of any health care system in the world. And

I would like to say in simple terms what I believe we should do to fix it.

First, we should guarantee private insurance to every American. Second, we should guard the right to choose a doctor and improve the quality of health care plans. Third, we should limit how much insurance companies can raise rates based on whether your business is large or small or you work for the government, whether you're older or younger or whether someone in your family has been sick. And we should make it illegal for people to drop others. But we must set up a system in which insurance companies themselves will not be forced into bankruptcy if we make it illegal to drop them, which is why it is important for people to be able to be insured in large pools. Third, we want to protect and improve Medicare and health care for older Americans. Fourth, we want to provide benefits through the workplace, because that's where 9 of 10 Americans who have insurance already get it.

Now, that's the approach. It's not complicated, although millions have been spent to make people think it is complicated; it is not all that complicated. It uses what works today to fix what's wrong today.

I know that a lot of people have seen this health security card. Don't leave home without it. [*Laughter*] But if you know how to use a credit card or a bank card or a Social Security card, people can figure this out. Under the system we have proposed, every American would get a card which stands for not a Government program but guaranteed private insurance and private health providers. The card would permit every American to choose a health care plan, to choose a doctor, to fill out one simple form, and to get health care for a whole year. And at the end of the year, Americans would be able to pick another plan or stay with the same plan or make a different decision. It would not stop any American, over and above that, from paying another private physician for some other service if that was desired. It would, in other words, give more choice than half the American work force has today in their health care plan.

Beginning by guaranteeing private insurance for all means that everyone must be covered. That's not only the only way to guarantee security, it's the only way to stop cost-shifting. As long as an insurance company can deny coverage or drop from coverage, then no one is really secure, and some Americans will have to pay the price for other Americans' health care because those who don't have insurance will eventually get health care when it is too late and too expensive, often at an emergency room. And then the cost will be passed on to all the rest of you who are paying for your health care right now in the usual way.

That is why I have said that I cannot sign and, indeed, would have to veto a bill that pretended to reform the health care system without providing a system by which everyone is covered. Because unless everyone is covered, there is no cost control, there is no end to cost-shifting, there is no real security, and there is no balance in the system. We are the only country in the world that hasn't figured out how to do this with an advanced economy, and we ought to be smart enough to do it. I mean, basically when I see all these ads that say we can't do it, I say, these people are telling me my country is dumber than these other countries. I don't believe that. Or they are telling me that the price of having great health care and great teaching hospitals and great medical research and extraordinary technology is that you have to have some people who don't have anything and all the rest of us have to pay for that besides. I don't believe that. That cannot be true.

The benefits package ought to be comprehensive enough to encourage primary and preventive health care because that saves money over the long run. That's a very important part of this. You think about it: Immunizations, mammograms, physicals, prescription drugs, all those things actually avert our health care costs when properly done and keep us healthier. We spend too much time in America treating people when they are sick and not enough time keeping people healthy in the first place.

Secondly, we want to preserve and enhance choice as the best guarantee that the quality of American medicine will remain the best in the world. People should be able to choose on their doctors and their health care plans; it guarantees quality. Under our proposal now, everyone would have a chance to make at least one from among three choices, at a minimum, every year. You could choose traditional fee-for-service medicine; you could choose an HMO, for example; you could choose a preferred provider organization that physicians and others organized themselves. But every year you would be given the chance, once again, to make that choice under our proposal. This is important. More and

more people under the pressures of the present system are living with shrinking choices. And a lot of people are quite properly worried that those shrinking choices will not only interfere with their choice but will interfere with the quality of health care.

There have been a lot of articles written in thoughtful publications in the last few months pointing out that choice is a rapidly vanishing facet of American health care today, and that in fact the attack on our plan as limiting choice is simply not true; that by guaranteeing at least three choices and that you get to make a decision every year again, that we are building into this system a higher level of choice and therefore a guarantee of competition and quality that otherwise would not be the case.

Now, the other thing that I want to say about this system is that affordable insurance should be there and should not be able to be taken away. That's why we want to make it illegal for rates to be raised unreasonably or for coverage to be dropped based on age or previous condition of illness. And we know that in order to do that and be fair to the private insurance companies, we have to let people be in large pools. That is, this is what all of you know as community rating. That's the only way you can guarantee that small businesses and self-employed people and farmers, for example, through some sort of cooperative system, can have access to the same good rates that people in big business and Government do, still have community rating, not discriminate against the old, not discriminate against the worker who's had a sick child or a spouse with cancer, and not bankrupt the insurance companies. If they're going to be able to be a part of this, you have to have some system of community rating.

These steps are very important. They put the control of the health care system of America back into the hands of the American people on the one hand and health care providers on the other. Today, the control is determined by the financing, and it is in the hands of the insurance companies. And very often they do what they do because of the way we are all organized and divided, so that even if they don't want to do something that has a harmful effect, the economics of their business dictate it because of the way the system is set up.

We can't permit that to go on anymore. The American people should have the power to choose. The American health care providers should have the power to deliver. There should be incentives to control cost through competition and requiring people to take some responsibility for their own health care. But it should not be organized the way it is now so that the people who are providing the financing in the middle have all the control and themselves are in a position not to make it fairer for many people. We cannot have the security of millions of our people in jeopardy, with a system that they are basically satisfied with when they have it but which could vanish overnight.

Another thing I want to say, because there have been a lot of questions about this, is that there's another part of our system we shouldn't mess up: Medicare is one of the best things about American health care because it works and has very low administrative costs, providing health security for millions of older Americans. The question is, how do we keep Medicare healthy as our population gets older? The fastest growing group of Americans in percentage terms are people over 80—hope to be one of them before long. [*Laughter*]

But how are we going to do that? How are we going to take care of our own as health care costs keep rising? We believe that we have to keep Medicare but that we have to recognize that the present system is heavily tilted toward institutionalized care which will (a) not be necessary for some people and (b) which will be explosively expensive as the percentage of our people living in higher age brackets goes higher and higher and higher. So our system, number one, covers prescription medicine along with Medicare, which Medicare doesn't do now—because we believe there is ample evidence that that keeps people healthier and will save money over the long run; a year's worth of medicine might cost the same thing as a day or two in a hospital—and secondly, by beginning to phase-in a long-term care system where we give people some help for making noninstitutional choices, for keeping their parents at home or finding adult day care centers or having in-home care. Because otherwise, you're looking at a population, by the turn of the century and the end of the first decade of the next century, which we simply cannot afford to maintain and would be bad for our country, unless we have more different options to deal with this rapidly aging population.

So under our proposal, if you get Medicare you keep it, which also includes the doctor of

your choice and medical security. We achieve some savings in the Medicare program by bringing the rate of inflation in Medicare down to twice the rate of normal inflation. When you hear there are all these cuts in Medicare, don't believe it. We're just going to bring the rate of inflation down to twice the normal rate of inflation and take those savings to pay for prescription medicine and to pay for the beginnings of a new and more comprehensive long-term care system. This is, again, terribly important. We cannot do anything to mess up health care security for older people. But we must strengthen it.

Finally, I think we should guarantee these benefits at work. And this is, after all, among the organized folks the most controversial decision of all. Nine out of ten Americans who have private insurance get it at work. Eight out of ten Americans who don't have any insurance have someone in their family who works. Expanding the present system lets us reach out to most of the uninsured and is based on shared responsibility. It is the easiest and simplest way to accomplish the goal. It's also the right thing to do. You can never stop cost-shifting until everybody's got insurance.

Consider this—I just mentioned welfare reform earlier—if we take a welfare mother with two little kids who says, "I hate welfare, and I want to get off of it, and I want to support my children," and you give that fine person job training, and then the woman finds a job. And she goes to work for a small business at an entry-level pay slot, because she got a very limited education, and no health care benefits at the office. And that woman goes from getting a welfare check to getting a paycheck; she begins to pay taxes. She is now paying taxes for someone who made a different decision, who stayed on welfare to keep getting Medicaid, the Government-funded health care program for poor people, which she has given up to go to work. That, by the way, is the central reason that we're having some difficulty moving people from welfare to work. People don't want to hurt their children. Again, this is a system that no other country has. So we have to find a way to do it.

Now you say, well, but it's really tough on restaurants who have a lot of young people who are healthy and who don't want to pay for health insurance anyway. Or it's tough on people who have a lot of part-time workers. Some do and some don't; UPS has over 100,000 part-time workers and insures them all. But you say, it's tough on businesses with part-time workers, and it's certainly tough on small businesses that are eking by. But that is why we reasoned that if we do this, we have to give substantial discounts for small businesses with low average payrolls, low profit margins, difficult times. There are big discounts written into this bill for just that purpose. And the self-employed, for the first time, under our bill, get 100 percent tax deductibility, not limited tax deductibility as they do now. These things will make this insurance more affordable, plus which, if small businesses and self-employed people are in larger pools, they will not be paying higher rates as they do now.

One reason small business people have to either not cover their folks or reduce coverage every year is that the average small business premium is 35 percent higher than the average government premium or big business premium. And you can't blame people for doing something in the face of those kinds of economics.

Another reason is, as a restaurant owner told me—the other day I was in Columbus, Ohio, and this restaurant owner said to me, "Look, I'm getting the worst of all worlds. I have 20 employees full-time and 20 part-time. And I was sick 5 years ago, so our rates went up." It was an eating establishment. She says, "I cover my 20 full-time employees. I don't cover the part-time employees. I feel guilty that I don't cover the part-time employees and mad that my competitors don't cover the full-time employees, and I'm having to pay higher rates because we had one person, me, in our group of 20 that was sick." So the rates go up, and the deductibles go up. She said, "I'm getting the worst of all worlds, too high insurance, my competitors have an advantage because I'm covering my employees and they aren't covering theirs, and I feel just terrible that the part-timers don't get any insurance at all." She said, "I would gladly do it all if everybody were treated the same way and we had access to competitive rates."

So I would argue that this is still the fairest and best way to make sure everyone is covered, discounts for smaller business, full deductibility for the self-employed, and a system which permits us to overcome the discrimination in rates that small business endures today.

So again, this is a private health care system; it builds on what has worked; it is not more Government and more bureaucracy. It uses

what's right about the American system, the health care, and fixes what is wrong, the financing. It guarantees permanent private insurance, safeguards the right to choose a doctor and a plan, limits how much rates can be raised because of categories and makes it illegal for people to be dropped, protects and improves Medicare and the health care of senior citizens, and provides health benefits to the workplace.

Now, the largest associations of America's family physicians, pediatricians, nurses, and pharmacists have supported this health care plan. Our approach was not designed to hurt anyone. It did have to make some difficult choices. It was designed for the American people. It was about giving life to our best values and dealing with one of our biggest problems. It was about giving families who work hard and do their best to raise their kids the security they deserve; stopping people from paying more because of the irresponsibility of others; stopping a situation in which 8 million older Americans, every month, who are not poor enough to be on the Medicaid program but are on Medicare and have to have medicine every month, 8 million, choosing between food and medicine. It was, in short, about dealing with a problem that is only going to get worse unless we fix it now and doing it in a way that does not interfere with what is finest about our health care system. It's about, ultimately, the freedom of the American people to be free from fear, the freedom to preserve choice, the freedom to preserve quality, and the freedom to grow and prosper into the 21st century, putting our values to work and believing that it is irrational to say that we can't do something that our competitors have figured out how to do.

That's why I think this year we will give every American the freedom that only real health care security can mean. I would encourage you to participate in this outreach, to respond to your communities, the people you honorably represent, not to agree with every jot and tittle of everything in the plan we have presented. If we involve thousands of people and work for months and we know how complicated this is, but the basic things we have to do are fairly simple and straightforward. And we ought not to be in a great political campaign to maneuver symbols here. We ought to be involved in a great national debate of the American family to produce results that will genuinely solve this problem.

And so, my fellow Americans, let me end where I began. You represent an awful lot of the American family. You know how the people you represent would be affected by certain changes that were made. The Congress is beginning to debate in earnest. I ask you to support health security for all Americans. I ask you to support doing it through the workplace. I ask you to support preserving Medicare and preserving choice and giving small business people and self-employed people a break. I ask you to support those things. I ask you to enter into this debate and help us to fashion a plan that will meet those objectives. I ask you to do it with a good spirit, with a fair heart, with a sense of commitment to this, because you cannot succeed over the long run with the particular objectives of your group and we cannot succeed over the long run as a whole people unless we face this.

If we had done it earlier, it would have been less complex and easier. We'd still have problems with the health care system, the problems with this never go away in any country, but at least it would not have us by the throat, financially and emotionally. We can do this, we can do it this year, and we ought to do it. People like you will speak not with one voice on the details, but with one voice on the urgency of the mission.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. at the Washington Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Bob Elsner, chairman, American Society of Association Executives, and country music entertainers the Oak Ridge Boys.

Remarks Announcing the Appointment of Lloyd Cutler as Special Counsel to the President and an Exchange With Reporters

March 8, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to announce the appointment of Lloyd Cutler as Special Counsel to the President, a position I know he will fill with distinction.

Lloyd Cutler is a fitting person to fill this important role. He was Counsel to President Carter, a leading member of the American bar, one of our foremost experts on issues of governance, ethics, and the Presidency, a person who has demonstrated throughout his career an abiding commitment to the values and to the ethic of public service.

In Lloyd Cutler, the White House has secured the service of a man of seasoned judgment, impeccable professional credentials, and the highest ethical standards. He'll provide a firm, uncompromising, and steady hand in a position of the utmost importance to me and to my administration.

In selecting a new Counsel, the criterion of greatest importance to me was that we find an eminent lawyer who could step into the role immediately and bring to the job the stature, the standards, and the experience that the American people expect. In short, I wanted a Lloyd Cutler-type of lawyer, so I just decided I would go to the original first and see how I could do.

There is nothing more important to me or to this administration or to our ability to carry out the agenda of change and renewal that brought us here than to secure, maintain, and deserve the trust of the American people. Throughout my career, I have been committed to the highest standards of public service, and so has Lloyd Cutler. I'm glad he has been willing to answer the call to service once again.

In welcoming him to the White House, I also want to again express my deep gratitude for the service that Bernie Nussbaum rendered this administration. His leadership contributed markedly to the appointments of Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Attorney General Janet Reno, the FBI Director, Louie Freeh, and, I believe, the best qualified and clearly the most diverse group of American Federal judges in our history. I will always be grateful for that service and for his friendship.

While Lloyd Cutler will play an important role in maintaining the highest ethical conduct in this administration, let me emphasize this point: On ethics, as with every other issue, it is the President who must set the standard. At this stage in his career, a stage at which no one would have blamed him for resting on his laurels and resisting this entreaty, Lloyd Cutler has chosen once again to roll up his sleeves and to serve his country. And for that, I thank him.

Welcome back to the White House.

Mr. Cutler. Mr. President, I am honored by this appointment, and I will do my best to serve you and the country. And I am especially honored to have the opportunity to serve under this President who has already accomplished so much in just a short year and has so much promise of achievements to come.

This is hardly the way I expected to spend the spring of 1994. I am a senior citizen, you can see, and from direct experience, I know the intensity and the rigors of this job. And I have, therefore, limited my commitment with the President's permission—I had to negotiate hard for it—to a period of months.

The role of White House Counsel has many aspects, but I intend to concentrate on what the President just told you is his goal, that the procedures and the actions necessary to maintain public confidence in the integrity and the openness of the Presidency. In Government, as in other aspects of life, trust is the coin of the realm. And Mr. President, I pledge myself to do what I can to assure that that trust is maintained.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us about other contacts that your aides have acknowledged now that emerged through the document search, and the interviewing that had apparently taken place between regulators and White House officials, and what you know about it? And secondly, can you tell us whether you will agree to Mr. Leach's request that your Chief of Staff and other top officials testify before the House Banking Committee?

The President. First, let me say that based on what we know, based on what we know now—and remember I asked everybody to go find out everything they could find out—any contacts were incidental and were followup conversations which had nothing to do with the substance of the RTC investigations. This, like everything else, is an issue on which we intend to cooperate fully with the Special Counsel. We welcome his inquiry. We want to clear the air, and we will do that.

With regard to the question of hearings, maybe I ought to let Mr. Cutler respond to that since it's the first thing we'll be dealing with. But we have discussed it, and I am fully in accord with his recommendations. So maybe I should let him——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—recommendations?

Mr. Cutler. Well, as I understand it, at this point, the Special Counsel has requested the congressional committees not to hold hearings, and that request is still under consideration by the House Banking Committee. But if the House Banking Committee should decide to ask the list of people who Mr. Leach has identified to testify, it would be my recommendation that everyone in the White House cooperate.

Q. How will you handle your own personal divestiture from your law firm, conflict of interest issues for yourself? Are you going to go through the usual recusal that a White House Counsel who would stay a long time would go through?

Mr. Cutler. Yes, I am, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President, do you think you made a mistake by not bringing in Washington insiders into your administration in the first place, since you obviously, every time there's a crisis, you'll fall back on them? And while I have the floor, Senator Dole has said that congressional Republicans will campaign against Democrats if you don't go along with holding hearings. I know that won't come as a surprise, but——

The President. Let me answer the first question first. I think that when we started out this administration, we had a lot of Washington experience in the Cabinet and not as much in the White House. And I think that the culture here and the whole procedures here are quite different than they are in most any other place in the country. And I think it's something we have to be very sensitive to.

I also think, as I said before and I'll say again, it's important for me that I have a high level of confidence in the procedures, that the way we're operating is the right way to operate, and that you have a high level of confidence in the procedures. Because I can tell you, I'm not going to do anything to abuse my authority. I'm not going to knowingly ever do anything to undermine the respect of the American people for the Presidency. And I think Lloyd Cutler can help us to do that.

Now, on the question of what Senator Dole said, I will just remind all of you one more time that it was all the Republicans who were clamoring for a special counsel—clamoring, saying this is all we want. And then all of you wanted it. And all I've tried to do is to cooperate fully with the Special Counsel and to let the Special Counsel do his job. If the Republicans are finally being honest that they want to make political hay out of this and that that's their real concern, I think the American people have noticed that a long time ago. I think it is obvious to them. And I think that it's not for me to give them political advice, but I do not believe that the politics of personal destruction is what the American people are interested in.

I am cooperating. I am not doing what some people have done in the past. I am cooperating. I am being open. I'm going to work to make this whole process a success, and I'm going to let the other people do and say whatever they want to do.

Q. Mr. President, does your recruitment of a Lloyd Cutler say something about at least the perception of a lapse of ethical judgment?

The President. Well, I think, you know, maybe I ought to let, again, Mr. Cutler say something about that. I do not have any information that anyone has done anything wrong, that anyone has tried to use the authority of the White House in any way, shape, or form. And I can tell you for darned sure, I haven't. And I would—there's a difference in perception and—perception is something like beauty; it's in the eye of the beholder. And as I said, one of the things that I want to do is to make sure that we have procedures here where there will be no doubt of that. I think we've already done that by constructing a firewall so that we can't have information even coming in to us, even if our people are passive recipients of it, unless it is an appropriate thing to do. And I think

Mr. Cutler agrees that it was the right thing to do.

Q. The First Lady is quoted in a magazine interview today as ascribing the Whitewater matter to what she calls a, quote, "well-organized and well-financed attempt to undermine my husband and by extension myself." She isn't any more specific than that. Would it now be appropriate, sir, for her to hold a news conference to explain what she means by that and to answer questions about her role in this and other matters, sir?

The President. I think I'll let her speak for herself, but I think surely it has not escaped you that this is not a disorganized set of comments we're getting out of the Republicans, that this happened over a long period of time, and that the nature of that has not been looked into with anything like the intensity or longevity of the matter itself. But no, I think her words speak for themselves. She's perfectly capable of speaking for herself.

Q. Well, could I follow up by asking Mr. Cutler if that's what he thinks is behind this whole matter, and that's the problem he's trying to rectify?

Mr. Cutler. I think I'll stick to giving legal advice.

Q. Mr. President.

The President. Yes.

Q. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, D'Amato, was on the Senate floor this morning, and despite your passionate defense of the First Lady yesterday, he said, specifically referring to Mrs. Clinton, quote, "Were you briefed by your Chief of Staff, Maggie Williams, about her meeting with Roger Altman, the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, and did you know it was wrong?" Do you know if Mrs. Clinton was briefed by Maggie Williams about that meeting that Roger Altman had here at the White House?

The President. Is Senator D'Amato aware that there was an ethics council opinion that the meeting was not improper? Maybe the ethics council was wrong. Look, the Republicans have decided that Senator D'Amato will be the ethical spokesman for the Republican Party in the Congress. That is their right to do that. I'm not in the business of answering his questions. I am cooperating with the Special Counsel.

Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

Q. Mr. President, when Bernie Nussbaum gave you his letter of resignation, he said that he felt that he was the victim of an unfair standard in Washington about what a lawyer should be to a President. I would like to ask you and Mr. Cutler whether you agree with Mr. Nussbaum's assessment.

The President. I think there is—I think all of us recognize—I saw where one of the Washington lawyers the other day said there was a curious navigation in this community between law and politics and the press about what is perceived to be ethical or not ethical. I think it is clear that I don't think Bernie Nussbaum thought for a minute he was doing anything wrong or thought for a minute he was doing anything other than trying to represent the President in a perfectly appropriate way.

We are looking into and the Special Counsel is going to look into the facts here. I don't want to comment about that. I can say that I do not believe that he thought that he was doing anything amiss.

Mr. Cutler. I've been a personal friend of Bernie Nussbaum's for quite a while. I talked to him when he first came down as Counsel. I agree with the President that Bernie has never had an unethical or improper thought or bone in his body. He must have believed that everything he did was entirely correct. And at least based on what I've read in the newspapers, it isn't at all clear that any of these meetings were called by him.

Q. I didn't hear——

Q. If I could just follow up——

Mr. Cutler. I said it is not clear that any of these meetings were initiated by him.

Q. Speaking more generally about the role of the Counsel, and whether the Counsel is supposed to be—whether the Counsel is unfairly held to a standard, when he says he's supposed to represent the President no matter what?

Mr. Cutler. The Counsel is supposed to be Counsel for the President in office and for the Office of the Presidency, as many people have said. Most of the time those two standards coincide. Almost always the advice you would give the President is advice that is in the interest of the Office of the Presidency. I don't think there is much of a dichotomy between the two. When it comes to a President's private affairs, particularly private affairs that occurred before he took office, those should be handled by his own personal private counsel and, in my view, not by the White House Counsel.

Q. May I follow up on that, sir? Without the benefit of hindsight, let's consider hypothetically, had you been White House Counsel, would you have raised some kind of flag about the meetings to which Mr. Nussbaum was privy? Do you think you would have?

Mr. Cutler. That's like, would you have passed on third down or would you have had a draw play. I don't want to get into that.

Q. Would that be clear in your mind? You would not know if it were clear in your mind?

Mr. Cutler. I'd have to know the facts and the circumstances, and I think Bernie Nussbaum had a lot of bad luck.

Q. Will you let such meetings go forward in the future then? Are you saying that this would be appropriate in the future?

Mr. Cutler. Steps have been taken to be sure that any such meeting in the future would be a meeting that the White House Counsel would decide whether to hold or not, and that is what has been done.

The President. Let me explain that, if I might. If you'll note that there was—I think the problem here, and this may go to the questions that all of you are asking, including the question Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International] asked, is that there was a certain—and your perception of it, I think, may be rooted in the fact that there was a certain kind of ad hoc quality to it. That is, what we should have had and what we now have is an organized firewall, so that an advance judgment would have to be made before every meeting and every telephone conversation by someone charged with the responsibility for making that judgment and someone with the requisite knowledge to make it. That, I think, is the problem, so that these things that don't just happen by happenstance in an area which is highly charged and of great public interest. I think that is the issue, is setting up a system.

We believe we now have a system that will work. So that if in the future you come to us and say, "Was there a meeting? Was there a conversation?" we'll be able to say, "No, there wasn't," or, "Yes, there was. Here's what happened. Here's who approved it. Here's why it occurred." Boom. And instead of having what happened happen, where everybody tries to go back and reconstitute, in effect, a set of things that just sort of occurred in serial fashion where there was no organized dealing with this, I think we have dealt with it now in an appropriate way. I don't think we will have this problem again.

Q. Mr. President, there have been any one of a number of aides or officials who have blamed a lot of the, whatever you want to call it, mess that we're dealing with here, as you've said, not on any sort of allegation of wrongdoing or criminal admission of a sort but on the way things were handled. You've talked about how this issue is going to be handled from here on out. Is anything going to change in the way the operation is done here that would guard against the way the White House handles issues of this sort so as to prevent another Whitewater from coming up?

The President. First of all, let's just talk about this. Now, remember, be careful when you use language. This White House has not initiated any effort to do anything improper. This White House has not attempted to cover up any information. We are uncovering information and making extraordinary efforts to do so. What we are trying to do is to have some daily procedures here that will—and systems that will guard against any misunderstandings of this kind in the future. Do we need some changes in the system? Is Lloyd Cutler the person to help us do that? I think the answer is yes. I think he understands how to strike the proper balance in what kind of institutional changes we might have to undertake and just in the way we operate here so that the Office of the President and the President in office can both be properly represented.

Q. Could I follow that, sir? You have not even been accused of doing anything improper, and yet, look at the cost: diversion from your policies, from your message for weeks, if not months. Are you bitter about this, sir? And are we wrong for pursuing it the way we have? The press corps, I'm talking about.

The President. The answer is—am I bitter about it? No.

Q. Why not?

The President. Because I think as you grow older, bitterness is something you have to learn to put aside. As you strive to be more mature, one of the things you have to give up in life is your bitterness about everything. You have to work through that. That's part of my personal mission in life. It has nothing to do with being President, really.

I also think you can't be a very good President if you're consumed with bitterness. If I wake

up every day all agitated about this, then I can't deal with the problems of the people. If I'm thinking about me, I can't be thinking about them. The American people hired me.

Now, you will have to make a judgment. The only thing I have—I will just reiterate what you said. I've still not been accused of anything wrong, because I haven't done anything wrong. And I'm not going to do anything wrong. I revere the responsibility that I have been given, and I am not going to abuse it.

Do I expect to learn something out of this? Do I expect Lloyd Cutler to bring something special to this White House and help us to then have a procedure that has the confidence of you and the American people? Yes, I do. I think we'll do better.

Do I think we're in danger of spending too much time on it? That's why I wanted the Special Counsel. If you'll go back, when I had said—I said, I'm for the Special Counsel. Let him do the job. Let us do that. Let's don't fill the airwaves talking about something that we need to draw definitive conclusions about, and that's what the Special Counsel will do. And I hope earnestly that we can go back to doing just that. That's what is in the public interest, to let the Special Counsel do the job and not clutter up the public life of this country with something that's going to be clearly and firmly resolved, eventually.

Q. I'm a little bit confused with the procedures that have been in place since the start of your administration. They were reiterated after these meetings were discovered. I'm a little confused about what exactly in the next 6 months you expect Mr. Cutler to do, and maybe both you and he could talk about what you think he'll bring, other than the symbolism of his presence.

The President. First of all, the procedures have not been in place. We never had any—if you go back to the facts as we know them and based on what I know, based on what you know, based on what's been reported, we did not have a centralized system for saying, hey, all these issues, before there is any contact, even if all we're doing is responding to somebody else, there needs to be some central vetting point. That is a significant firewall that we have created that did not exist beforehand.

Maybe you want to say something else.

Mr. Cutler. In the future—and many of these processes have already been put into effect by the Deputy Counsel—in the future, whenever a question arises as to whether a particular meeting should be held or a communication should be made or received, relating to an investigation or an enforcement action concerning what we might call a high political person, someone in the White House or high in one of the Cabinet Departments, it will be the White House Counsel who will after careful reflection decide whether there should be such a meeting or a communication. And he will make a careful record of what happens so that it will be available if questions are raised later on.

There are many, many communications between the President and the President's lawyer. After all, the President is the enforcement official of the Executive branch. It is his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. And there are many entirely proper communications with the enforcement authorities about policy, about cases being brought against third parties—about cases being brought, for example, against, let's say, a Republican Member of Congress—where the President might need a heads-up because it may be a big news event. All of those things are perfectly normal and perfectly proper and have always existed.

There are other cases where a meeting or a communication, either because no record is made—even though the communication was innocent, nobody can really prove what happened—there are many cases where it is inadvisable to have that kind of communication. And the decision will have to be made, and it will be made by the White House Counsel and the Deputy Counsel as to whether there should be a communication or not.

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on a question from yesterday that perhaps you've had a chance——

The President. Wait, let him go first.

Q. All right, I'm sorry.

Q. Mr. Cutler, you said that you will remain aboard for 130 days. But the special prosecutor seems to have taken rent out in Little Rock for a longer period of time. Would you reconsider, sir, staying longer if the case merits your presence here?

Mr. Cutler. I've put a limit on how long I would stay in part because I know how tough a job this is and I know how old I am, in part because I'm married fairly recently to a very young and peppy wife and I want to spend

some more time with her. If something happens, I'll decide when the event comes. [*Laughter*]

The President. I can't compete with that. [*Laughter*]

Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio], go ahead.

Q. Thank you, sir. To follow up on a question that came up yesterday that perhaps you've had a chance to discuss with Mr. Cutler, have you decided whether you're going to be able to preclude invoking executive privilege and the lawyer-client relationship in response to all of these inquiries?

The President. Well, let me say this. I don't know that—obviously, I have no way of knowing what will come up. But it is hard for me to imagine a case in which I would invoke it. In other words—again, I can't imagine everything that—it's difficult for me—I thought about it a little bit, and we've talked about it a little bit. My interest in here is to get the facts out, fix the procedures for the future, get the facts out about what was known here and what happened, and cooperate with the Special Counsel. So I can't—it's hard for me to imagine a circumstance in which that would be an appropriate thing for me to do.

Go ahead, Karen [Karen Ball, New York Daily News].

Q. You were covered by the subpoena for documents. Did you have any notes or memos or anything that you had to give to—to pass on to Mr. Fiske?

The President. I didn't in my possession. I told them that any notes I have—if I make any handwritten notes about any kind of conversations that occur to me, I give them all to—I would have given them to Mr. Podesta or someone in the White House to file in an appropriate way, so they can go look and see. I don't remember any that I have.

Q. You didn't search——

The President. I didn't because I don't have any in my briefcase that I take home at night or anything like that. I have no such documents.

Q. Are you saying, Mr. President, that you don't keep a diary?

The President. That's correct, I do not. I do not. We keep regular—we keep very detailed records, obviously, of people I meet with, telephone calls I make. Sometimes I make extra notes on meetings and extra notes on phone conversations, and when I do, I put those in a file. But I don't keep a regular diary in the sense you mean that, no, I don't.

Q. Are there any tape recordings of conversations made in the Oval Office?

The President. To the best of my knowledge, there are not. If there are, someone else made them, not the President.

Q. Mr. President, it's been 2 years since this story first emerged on the scene, almost exactly, I think, to the day. And since then, of course, it's gone out of public view, and then it's come back several times, now apparently bigger than ever. To what degree do you think that you and your White House are responsible for the fact that this has now emerged bigger than ever?

The President. I don't know, because—I've done what I could to answer what I know about this. I don't know that—what I know about this—I don't know that anything new has happened in terms of the facts, except that there was the—whatever was happening about other people involving the S&L issue. But it's still what it always was; it's a real estate investment I made 15 years ago that I didn't make money on.

Q. But you don't think your staff and your White House bears any responsibility for the fact that this matter hasn't been put to rest?

The President. I don't know how we could put it to rest except—because no one has produced any credible evidence of any wrongdoing on our part. I don't know what we could do. I've tried to answer the questions that were asked.

Now, in this last flurry around what meetings were held or communications or conversations were held, that's a different issue, Carl [Carl Leubsdorf, Dallas Morning News]. That's—obviously, that raised a lot of flags for a lot of you, anyway. And we're trying to resolve that. But quite apart from that, we've tried to do what we could. We've given what records we had, first up to a Republican prosecutor who was appointed by the Attorney General, and then to the special prosecutor; we have pledged to fully cooperate. I simply don't know what else we could do. But I'm willing to try to do anything I can to be cooperative with the special prosecutor, and I will continue to do it.

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on the question from yesterday, someone asked you yesterday whether you had ever been briefed after the fact about these two meetings in question

in the White House. You said you had not. Bruce Lindsey is one of your——

The President. No, no, wait a minute. Someone asked me if I had been briefed about—I think there were three issues, weren't there? There was a meeting about a press matter. Then there was the Altman meeting. Then there was a—I think there was a telephone call or something that said—about the RTC referral dealing with the question of whether my campaign might have been the beneficiary of a fundraiser where the checks came out of an S&L. I think those were the three issues.

And I said that I had not been briefed on that. I did not know about the Altman meeting until he testified about it. I did not know about the press meeting until that whole discussion, until it became public. Some time in October, I do not remember when, I learned about the RTC referral. My clear—I don't even remember when or exactly how I learned about it, but my clear impression was that the RTC had made a referral on this, and I understood the issue, and I just absorbed it. I did nothing about it. I ordered no action to be taken. And I honestly don't remember what date it occurred.

Q. I didn't mean to be misleading on that question. The question I'd like to ask is, in one of these meetings that's become part of the controversy here, Bruce Lindsey attended one of those meetings. He is a longtime personal friend of yours and an adviser. What I'd like to know is whether Mr. Lindsey ever briefed you personally about any of those sessions?

The President. Which one was that?

Q. I believe it was the first one, but I cannot swear—the second one. It was the second meeting.

The President. The only thing that Bruce—Bruce is the person who—he might have—he probably is the person who told me about the RTC referral at some point in October. I say "probably"; I literally don't remember. All I remember is at some point in October I heard about it. And my clear impression was that that was an action the RTC had taken to make this referral, and it didn't seem—it was just something that I knew and absorbed. I didn't discuss it or ask anybody to do anything or take any action. That never occurred to me. It was just something that I was being given as a matter of information. And I didn't make any notes at the time about when I learned it. It was just something that I was told. And I'm sorry I can't remember more about it.

Q. Mr. President, are you doing, you or the White House doing anything to discourage the House Banking Committee from holding these hearings on March 24th that are planned? It's part of their semiannual review into the RTC, and it's that plan that Representative Leach——

The President. That's a decision that the House Banking Committee and others in the House will have to make. It's not up to me.

Q. You're not——

The President. No, I—the only thing I will say is, again, I'm trying to cooperate with the Special Counsel. The whole idea was that we would lodge all this whole inquiry into the Special Counsel so that the rest of us here in Washington could go on with our business. The Special Counsel requested yesterday that hearings not be held. I think that is a request entitled to respect. If the Congress decides to ignore that request and to proceed, then I think that's something we would have to take very seriously. My inclination would be to obviously participate.

Q. Can you tell us how much time this investigation is taking of yours and to what extent this might be distracting from other——

The President. It's costing the taxpayers a fortune, of course, in terms of the Special Counsel as opposed to letting the Justice Department go forward. And it's costing all of you more, probably. But I have—obviously, I took a little time to prepare for this press conference, and I had discussed these matters in some detail. But I'm trying very hard to minimize how much time I have to spend on this. This is not what I was hired to do. I was hired to be President. And this relates to things that happened years ago, all the legal questions that are raised, and I'm just trying to cooperate. And I hope that the people who pushed so hard for the Special Counsel, principally the media and the Republicans, will also do the same thing, will let the Special Counsel do his job. That's what I think we ought to do. I don't need——

Q. But is it distracting?

The President. Is it distracting? Well, in the sense that I'm standing here talking to you about this instead of something else, it is. But you have to understand, I am very relaxed about this. I did not do anything wrong. There is nothing here. I made an investment, and I lost money, like a lot of other Americans. And that's all there is. I've never had anything to do with

any kind of savings and loan. I didn't borrow any money. I didn't invest in it. I didn't have anything to do with the decisions on it.

So I am perfectly at ease with this. I just want it to go on. I mean, the longer it goes on and the more money it costs and the more delay it is, the more it just has static—to go back to the question the gentleman asked earlier. But I just—my only position is, I want to cooperate. I want to be fully forthcoming. I want the American people to see that this White House is different. If there's a question here about conduct, we're open, not closed. There's no bunker mentality. But I think it's very important for the public interest that we let the process that has been established through the Special Counsel work.

Thank you very much.

Q. Can you clarify whether Mr. Cutler will be here 4 months or 6 months? How does that all work?

Q. And what's his salary?

The President. Let me answer—I think—first of all, we have not decided that you can add 130 work days and come up with 6 months and a half if you work a 5-day week and less if you work a 6-day week. But he has not used this—I want to emphasize what he said—he has not used this to evade the compliance with the ethics law. He's fully complying with all of them.

What we have agreed is that we would work real hard to make sure that we had the Counsel's office up and going and working in an appropriate way and that the procedures were working fine and that this matter and others were being handled in the best possible way and that at some point on the outer range, or a little bit closer to now, that he would consider his job done. But we don't have a fixed view of the time.

Q. So you'll look for a full-time Counsel during this period that he serves as the interim Special Counsel?

The President. Actually, we will look for someone to succeed him at the end of this tenure.

Q. Is he on full salary here? Are you on full salary?

The President. I don't know what he's—I haven't asked him. I mean, I haven't asked anybody. I assume we're paying him full salary.

Q. We were told that you might be waiving a salary.

Mr. Cutler. I wanted to serve without compensation. It's been suggested that I consider accepting the salary and donating it to the Treasury Deficit Fund, and we're considering that right now.

And on your other question, remember that the difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes a little longer. And I hope that very soon we can get on and get a fine, new, younger Counsel like Bob Strauss. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:15 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Representative James A. Leach, House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee member; John D. Podesta, Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary; and Bruce R. Lindsey, Assistant to the President and Senior Adviser.

Statement on the Executive Order on Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation at Federal Facilities

March 8, 1994

For too long, we have paid too much to heat, cool, and light Federal buildings. That's why I'm directing all agencies across the Nation to make profitable investments in energy efficiency, investments that will benefit the environment and the taxpayer. This initiative makes Government work better and cost less.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the signing of the Executive order, which is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting
March 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 8, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Trade Reports
March 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1994 Trade Policy Agenda and 1993 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 8, 1994.

Nomination for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting
March 8, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Alan Sagner to the Board of Directors for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

"Alan Sagner is a motivated individual whose talents and creativity will be a great asset to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting," the President said. "I look forward to his appointment."

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

Remarks on the Earned-Income Tax Credit and an Exchange With Reporters
March 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, other members of the administration.

The earned-income tax credit is an important symbol of the core commitment of this administration to promote the values of work and family and community and to help people who work hard and play by the rules. It's been the driving force of everything we have tried to do since we took office, from bringing the deficit down to working to help create over 2 million jobs, health care reform to welfare reform, all the other things we are doing.

This earned-income tax credit can help to improve the lives of working people all across the country by lifting them above the poverty line. You all know that millions and millions of working people now have had stagnant wages for virtually two decades, that more and more people work hard and their wages don't keep up with inflation. The principle behind what we are doing with the earned-income tax credit is simple: If you work for a living, you shouldn't be in poverty.

This year across our Nation, 14 million Americans will claim the credit when they file their 1993 tax returns. So we know that will help a lot of people in need. But we think there are some more things we can do. The vast majority of the millions of Americans who qualify receive their money in a lump-sum payment, like a refund, after they file their taxes. But many of them, if they have at least one child at home, could be receiving the benefit for the current year right now in their regular paychecks. By simply filling out a form with only four yes-or-no questions, the W–5 form, qualifying workers could be collecting as much as 60 percent of this benefit due them in this way spread throughout the year. That means extra money when they need it to pay for groceries or clothing or just to make ends meet between paydays.

We want qualifying Americans to know about this option. In the coming weeks we'll be getting the word out to employers everywhere, but today we're starting here in our own backyard. In the Federal Government, believe it or not, hundreds of thousands of workers are eligible for the earned-income tax credit. We want eligible Government workers to be an example of how this program can be used.

So today I am sending a memorandum to all Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads, instructing them to get that word out, to get their personnel and payroll offices on board so that Government employees know about the advance payment option for this earned-income tax credit.

It's our responsibility to help the people who need it and who have earned it. This is not a handout. It's a helping hand. That's an important distinction. It gives some breathing room to people who, day-in and day-out, have done everything they could to take care of their families, to make their own way, to be self-supporting taxpayers.

I've met with many families already who've benefited from this credit, and for some, it's helped with the most basic needs, food, clothing, shelter. For others, it's helped to bridge the way from being a semiskilled job holder to a better life with a better training program and a better income. For still others, it's just an incentive to keep going. This program works.

Let me say that this year, because of our economic program which passed, as you know, last year, beginning in 1994 we will increase the number of people eligible for the earned-income tax credit from 14 million people to almost 20 million people. And in addition to that, the size of the benefit will begin going up rather dramatically, phased in from this year to all future years.

But what this means as a practical—for the next 4 or 5 years, when it goes up, what this means as a practical matter is that a person with a marginal income, working hard, eligible for 60 percent of this benefit every month might literally get another $100 a month to help feed children or clothe them or meet basic family expenses. It is a very important distinction. And I want to emphasize that on the terms of getting the benefit every month, those people will qualify for the increased benefits, and there will be more people qualifying this year because that applies to 1994. So it's very, very important.

I'm going to sign this Executive order and then ask Secretary Bentsen and our IRS Commissioner, Peggy Richardson, to talk about what they're going to do.

[*At this point, the President signed the memorandum. Secretary Bentsen and IRS Commissioner Richardson then made statements.*]

The President. Let me just say one other thing to kind of reiterate this. To give you some idea about the numbers of people we're talking about in America, starting this year, about 83 percent of the American people will pay the same income tax rates they've been paying, adjusted for inflation; about 1.2 percent will pay a higher rate; and about 16.6 percent of total taxpayers in the country are eligible for a tax reduction. Those with children are eligible to get the monthly benefits as well as the lump-sum payment at the end of the year. This is basically an income tax cut in the form of a credit. So it's a very significant thing, one in six American taxpayers eligible for this benefit.

President's Income Tax Returns

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what——

The President. What? What did you say?

Q. Have you paid your taxes yet?

The President. No, I haven't filled out my returns yet, I don't think. I hadn't signed my return yet. I always get——

Q. It's not April 15th.

The President. Not time yet. They'll be filed in a timely fashion. And you'll see them, as you always do.

Richard Nixon's Visit to Russia

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what you think of Boris Yeltsin refusing to see Richard Nixon? Did you tell Richard Nixon it was okay with you if he met with former Vice President Rutskoy and the other opposition leaders?

The President. I did, yes. He told me he wanted to do that because, as a non-Government official, he felt that it was an appropriate thing for him to do, basically going to Russia on a fact-finding mission to listen to people who had views very different from not only the Russian Government, from his own and from my own. And he said he thought he was in a different position from me, for example, and I agreed that he was in a different position. So he said that's what he intended to do. And I told him that was—I would be interested in hearing his report when he got back.

Q. What do you make of Boris Yeltsin refusing to see Richard Nixon as a result?

The President. Well, of course, you have to—it's up to President Yeltsin whom he sees and doesn't see. I wish he would see him because I think they'd enjoy talking to one another. And I think Richard Nixon is basically quite sympathetic with the dilemmas faced by Boris Yeltsin and generally quite supportive of his administration. So I would hope that he will see him, but I don't think it's, you know, it's not the end of the world.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about the pullout, now, of all the troops from Somalia?

The President. Well, first, I want to compliment our military people; they are doing an excellent job. They've handled it very well. And I think, as I have said all along, you know, this was originally—if you go back to 1992, this whole mission was billed as a humanitarian mission. And the first time President Bush spoke with me about it, he said he thought maybe they would be out before I was inaugurated or by the end of January. And what we learned from that, of course, is that at least in the case of Somalia and many other cases, you can't have a humanitarian mission divorced from the political problems of the time. The people in Somalia were starving not because there was no food that could be given to them, they were starving because of the political and military conflicts consuming the country.

The United States, and then the United Nations, went in there to give the people of Somalia a chance not only to save lives, restore normalcy, end starvation but to give them a chance to work out their own problems in a different way. And I think we have given them that chance. The American people have been very generous with their money and with their support. We have lost some of our most precious resources, our young people, in Somalia because of the nature of the conflict. And I think we have done our job there and then some. And I feel very——

Q. But the civil war will resume there.

The President. Well, we don't know that. I mean, they still—that's up to them. But there's civil wars in a lot of countries in this world that we have not made anything like the effort for we've made in Somalia. There's a civil war in Sudan; there's a civil war in Angola; there were lots of people killed in Burundi. I mean, that's just in Africa, never mind all these other places.

So we have made an extraordinary effort, the United States has, to help the people of Somalia. And the leaders there now have a choice to make. There are still United Nations forces there. They're still in a position to guarantee the availability of food and medicine and a more humane life. And they will have to decide whether they care more about that and care more about their people and seeing their children healthy, or whether they want to let the country be consumed in war again. But they have to take some responsibility now. The responsibility is shifting back to the leaders there on the ground. And they ought to work it out. They ought to prefer the life their people have had the last 14 months or so, 15 months, to what they had before. But it's up to them.

Richard Nixon's Visit to Russia

Q. Mr. President, back on Russia, can you tell us about your conversation with Mr. Yeltsin? He seemed to suggest that you agreed with him on the Nixon visit. Did you talk with him about this?

The President. Mr. Yeltsin?

Q. Did you talk with him or with anyone?

The President. I don't believe—I don't think Boris Yeltsin and I discussed President Nixon's visit. I don't believe we did. You know, I talk to him on a fairly regular basis, but I think the last time we talked we were talking about Bosnia, and I don't think we had a conversation about it.

But I did talk with Richard Nixon, President Nixon, before he went there. And he raised this prospect of meeting with some of the opposition leaders. He said he thought it would be interesting. He wanted to get a feel for where they were and what kind of people they were. And again, he said he was not in the Government of the United States; he was in a different position. And I said I had no—he should meet with whomever he wanted and I'd be interested to hear his reports when he got back.

Q. But you don't think it's a diplomatic insult for Richard Nixon to have seen these other leaders, opposition leaders?

The President. No, because he's not in the Government. You know, he's not even—he was over there on a fact-finding mission, and as I said, Richard Nixon has been extremely supportive of this administration's Russia policy, which has been extremely supportive of President Yeltsin and his objectives. So I think he's been, in that sense, as an American citizen and a longtime expert on that area of the world, he's been very supportive of the objectives of President Yeltsin, and I think it should be seen in that light.

Again, I can't speak to whatever the dynamics are in Russian domestic politics at this time and whether that is having any impact on President Yeltsin's decision. I can't speak to that. But all I'm saying is that I think that President Yeltsin should not assume that Richard Nixon is not friendly toward his administration and toward democracy and toward reform, because quite the contrary, he's been a very strong supporter of our policy for the last year. And I wouldn't overreact to the fact that he met with some people who are in opposition to President Yeltsin.

Thank you.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, what advice do you have for top aides who are appearing in Federal court about Whitewater and——

The President. Just the same advice I give everybody, you know, just tell them what happened, answer the questions, and go on. Be very open.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Memorandum on the Earned-Income Tax Credit

March 9, 1994

Memorandum for All Cabinet Secretaries and Agency Heads

Subject: Earned Income Tax Credit Directive

Last year, we fought for, and won, a major expansion of the earned income tax credit (EITC) through enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This credit will help millions of workers and is a cornerstone of our effort to reform the welfare system and make work pay.

We must ensure that all workers in America who are eligible to receive the EITC are made aware of the program and of the advance payment option. It has been estimated that approximately 2 million of those eligible for the EITC miss the opportunity to claim it because they do not even realize that the EITC is available to them. Furthermore, less than 1 percent of those who claimed EITC in past years took advantage of the advanced payment option, which would allow some participants to obtain up to 60 percent of their credit in their paychecks rather than waiting until the filing of their tax return to receive it.

In our own departments and agencies, we must begin to spread the word about the EITC and help eligible workers meet the day-to-day expenses of raising a family by claiming the advanced EITC. There are hundreds of thousands of workers within the executive branch alone who are potentially eligible for the EITC. Many personnel and payroll offices within your bureaus and agencies are not aware of the credit, and have not informed Federal employees about the possibility of obtaining the credit in their paychecks under the advance payment option.

You are directed to instruct all bureau heads, personnel, and payroll office managers in your purview to take measures, in cooperation with the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Office of Personnel Management, to ensure that all potentially eligible employees are informed about the EITC and can claim it on an advance basis through their paychecks.

I also strongly encourage you and your bureau heads to join me over the next several weeks in incorporating these important EITC messages into speeches and presentations that you may be making before the public. Your efforts in your organization will complement an Administration campaign to promote the EITC with business leaders, members of Congress, State and local government leaders, and EITC eligibles. Through these actions, we hope to markedly improve the effectiveness of an already successful EITC program, rewarding work, and laying a foundation to end welfare as we know it.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Remarks on Proposed Reemployment System Legislation

March 9, 1994

Thank you very much, John, for that introduction. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Reich, thank you for your wonderful work on this project. Lane Kirkland and Larry Perlman, thank you for being up here with us and for representing the American business and labor communities in the partnership we hope to build.

And I want to thank John Hahn from Niagara County, New York. I met him last month. As he said, he was laid off after 28 years at Bell Aerospace, and he learned new skills after 28 years as a biomedical technician. He and Deb Woodbury and Donald Hutchinson were all on our panel. It was a good one, and I learned a lot listening to them.

This morning when we were going over the day, early morning in the White House, Mack McLarty mentioned to me, he said, "We're going to talk about two things today that you ran for President to do something about because it helps all the people we grew up with." When I started out on the long quest which led all of us to this particular moment, and I talked to a lot of my fellow Governors and friends who are mayors, and others, it seemed to me that this country was really at some risk of being thrown into the 21st century not being able to preserve the American dream and keep going and that there were at least three huge problems for ordinary Americans.

One was that more and more Americans were working harder and harder for stagnant wages and falling closer and closer to the poverty line. That's why we announced today the initiative on the earned-income tax credit and how it was going to impact working families with children to lift them out of poverty.

Another was that no matter how low unemployment gets in some areas, so many Americans are left behind by education and location, normally. But it means that when we have a 6.5 percent unemployment rate, as we do today, it's in fact quite a misnomer; that the unemployment rate today among people with a college degree is 3.5 percent; and among people with some education after high school, at least 2 years of further training, is a little over 5 percent; and among high school graduates a little over 7 percent; and among high school dropouts about 12 percent; and in many inner cities it's

20 percent; and among minority youths in many inner cities it's over 50 percent. So the number doesn't mean anything if there are huge pockets where no investment is made in people. And the Vice President and Henry Cisneros and the Secretary of Education, who is here, the Secretary of Labor, and others are working on this whole community empowerment initiative to try to focus on that.

The third big problem is the one we come here to address today, the problem represented by these three fine people. And that is that the average American will change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime whether he/she likes it or not. And what we have to do is to make sure that they can like it, that these changes will add to people's security, not to their insecurity. And we know that unless we do that, that all of our bigger policies will not have a big impact on the ordinary lives of the people that sent us all here in the first place.

I'm proud of the fact that the efforts that we've made to bring the deficit down and get interest rates down have led to big increases in investment and over 2 million new jobs in the last year. But there are lots of people who can't access those jobs. And as the Secretary of Labor said, there's still a huge amount of turnover in this economy. That's why this "Reemployment Act of 1994" is so important.

I think every one of you who has ever dealt with it knows that the existing system for unemployment and training is simply broken in the sense that it was designed for an economy that no longer exists. It was designed basically just to hold people tight with a wage that was below their earning but enough to live on until their old jobs came back, because most jobs were lost in ordinary cyclical recessions. But now we know that the great majority of workers who are laid off aren't going to get their old jobs back, that they're either caused by structural changes in the economy or changes in the nature of those particular job requirements themselves.

Last year, three out of four laid-off workers expected to lose their jobs permanently, the highest figure since the Labor Department began keeping these statistics. The existing training system, as the Members of Congress know, is a crazy quilt of separate programs that too often puts bureaucracy first and leaves the customers, the unemployed workers, bewildered.

This act is designed to fix the system that's broken, outmoded, bureaucratic, and too often delays people getting back to work instead of accelerating their return to the work force. It will build a new system to help workers get the training and counseling they need to fill higher wage jobs more quickly.

The plan has four points: first, to replace all these fragmented programs with one-stop shopping; second, to offer more choices for reemployment services that will put people back to work. We do have, to be fair to America and to give our country and our private sector a pat on the back, the most mobile and flexible labor markets of any of the advanced countries. But oftentimes these retraining and unemployment programs actually put barriers in that mobility instead of speeding it up. Third, we want to put the private sector, business, and labor in charge of making sure that this training actually prepares people for real jobs—that if we are going to spend money on training programs, that the money will be well spent and relevantly spent. And fourth, we want real accountability in the system so that we invest in job training programs that actually lead to jobs.

Right now there are six separate programs for dislocated workers. And workers get bounced around from office to office, program to program. We have examples of workers in the same work force facing the same dislocation, one eligible for one program, another eligible for another, with the benefits and the coverages different. So the first element of the plan is to create one-stop shopping so workers can go to one office and get the counseling and assistance they need and learn about new job opportunities, the skills those jobs require, and the best training programs to teach those particular skills at one place. No American unemployed person should have to navigate the maze of laws that the Congress passes for different reasons. The average American doesn't care what law he or she fits under. They just want to know: Here I am; I need a job; I need training; how am I going to get it?

The second part of the plan is to make sure that along with this one-stop shopping, workers will have the widest possible range of choices for training and employment, letting the marketplace bring to bear the kinds of things that we know are there today. We want to first reach out to workers as soon as possible after they lose their jobs, or whenever possible, as we

found in Sunnyvale, California, which the Vice President mentioned, get advanced notice of that. And then we want to offer them an array of choices that will help them to find the opportunities and the training they need from a computer-based network with information on job openings throughout the country to counseling on job searches, on-the-job training, long-term training for new skills, and training for people who want to start their own businesses.

For workers who start those new businesses, our plan will allow them to make a start while still drawing unemployment insurance. And for every worker, we offer the opportunity to make his or her own choices about employment and training, not to have someone else make those choices for them.

We want to also train people for real jobs. That's why the third part of the plan is to make sure that the efforts are guided by people who have real experience in those jobs, American business and labor folks. Local work force investment boards, appointed by local elected officials, will oversee these one-stop centers. Business representatives from CEO's to plant managers will form the majority. There will be representatives from labor and from the schools. And because business and labor are already doing so much to train workers, we want to encourage companies and unions to establish their own one-stop centers for their own workers hit by layoffs and plant closings.

Finally, this approach will demand accountability. We cannot afford to waste the taxpayers' time or money or, more importantly, the workers' time and the benefits that run by all too quickly, on fly-by-night proprietary schools or Government programs long on redtape and short on results. We have to empower laid-off workers to choose their training from among private and public providers who will compete for their business, require that the providers offer them consumer reports so they'll be able to make informed choices: how many people got what kind of jobs at what kind of pay? That, after all, is the ultimate test.

And the Secretary of Labor, under this approach, must define measurable performance standards for training programs, and those that fall short of the standards should lose their right to the money. In 5 days, the leaders of the world's industrial nations will meet in Detroit to discuss how to create high-wage jobs for all our people. Our country's great strength is our resilience and adaptability. That's what helps our businesses and our workers to be as dynamic as this economy.

We know that other countries marvel still at the amount of flexibility in our work force and in our economy. And the amount of increased productivity we saw in the last quarter—just today, the report that we had the highest increase in productivity in the last 3 months of last year that we had in 8 years. But we know that that still is not benefiting too many Americans who are lost in the gaps of change.

The "Reemployment Act of 1994" builds on our greatest strengths, invests in our most important resource—our people—so that we can turn the 20th century safety net into a 21st century springboard to succeed and win in the global economy.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:26 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lane Kirkland, president, AFL–CIO; Larry Perlman, chief executive officer, Ceridan Corp.; and John Hahn, Deb Woodbury, and Donald Hutchinson, participants in the Department of Labor conference on reemployment held on February 2.

Message on the Observance of Id al-Fitr

March 9, 1994

My family and I wish to extend our personal greetings to all in the Muslim Community celebrating the Id al-Fitr.

This week marks the end of the holy month of Ramadan for Muslims in the United States and around the world. A time for rejoicing and celebrating, this Id in particular also reminds us of our shared responsibility to work for a better future for all the world's people—especially in the wake of the Hebron massacre. Let

us all rededicate ourselves to realizing this goal in the Middle East and around the world.

In the United States, this is an occasion for us to reflect with pride on the achievements of Muslim Americans and to take satisfaction in the historic and constructive relations which we have had with Muslim countries around the world. Central tenets of the Ramadan fast that is now ending are responsibility for those less fortunate and rededication—individual by individual—to the creation of a better community and a better world. These are ideals that stand as beacons for people of all faiths everywhere.

On this occasion, let me convey to you my very best wishes with the traditional greeting: May peace be with you and may God grant you health and prosperity now and in the years ahead.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Message to the Congress on Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM
March 9, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States has been engaged in nuclear cooperation with the European Community (now European Union) for many years. This cooperation was initiated under agreements that were concluded over three decades ago between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and that extend until December 31, 1995. Since the inception of this cooperation, EURATOM has adhered to all its obligations under those agreements.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish new nuclear export criteria, including a requirement that the United States have a right to consent to the reprocessing of fuel exported from the United States. Our present agreements for cooperation with EURATOM do not contain such a right. To avoid disrupting cooperation with EURATOM, a proviso was included in the law to enable continued cooperation until March 10, 1980, if EURATOM agreed to negotiations concerning our cooperation agreements. EURATOM agreed in 1978 to such negotiations.

The law also provides that nuclear cooperation with EURATOM can be extended on an annual basis after March 10, 1980, upon determination by the President that failure to cooperate would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives or otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security, and after notification to the Congress. President Carter made such a determination 14 years ago and signed Executive Order No. 12193, permitting nuclear cooperation with EURATOM to continue until March 10, 1981. President Reagan made such determinations in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12295, 12351, 12409, 12463, 12506, 12554, 12587, and 12629 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1989. President Bush made such determinations in 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12670, 12706, 12753, and 12791 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1993. Last year I signed Executive Order No. 12840 to extend cooperation for an additional year, until March 10, 1994.

In addition to numerous informal contacts, the United States has engaged in frequent talks with EURATOM regarding the renegotiation of the U.S.–EURATOM agreements for cooperation. Talks were conducted in November 1978, September 1979, April 1980, January 1982, November 1983, March 1984, May, September, and November 1985, April and July 1986, September 1987, September and November 1988, July and December 1989, February, April, October, and December 1990, and September 1991. Formal negotiations on a new agreement were held in April, September, and December 1992, and in March, July, and October 1993. They are expected to continue this year.

I believe that it is essential that cooperation between the United States and EURATOM continue, and likewise, that we work closely with our allies to counter the threat of proliferation of nuclear explosives. Not only would a disrup-

tion of nuclear cooperation with EURATOM eliminate any chance of progress in our talks with that organization related to our agreements, it would also cause serious problems in our overall relationships. Accordingly, I have determined that failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with EURATOM would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives and would jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States. I therefore intend to sign an Executive order to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export criterion of the Atomic Energy Act for an additional 12 months from March 10, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 9, 1994.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Senate Transmitting Maritime Boundary Treaties With the United Kingdom

March 9, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Treaty Between the United States and the United Kingdom on the Delimitation in the Caribbean of a Maritime Boundary Relating to the U.S. Virgin Islands and Anguilla and the Treaty Between the United States and United Kingdom on the Delimitation in the Caribbean of a Maritime Boundary Relating to Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands and the British Virgin Islands, with Annex. Both treaties were signed at London, November 5, 1993. I also enclose for the information of the Senate the report of the Department of State with respect to these agreements.

The treaties establish maritime boundaries between the United States and the United Kingdom relating to our respective Caribbean territories. One treaty creates a 288 nautical mile long boundary between the United States territories of Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands and the British Virgin Islands. The other treaty establishes a maritime boundary 1.34 nautical miles in length situated about 40 nautical miles from the U.S. Virgin Islands and Anguilla.

The boundaries define the limits within which each Party may exercise maritime jurisdiction. In the treaty creating a boundary with the British Virgin Islands, this includes territorial sea, fishing, and exclusive economic zone jurisdiction. The boundary with Anguilla separates fishing and exclusive economic zone jurisdiction.

I believe the treaties to be fully in the interest of the United States. They reflect the tradition of cooperation and close ties the Parties have had in this region. These boundaries have never been disputed. The boundary lines established by the treaties formalize the practice that both Parties have followed since 1977 concerning these maritime limits. In establishing the equidistant boundaries, both sides have worked closely together in applying modern surveying techniques and precise technical calculations. The treaties will permit more effective regulating of marine resource activities and other ocean uses.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to these treaties and advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 9, 1994.

Appointment of Deputy Assistant to the President for Speechwriting and Research

March 9, 1994

The President today named Donald A. Baer, assistant managing editor of U.S. News & World Report and a reporter and former lawyer, to serve as Deputy Assistant to the President for Speechwriting and Research.

"Don Baer is a writer of depth and talent who understands, both from the experience of his life and from his career as a reporter and editor, the challenges that face Americans all across the country in their daily lives," the President said. "I look forward to Don's able assistance as we work to communicate my administration's vision of hope and opportunity to the American people."

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

Nomination for United States District Court Judges

March 9, 1994

The President today nominated six individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court. They are: Richard A. Paez for the Central District of California; Clarence Cooper for the Northern District of Georgia; Denise Page Hood for the Eastern District of Michigan; Solomon Oliver, Jr. for the Northern District of Ohio; Terry C. Kern for the Northern District of Oklahoma; and B. Michael Burrage for the Northern, Eastern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

"These six individuals have impressive records of achievement in both the law and public service," the President said today. "I am confident that they will serve with excellence and distinction as members of the Federal judiciary."

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

Remarks at the AmeriCorps Public Safety Forum in New York City

March 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, President Lattin, and my good friend Congressman Chuck Schumer. And in a moment you'll hear from Eli Segal, who is the head of our national service effort, so I won't introduce him more now. I want to thank all of the members of all the service groups who are here from not only from New York but many from other States, and recognize the chair of the board of the corporation of national service, Mr. Jim Josephs, who came. Thank you for being here, sir. I also want to thank three distinguished New Yorkers for their presence in the audience: your new attorney general, Oliver Koppell; New York City's public advocate and my longtime friend, Mr. Mark Green; and the man who first introduced me to the local government of the city of Brooklyn, the Brooklyn borough president, Howard Golden. Thank you.

Before Chuck Schumer sits down, I want to ask him to come back up here to show you: This man has a broken arm, as you can see, and he's slightly incapacitated. So I asked him if I could join his two children and sign his cast. I do this to make a point I try to make at every speech, which is that government cannot solve all the problems of America. That's why we need all of you in service. And government cannot solve all these problems, either, because he is not the victim of a crime but

his own awkwardness; he fell. This is a problem I can't solve, so I'm just putting my stamp of approval on the treatment of it. [*Laughter*]

Representative Charles Schumer. Mr. President, what I wanted to say is, you saw our Senator wearing a cast, but he broke his arm the Republican way, skiing in Vail. [*Laughter*] I broke my arm slipping on the ice 11 o'clock Saturday night to go to a community event at the Good Shepherd School in Sheepshead Bay.

The President. That wasn't on the program. But it was pretty funny. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the first of a national series of programs on our national service program which we called AmeriCorps. The topic we are here to discuss today is how to bring people together and communities together to encourage them to assume some responsibility for dealing with the violence that has become all too common in most American communities.

It's appropriate that we begin here in New York City, that we begin in Brooklyn in the congressional district of Chuck Schumer, because he has been the architect and the strategist behind almost every major anticrime initiative that the Congress dealt with in recent years.

It took 7 years and a change of administrations, but we finally got the Brady bill to become the Brady law. There were skeptics who said this will not make any difference, but you ought to see the results in the first couple of weeks of the Brady bill becoming a law. All over America, in little communities and big, people who had criminal records were actually buying guns formally, legally in gun stores; they were found out; illegal guns were collected; criminals were apprehended. This law is going to make a difference.

Chuck Schumer has also worked for community policing and for safe schools and for the ban on assault weapons that he talked about so strongly. That ban on assault weapons is in the crime bill that has already passed the United States Senate. And tomorrow Mr. Schumer goes back to Washington to work with his subcommittee to begin to mark up the crime bill that also will put another 100,000 police officers on the street, ban 28 kinds of assault weapons, and give us the chance to give people like you the chance to do some things to prevent crime from happening, and give our young people something to say yes to, as well as to say no to.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation for the work that has been done by New York Senator Daniel Moynihan on this issue. He asked me to say to you how sorry he was he couldn't be here today. He had originally planned to come with me but had an obligation in Washington which prevented him from leaving. But for 28 years he's been warning us about the fragile state of families and communities, the social institutions that hold us all together.

About a year ago, he gave a speech at the 50th anniversary of his own high school graduation from Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem. In that speech he talked about how much New York had changed in 50 years. In 1943, he said, there were exactly 44 homicides by gunshot in the entire city of New York, when the population then was only 150,000 more than it is now, but was more. In 1992, instead of 44, there were 1,499. He sent me a chart that tracked the murder rate in New York since the turn of the century, and it was only a generation ago that the murder rate began to explode.

About that time, on a New York night 30 years ago this very Sunday, a 28-year-old woman known to the neighborhood as Kitty Genovese parked her car outside her home, as she always did. She was coming home after a long day working as the manager of a nearby bar. She had come to New York to work, to make a life for herself in this great city, drawn like so many before and since by the power of opportunity and enthusiasm that I see in this room. As she walked to her building, a man grabbed her and stabbed her. She cried for help. She screamed for help so loudly that it woke people up in the middle of the night. Lights came on in the apartment building; a window opened; the attacker got nervous and left. Now, this was 30 years ago, not 30 days ago. But not a single person came to the aid of the woman as she tried to get herself to safety. So the man came back and stabbed her again. As 38 witnesses watched or listened from the safety of their own homes, Kitty Genovese screamed that she was dying. So the attacker fled again, but still no one came to the rescue. No one even called the police at a time when the average response time was 2 minutes. So the attacker came back a third time, stabbed Kitty Genovese again and killed her, over 20 minutes after she first cried for help. A call to the police would have brought

a patrol car in 2 minutes. But as one man told investigators, "I don't want to get involved."

Well, that story shocked us all 30 years ago, not just because of what happened to that woman, as tragic as it was, but also because of what had happened to her neighbors. It sent a chilling message about what had happened at that time in a society, suggesting that we were each of us not simply in danger but fundamentally alone. It was a message that was both resonant and at odds with the times. I still remember it as if it were yesterday, even though I was much younger then than almost all of you are now.

Modern technology was connecting everyone even then with the television set, a telephone, and an automobile. New highways let us reach out to each other faster than ever before. Rockets were already taking astronauts into space; even the moon was getting closer. These new inventions made the world a smaller place. We were becoming more aware of the great diversity of America, of people who lived beyond the borders of our neighborhoods or past the railroad tracks at the quiet end of town. More Americans of more race and backgrounds than ever before even then could chase the promise that lay before them. Young families left their streets or their farms in search of better jobs in the cities; factories hummed; industries then, as now again, were the envy of the world. But the unintended result of all this chasing around is that we became uprooted. The more folks moved around, the more they became strangers to their neighbors. More doors were shut; more locks were bought and turned; more curtains were drawn as they were on the night that Kitty Genovese was killed. On that night, it was as if the value of responsibility had already come to mean only responsibility for yourself.

Four years after that incident, a young United States Senator from New York, running for the office I now hold, said this, "The real threat of crime is what it does to ourselves and our communities. No nation hiding behind locked doors is free, for it is imprisoned by its own fear. A nation which surrenders to crime is a society which has resigned itself to failure. Thus, the fight against crime is, in the last analysis, the same as the fight for equal opportunity or the battle against hunger and deprivation or the struggle to prevent the pollution of our air and water. It is a fight to preserve the quality of community, which is at the root of our greatness, a fight to reserve confidence in ourselves and our fellow citizens, a battle for the quality of our lives."

Two months later the man who spoke those words, Senator Robert Kennedy, himself lay slain. And a line of mourners more than a mile long wrapped around St. Patrick's Cathedral, tied to his coffin in their common grief but still too far apart from one another.

Many, many times in the years since, in this city and in others, we have honored memories of the fallen. But we have failed to heed their warnings or finish their work. Time after time, we hear the lonesome sound of pipes at the funeral of a police officer killed in the line of duty. We hear the soft sobs of a mother burying another child gunned down on another city playground or in another school. We read the tragic news of the young student shot while simply riding a van across the Brooklyn Bridge.

This very morning back in Washington, people are reading about how one student shot another student four times yesterday in an argument arising out of the fact that they bumped into each other in a school hallway in what we all thought was perhaps our safest public high school in Washington.

Too often our reaction to the violence is to simply hunker down and turn our backs, raise the drawbridge, buy a better lock, and leave the problem to others: the thin line of blue or the gray mass of government.

Justice Edwin Torres who grew up in the barrio and is now a justice of the New York supreme court, sees this problem in his courtroom every day, and he wrote a stunning letter to Senator Moynihan not too long ago in which he described people so beaten down by the daily barrage of violence that they almost apologize for being the victims—as if you were smart enough or strong enough, no matter how bad things got, you could just figure out a way not to be a victim.

No citizen of this great Nation should ever have to apologize for that. And no American should live in fear. No one should surrender to any of this for a moment. And so I come to you to ask for your help and those like you all across America to take back our neighborhoods, to take back our future, to take back the basic quality of our lives.

Thirty years ago, if Kitty Genovese's murder taught us that we can't look away, the years since surely teach us that we cannot look to

others. Thirty years ago, her life might have been saved if she had simply called—or had someone, who was looking at the whole thing unfold, called the local police. Today even that is not enough. We have to help, each and every one of us, to reclaim our streets, our schools, our communities, and our lives.

This is not a call for blind heroics but practical action if we want to save our own citizenship. I have met some heroes who deserve our praise. I met, when I came to New York a few weeks ago, the three men who subdued the gunman on the Long Island Railroad. I met in Ohio just 3 weeks ago Anne Ross from Dayton, who organized a neighborhood group to sweep drugs off their streets. They've taken down the numbers of license plates of drug dealers. They've shared photographs of dealers with the police. They've shut down crack houses and turned them over to families who don't deal drugs or use them, all the while having their lives threatened, she, her husband, and the others who she's mobilized.

Two weeks ago in Chicago, I met a woman named Carol Ridley, whose own son was shot by someone who said he was his son's best friend, when the boy was only 22, in a foolish argument. But instead of withdrawing into her own grief, she's gone outward, working in Save the Children seminars to try to stop children from killing other children, to try to end the madness of all these weapons being in the hands of people who shouldn't have them, and to try to teach young people that there are other ways in which they can deal with their anger and frustration.

These ordinary people have done extraordinary things. The first is to prove that there can be something more powerful than fear, and that is our will and our collective ability to change the way things are. We have reached a time when we have to change not only our laws—not only the Brady bill and the crime bill and put more police on the street—we're got to change the basic attitudes of this country, not only about crime and violence but about how we think about ourselves and one another.

None of us any longer can pretend not to hear these cries for help, and each of us has a serious personal responsibility to do our part. Government cannot do this job alone; neither can the police forces themselves. But together there are things we can do, and one of the best is this new national service program, AmeriCorps.

It represents the best of our country. It will give Americans, especially the young, a chance to serve our Nation by helping their communities, helping to make our schools and streets safer, immunizing our babies and turning our children into better students, cleaning up our parks, and caring for the elderly.

Today we'll hear from Americans from all walks of life who are as different in background, age, and experiences as the AmeriCorps can possibly be. Some will have had the fabric of their lives ripped by crime. But what makes them alike, and what makes me so hopeful, is that out of their tragedies they each made a choice to make a difference.

As extraordinary as their stories are, keep this in mind: There are thousands, indeed tens of thousands, legions more like them everywhere in this country, in every community: ordinary Americans doing extraordinary things, Americans reconnecting others in their communities. That's what AmeriCorps is all about. For all the miracles of mankind's technology and discovery, nothing, still, nothing connects us to one another like an outstretched hand, an open heart, and the certainty that each of us has made a difference.

We will make a difference if we can give our people something to say yes to, introduce them to people they can look up to, give them a chance to live and learn the meaning of responsibility and opportunity and community.

When I was a young man, I read a book by a fellow southerner named James Agee, called "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men". It was the story of desperately, desperately poor people in my region of the country, the South, during the Great Depression. It remains a book as powerful today as it was the day it was written. You cannot imagine, I don't think, what it was like to live in times when whole States had half the people living below the poverty line, when there were massive stretches of communities where more than half the people were out of work, where people could only eat because they were able to grow a little food in the ground that they held on to.

And in that time, James Agee wrote this, and I think it is something that we ought to remember as we drive up and down Flatbush Avenue in Brooklyn. Listen to this: "In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances

and no matter what parents, the potentiality of the whole human race is born again. And in him, too, once more, and of each of us, our terrific responsibility toward human life, toward the utmost idea of goodness, of the horror of error, and of God."

It is not enough for any of us ever to say again what was said here 30 years ago, "I don't want to get involved." We must not only want to get involved; we must be involved. We must be good neighbors again. And in being good neighbors, we will reclaim for ourselves the promise of this great Nation.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

[*At this point, an audience member asked why the President had not publicly supported AIDS legislation introduced by Representative Jerrold Nadler.*]

The President. I'll be glad to talk to Mr. Nadler about that. Every time——

Audience member. Have you—[*inaudible*]?

The President. No. Nobody has ever mentioned it to me before. But let me say this——

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]—about this plan.

The President. I've listened to you. Will you listen to me? Will you listen to me? I've listened to you. It is always convenient to me, when you interrupt my meetings, how often you ignore what has been done: the first AIDS czar, the first time we have ever had a really national strategy, dramatic increases in funding in research, dramatic increases in funding in funds to care for people with AIDS, dramatic increases in efforts to prevent AIDS from occurring. We are doing far more than has ever been done before.

I will be happy——

Audience member. Why haven't—[*inaudible*]?

The President. Listen to me. I've listened to you. I let you interrupt this meeting, and I let you talk. And you have taken up all the time of all the people that are in here.

Audience member. I let you speak.

The President. No, you haven't. You're trying to interrupt me. They let me speak. They invited me here, not you. I have told you, I will be glad to discuss this—[*inaudible*]—no, leave him alone. Don't hurt him. Don't hurt him. He's got a right to be here.

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]—is in Congress—[*inaudible*]—why aren't you supporting this? It is a crime.

Audience member. Welcome to Brooklyn. [*Laughter*]

The President. What did he say? I didn't hear.

Audience member. Welcome to Brooklyn.

The President. Let me ask you this: Wouldn't you rather have him in here asking me to do something than standing outside convinced I wouldn't do anything, no matter what? [*Applause*] It's America.

Go on, Eli.

[*Eli J. Segal, Assistant to the President for National Service, discussed public safety concerns and then introduced Chicago police chief Matt L. Rodriguez and San Diego police officer Andy Mill, who discussed community policing. Mr. Segal then asked if the President had questions or comments.*]

The President. Well, I wanted to say, first of all, how much I appreciate your being here and how much I appreciate hearing from police officers that there's something for the community to do with the police, and specifically, the details that you recommended.

I don't think I can overstate the importance of having a presence on the streets and in the neighborhoods and the communities, either by having volunteers do what Chief Rodriguez said and go behind the scenes so more police officers can be out there, or having senior volunteers or others walking the streets. We have a lot of evidence that this helps prevent crime in the first place. We're not talking about just catching criminals; we're talking about recreating a sense of order, reminding people of what the rules of society are, just sort of physically being there. There's a lot of evidence that that reduces crime.

And you mentioned that I had the New York City police officer, Kevin Jett, down to the State of the Union Address, recognized him. And we brought him back to the White House afterward and had a nice talk with him. And he talked a lot about that, about how he saw a big part of his job as stopping crime in the first place by just being there and know what was going on.

The second thing I want to say is, it's easy to underestimate, I think, how much ordinary citizens can do. In Chicago, I have actually been in some of your housing projects where welfare mothers got their first jobs in the projects, patrolling the stairs, and getting discounts on their rent, among other things, in return for working,

patrolling the stairs. But it all worked together to make these housing projects crime-free instead of places of fear.

So I guess I just want to thank you and to—the one thing that I would like to ask as a practical matter is how you think we can best assure that—and I'm going to lead you, but I know you want this—one of the things that always bothers me is when we—Mr. Schumer knows this—we pass a bill through Congress, the temptation is to say exactly how the money ought to be spent that we're appropriating. And it appears to me, just from the two different cases that the two of you cited, drastically different, that we ought to make community policing money available with as much flexibility as possible, because New York's idea about how to handle this may be different from San Diego's or Chicago's.

And so maybe you should comment on that. I think it's important that we send a clear signal. We don't want to tie the hands of the local officers too much.

[*Chief Rodriguez concurred with the President's statement supporting local control of resources, and Officer Mill discussed other aspects of community policing.*]

The President. I just want to reemphasize what these two guys have said. Now, here are people who are spending their lives in law enforcement. And as Governor—I know I've had this conversation with Governor Cuomo before, that all the bills I have signed—I was a Governor for 12 years before I became President—I have signed bill after bill after bill building more prison space, having longer sentences for serious crimes. I watched the average amount of time served by an inmate go up rather dramatically during my term as Governor. I saw the reintroduction of capital punishment after years in which we didn't have it. I understand all about this punishment business, but if you look at it, the crime rate still keeps getting worse. What lowers the crime rate is the involvement of the community and the intelligent and adequate allocation of police resources.

And I think it is very important that you understand this is not just idle rhetoric. I mean, these people have put their lives on the line for years and years and years. They know what they are talking about. We have to reclaim our streets and lower the crime rate through people like you supporting the kinds of ideas that they put out. This is not soft; this is hard. This is save yourself by rebuilding your community.

I thank you both very much for that.

[*Mr. Segal invited the audience to ask questions.*]

The President. Would you introduce yourself and say where you're from if you ask a question in the audience?

Q. Certainly. My name is Ray Owens. I'm a native of Austin, Texas, here—live now in the New York area. And I'm with Teach For America, Mr. President——

The President. Good for you. Great program.

Q. ——a national teaching corps, yes. And as you well know, we're the national teaching corps that's sending talented teachers who are accepting the responsibility to teach and serve in communities and neighborhoods that some educators have refused to work in, in great part because of the crime there. So in this regard, indeed, there are a number of people who still say that community policing is really more about community relations than it is about reducing crime.

I'm wondering how we can be sure that there's real substance in our community policing efforts.

The President. I think the best way to be sure of it is, first, to give as much—to go back to what—and keep in mind, this is a very appropriate question because Mr. Schumer's congressional subcommittee, I'll say again, is going to deal with this issue tomorrow. They are marking this bill up tomorrow. So this is a timely question.

My own judgment is, the best way is to say, here are the results we want to achieve. That is, we want the community involved; we want volunteers to be able to participate; we want each city or community to be able to define that however they want, except we're going to measure the results.

I think the main way to do it is not to tell everybody on the front end how they have to do it with a whole bunch of rules and regulations, but to cite some examples that have worked and then say we're going to measure results.

There are more than one way to do this. I mean, in the city of Houston, they had a 22-percent decline in the murder rate and a 27-percent decline in the crime rate in one year when they went to a community policing situation. I mean, 15 months, in a 15-month period.

Not surprisingly, the mayor was reelected with 91 percent of the vote, because they went to a community policing strategy that worked.

So my own judgment is, give the people who are on the ground and who have the biggest stake in the success of this the power to design the program, and then reward those programs that work and don't continue those programs that don't. I think you have to measure the results, because everyplace is going to be different.

[*Geoffrey Canada, director, Rheedlan Center for Children and Families, New York City; Kevin Stansberry, youth service leader for the Safe Schools and Urban Schools Service Corps, Red Bank, NJ; and Frankie Rios, youth service leader, Safe Places, the Bronx, NY, spoke about their community programs.*]

The President. Let me just ask all of you a little bit—you could see how moved this audience was by the sort of personal testimony that each of you gave. One of the problems that I see with our national service program, because no program can do everything, is that we can provide volunteers to a community to support a program like yours if it's already going on. But not every community has somebody who would give up a career in corporate America, where you could make more money, and decide to do this.

And one of the things that I'd like to just explore with you is what you think the national service organization can do—because we are a national organization, and we have high visibility, and I do events like this all the time—what can we do to make sure that there are more programs like this out in the community so that we can steer the volunteers to them. I mean, if you don't exist, then the volunteers won't go there.

Now, there's a Boys and Girls Club nearly everywhere, and so they just need to organize themselves everywhere to take the volunteers. But there isn't necessarily a program to keep the schools safe or to keep the corridors safe going to and from school. That is a huge deal. In a lot of places where even the schools themselves are safe, the kids are very much at risk going to and from school. And I've had people talk to me about that all over the country.

So do you have any advice for me about how we can help to sort of replicate these programs so we can direct the volunteers to them?

[*Messrs. Canada, Stansberry, and Rios discussed community organization and infrastructure in dealing with community issues.*]

The President. I think if you've got a place, then the people will come and the programs will spring up, and they will do it. One of the things I wanted to say in support of that, because Mr. Schumer and I talked about it on the way up here, you may remember that a few weeks ago, maybe it's been a couple of months ago now, Reverend Jesse Jackson had a national meeting in Washington of the Rainbow Coalition group to talk about violence. And he called me—we've had now two conversations—we had a brief talk about it yesterday. He started kind of doing an inventory in Washington and then asked some people about it in New York, about how many schools there were that didn't have real recreational opportunities for kids, especially if they weren't on athletic teams anymore.

And he went through an inventory with me just in Washington about, for example, within the city limits how many baseball fields there were that were really functioning and how there was no equipment for kids, and how many kids there were that never had a baseball bat in their hands until they were 14 or 15 years old now, and no swimming pools, no organized basketball programs, no bowling alleys, no skating rinks; these kinds of things.

I think we have maybe underestimated that in the last 15 years that our schools and our cities have been under such enormous financial pressures to cut back, cut back, cut back, maybe without even thinking about it, since these recreational programs for kids at large—not the stars on the athletic teams, but the kids at large—have been maybe the easiest things to cut. And one of the things that we talked about is whether we could have some of this national service money directed back to support these school-based programs so that you'll have something to do with the kids and have these activities. I think it's really important.

[*Clementine Barfield, president, Save Our Sons and Daughters, discussed community crisis intervention and victim assistance, and Elizabeth Mathews, VISTA volunteer, discussed shelter and support for battered women and their children.*]

Mr. Segal. Mr. President, do you have any questions or concerns? I saw you scribbling down there some thoughts.

The President. No, actually, I was just scribbling what I was learning from them, not what questions I wanted to ask.

I do want to say that each of you, in very different ways, is an incredibly powerful example, and I'm just, I can't say enough about it. I was very moved by both of you for very different reasons, but you were very powerful.

I want you to know that my—that before I became President, when I was still living at home in Arkansas, my wife and I spent a lot of time, a huge—a lot of time for what we had available with a friend of ours who ran a shelter like the one in which you work. And we saw large numbers, especially around holiday times, of women and children horribly brutalized. And I just would like to say that one of the things you said, that I think we may miss in this—and another thing you said in terms of sympathy for the people who commit these crimes and then go to jail—is we've got to do something that changes the attitudes of people who think that the only way they can deal with their frustration and anger is to wreak violence on someone.

Now, if they do something really terrible, we have to punish them and send them to prison and do all that. But there are a lot of these people who can be reached before they do something really terrible. A lot of these children who knife and shoot other children are people who have never learned to deal with their anger or their anxiety in any other way. To them, the future is what happens 5 or 10 or 20 minutes from now, instead of what happens 5 or 10 or 20 years from now.

And so, I don't know what thoughts you have on that, but that's one thing I am continuously plagued by. I see people like you who come in and bravely give your lives to try to help people who are so savaged by this. And then I know that a lot of the people we're dealing with now, who perpetrate these kinds of crimes, themselves were the victims of domestic violence when they were young, themselves grew up in kind of chaotic and violent situations, and they have no other conditioned way to respond to these terrible things that happen to them. And I hope we can devote some time and attention to that.

[*Ms. Barfield discussed creating a climate of peace, and Ms. Mathews discussed the need to prevent violence. Molly Baldwin, director, Reach Out to Chelsea Adolescents, Chelsea, MA, and Sherman Spears, youth service leader, Oakland, CA, then discussed conflict resolution among youth.*]

The President. We don't want to let anybody off the hook here today. You know, no one has mentioned this, but one of the things that—one of the gentlemen did mention the images that come across to kids. But if you look at the cumulative, instantaneous, reactive, macho violence you see in media entertainment programs, you know, it's not that one or two programs will change a kid's attitude, but the amount of it overall, I think, has a big impact.

And I also think when people turn on television and they see their National Government, what do you inevitably see? People with words, using extreme words to characterize conduct or activity or positions. The other politicians do it, the media do it, always trying to twist it like taffy to the *n*th degree. I don't know how many people—I've had older Members of the Congress tell me just in the last week how much meaner and partisan and negative the national arena is. Mr. Schumer was commenting sadly on it on the way in here today. So I think all of us in positions of public responsibility need to think about that, need to think about what kind of message are we sending to young people when they see that kind of conduct.

Look, if he, this fine young man here, can bury his anger and desire for revenge, he ought to be an example to all the rest of us who have so much less to be angry about. Next time I want to get real mad, I'm going to think about you. And I hope everybody else in this country will. I thank you. You have no idea what a powerful example you are.

[*A New York State Assemblyman asked about allocating money to States for education rather than for building prisons.*]

The President. I'll say this: One big problem is, you know, that you can go into a Federal court and get an order to build a new prison and make it nice. Prisons not only have better schools than a lot of schools, they have, almost unfailingly, any prison built in the last 10 years has better recreational facilities than a public school or than a local park. The New York

Times Sunday magazine had a stunning pictorial—I don't know how many of you saw it—pictorial exhibit a couple of weeks ago showing the prison and how beautiful they were and the schools and how rundown they were. So we have to try to change that. All I can tell you is if you look at what we're trying to do with the crime bill, we're trying to give some resources to the States and to the communities to begin to turn that around.

I also think—look, let's go back to the police officers that started this. None of us want to be naive about this. Some people deserve to be punished and should be behind bars. But we do know that a very large percentage of the truly violent crimes are committed by a fairly small percentage of the criminals. So what we have to do is to try to identify the people that should be incarcerated and incarcerate them, have more community-based punishment for people that do less serious things, and try to do all the stuff you all have been here talking about today. And there ought to be some way of allocating the resources that recognizes the importance of doing all three things, instead of just that one thing. But there is no—the practical problem is that in the last 10 to 15 years, there's not only been an upsurge of violent crime, which has led us to build more prison cells, there's also been a huge spate of lawsuits, which have gotten us to build prisons nicer than our schools. And it's crazy; our priorities, therefore, have been turned upside-down. Our schools should be nicer than our prisons so people want to get into the schools. And I really think that's a problem.

Now, that's not to say I don't think there shouldn't be educational facilities in the prisons or recreational facilities. I do. I think it's crazy to turn people back out of prison when they're illiterate, when they won't have a chance to do well. I'm not campaigning against prison reform. I'm just pointing out just what you did. We haven't done enough to help the kids stay out in the first place.

[*A participant discussed domestic violence. Another participant discussed gangs and asked how society should deal with gang members and gang violence.*]

The President. Well, my short answer is—I mean it's something we could talk about all day long, but I've spent a good deal of time talking with former gang members, with some present gang members. I've spent more time than Presidents usually do in inner-city areas, and I've thought about this a lot and talked to a lot of people who work on it. I mean, I think we heard a lot about it today. I think, first of all, you have to try to create the conditions for kids when they're young so they don't do that. There has to be alternative things.

Keep in mind, a lot of gangs grow up in a vacuum. Everybody that was introduced up here is a member of a gang. All these people who started organizations, that's what those organizations are, they're good gangs. Isn't that right? Isn't that right? I mean, every one of them, right? That is, we all want to be part of something that's bigger than ourselves, where we're really important because we're part of it, right? We do. This Public Allies, that's a good gang. That's what it is. It's something good that's wholesome and—[*applause*]. So if you live in a neighborhood where families have broken down, where there are no jobs and opportunities, where the school system is dysfunctional, where there's not a strong sense of community, somebody is going to organize something so people can be part of something, where they are important, and they matter.

And I think we have to recognize that, and we have to adopt some of these strategies to deal with it. Unfortunately—I mean, there are lots of things a President can do. You know, we can pass these programs and make these opportunities available. But in the end, people get saved the same way they get lost, one by one. And that's why all of you are so important to this. And that's why the power of his example—one picture—if somebody puts his picture in some newspaper in America tomorrow, talking about your story, it will be worth more words than I can spew out in 2 weeks or 2 years. And that's why I think the genius of this national service program is having more folks like you show up in good gangs to help to decide, community by community, how to create another way of life for all these folks. And you decide how it is. It will be different for different people in different places and different circumstances. And you will make the decision. And all the Government will do is to empower more of you to be out there. That's what the whole national service thing is about.

[*Mr. Segal closed the forum and asked the President to make final remarks.*]

The President. Let me say first, I want to thank all the New York officials who came, including one I did not introduce, Alan Hevesi, the city comptroller. I want to thank all the people from volunteer groups who came. And especially, I want to thank my good friend Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, whose father's speech I quoted tonight, who has devoted her life to community service. Thank you for being here. And Eli, since you're giving your life to community service and you grew up in this community, I want to introduce your mother, who raised you in this neighborhood. Thank you for coming.

The one last message I want to leave all of you with is I want to thank all of you who are part of these efforts. You are conducting a quiet and sometimes not-so-quiet revolution in this country. The purpose of national service is to swell your numbers and increase your impact and give this country back to the people who want America to go on to the next century as the greatest country in the world and want to give every child a chance to live up to his or her God-given potential. That is what this is about.

So my last word is this: We need more of you. And anybody within the sound of my voice, we want you to call, find out about national service, find out about the community groups in your community, sign up, and do something. We can change America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:21 p.m. in the Center for Performing Arts, Brooklyn College. In his remarks, he referred to Vernon Latting, president of the college, and Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, Deputy Assistant Attorney General and daughter of Robert F. Kennedy.

Remarks at the United Negro College Fund Dinner in New York City
March 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation for being able to join the honorees here tonight and all the distinguished Americans who are here, the presidents of the 41 UNCF colleges. Given my roots, I couldn't help noticing that of the 41 UNCF colleges, all but Wilberforce are located in the South. And sometimes I'm not so sure about Ohio and where it is. [*Laughter*] For any of you who are from there, that was a compliment from me.

You know, Bill Gray once came to Arkansas to give a speech for me, and I thanked him profusely. He was then the chairman of the House Budget Committee, perhaps the most powerful Member of the House at that time, except the Speaker. And he was exhausted, and he came down there. I said, "I cannot tell you how much I appreciate it." And he said, "Well, one of these days I'll give you a chance to demonstrate it." At the time, he knew more about my future than I did, I assure you. [*Laughter*]

I've been terribly impressed with the people who have been recognized here tonight, Stephen Wright and Arthur Fletcher, my longtime friend Vernon Jordan. You could chronicle his demise up there; his hair's going gray, and he's relegated to playing golf with me. [*Laughter*] I want to say a special word of recognition to Christopher Edley, Sr., because he has not only rendered great service to this organization but he has given me his son to be the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Now, the younger Mr. Edley was not so fortunate in his education. He was consigned to Swarthmore and Harvard. [*Laughter*] But he got over it, and he's doing quite nicely now in the Federal Government. I enjoyed the presentation that your distinguished alumni, Pearline Cox and——

Audience members. Yea!

The President. Cheer again. That's all right. Don't be shy, go ahead. [*Applause*]

And I was very impressed with Mrs. Trent not only for representing her husband's work but for setting the record straight on the way out. If it's all the same to you, ma'am, if you don't think you're too old to undertake a new challenge, I'd like to have you come to the White House and help me set the record straight, starting Monday morning. [*Laughter*]

I'd also like to say that every President since Franklin Roosevelt has supported this fine work, but it was an especially important cause for my predecessor, George Bush, and I'd like to thank him in his absence for the support he gave to the UNCF and thank his brother for the leadership he's given. Thank you, Mr. Bush, for your leadership, sir.

You know, when Bill Gray resigned from the Congress to take this job, I had an extended conversation with him, and I virtually cried when he told me he was leaving. But I now can look at him and his wonderful wife and see that there is life after politics, which is quite a wonderful thing because I can assure you there is less and less life in politics now than there used to be. [*Laughter*]

I never will forget the lesson Bill Gray gave all of us as chairman of the House Budget Committee when he believed that you actually could bring the deficit down and increase our investment in our people at the same time. That is what we are trying to do, and that is the path that he blazed. He also educated a reluctant National Government on the meaning of freedom when he got Congress to pass sanctions against South Africa and helped to put America on the right side of the struggle for freedom and democracy. Six weeks from now, South Africa will hold the first free elections in its history with—in one of the great, beautiful, and painful ironies in history—the jailed Nelson Mandela, and the jailer, Mr. de Klerk, who set him free, in an election where people will freely choose the course of their future. And you had something to do with that, quite a bit, Bill Gray, and America thanks you, and the world thanks you.

I think we all ought to know that that election will not be the end of South Africa's struggles, it will just be the beginning of a new phase, a phase in which free people will be called upon to overcome the legacy of their own past, a struggle in which we are still engaged in this country. One thing that the UNCF has always known is that the more free you are, the more you need to know. One of our administration's principal initiatives will be to try to support higher education in South Africa and to try to foster stronger linkages between your institutions and the institutions of higher education in South Africa, so that together we can march into the future.

Today Bill Gray was notified by the Director of the Agency for International Development, Brian Atwood, in our administration that the UNCF and the Hispanic Association of Higher Education are now going to work together to try to guarantee more participation in international aid programs for historically black colleges and universities throughout our country.

We have made a lot of progress since Dr. Patterson started his work and Franklin Roosevelt was President, a lot of progress since Benjamin Davis led soldiers in World War II simply to fight for their basic rights as citizens to defend this country. All the way along, those of you who have been part of the heart and soul of this administration have known that learning was the key to liberation.

I have been blessed in my administration with people who have graduated from the member schools of this distinguished group: the Energy Secretary, Hazel O'Leary, graduate of Fisk; my wonderful Presidential Assistant for Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, who graduated from Xavier and is here with me tonight; the Chief of Staff to the First Lady, Maggie Williams, and the Presidential Assistant for Personnel, Veronica Biggins, both graduated from Spelman, Dr. Cole; and my dear friend from Arkansas, our Nation's distinguished Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders, graduated from Philander Smith, my State's contribution to this distinguished organization.

We have named the most distinguished and the most diverse group of Federal judges of any group in our history, and many of those who are African-Americans started their educational lives at UNCF schools. Today, 17 of the 40 Members of Congress who are African-Americans and members of the Congressional Black Caucuses came from your schools.

In November, I signed an Executive order on Historically Black Colleges and Universities and committed our administration to their collective progress under the leadership of Catherine LeBlanc, who is here tonight with me. Since then, we have proposed putting more money into programs like Upward Bound, increasing funding for Pell grants, guaranteeing a new $375 million historically black colleges and universities capital financing program, and creating a whole new system of college loans so that our young people can borrow money to go to college at lower interest rates and pay it back on better terms, so that young people

will never be discouraged from borrowing money to go to college because of the burden of repaying it and never be discouraged from taking a more public-service-oriented job when they get out because their salaries will be insufficient to cover the cost of the loan. Now they can elect to pay it back as a percentage of their income over a long period of time.

And finally, we have, I hope and believe, at long last lifted the cloud that had been hanging over scholarships for minorities and said we will support them and we believe in them, because learning is the key to liberation.

What I want to say to you in closing is this, my friends: If learning is the key to full freedom in America, it must necessarily be true also that people must be free to learn. And too many of our young people are no longer truly free to learn.

I had an astonishing experience today in Brooklyn, before I came here, I met at Brooklyn College with several hundred young students there and young volunteers in community service programs all across the country. And we heard presentations from nine people who painted a stark portrait of America as it is: a wonderful woman from Detroit whose two sons had been shot down in a gang fight, one of them dying, who channeled her heartbreak into building a program, the acronym of which is SOSAD, to try to give young people the chance to avoid the fate that her son met. We met there today a young teenager from Oakland, California, who had been caught in a crossfire and had his body shattered. He lost an eye. He was paralyzed from his waist down. One of his legs had been amputated. He was confined to a wheelchair. And do you know, he is spending his life telling people who are the victims of violence, of gunshot wounds, and knife wounds, not be full of vengeance and bitterness, and trying to convince them and their families not to shoot back, not to stab back, not to fight back, but instead to build back their lives. This young man riveted that crowd. There were many others who came there, a young man from New Jersey who left a corporate career in New York and instead took his necktie off and put a T-shirt and decided to devote the rest of his life to building one-on-one relationships with kids in trouble, to give them a chance to get to the point where they would be free to learn. These are the kinds of people that I met.

But what I find is, even though there are hundreds, indeed, thousands of these stories all across America, you and I know that we're still losing an awful lot of our children. When the UNCF started—you think about this—when the UNCF started, just about everybody associated with its creation believed two things: number one, if you could make everybody free of discrimination, and number two, if you could give everybody the chance to get a good education, we could have real freedom and real opportunity and real community in America. We assume that.

If anybody had told anyone 50 years ago that after 50 years there would be 2,000 people a year killed by gunshot wounds in New York City alone, no one would have believed that. If anybody had told the founders of this organization 50 years ago that the out-of-wedlock birthrate in many of our cities would be in excess of 50 percent and that it gets worse and worse and worse as people are driven more and more and more into poverty, no one would have believed that. If anyone had said 50 years ago, what we're going to do with all this freedom in 50 years is have a flowering African-American middle class, an enormous explosion of entrepreneurs, unparalleled achievement by hoards of young professionals, and a dark flip-side in which people are killing each other with reckless abandon and people's lives are being lost and more and more young people are living in chaos and gangs, which people have feared, have been created, I am convinced, to do nothing more than fill the vacuum which has been created by the absence of family and community, of effective schooling and strong community organizations and hope, no one would have believed it.

And so I say to you, as we celebrate all the achievements that we see around this room tonight, as we celebrate all the achievements we know that are to come, we must recognize the inherent limits on the programs I just outlined and the support I just mentioned and the work that you are doing, unless we can also go back and pick up the rest of our brothers and sisters who are beyond the reach of these efforts.

And so I ask you to honor your past by creating a new freedom for those who have been left behind in this brave new world in which there is so much good and so much bad existing side by side. All these other kids count, too, the ones that will never get to your doors unless

you and all of your schools participate in this national service program and have your kids out there tutoring these kids, turning these kids away from violence, teaching people in our schools that there are nonviolent ways to resolve your angers, your frustrations, your disappointments, the thwarting we all feel every day in our lives. You can do that. You can teach the illiterate to read. You can teach the frustrated to be peaceful. You can raise the children up when they are very young. You can help to implant values into children who aren't getting them in other places. You have a larger, a different, a more profound mission than ever before.

I want to support you in that mission, too, because I know, I know, if we can get back to the point where the promise of all those ads we saw tonight, from the very first to Maya Angelou's magnificent poem, if we can do that, then this country's going to be all right. But if you want to hear somebody singing that poem over and over in their head, "And still I rise and still I rise and still I rise," it has to be true not just for the best of us but for all the rest of us. That is our challenge. Let us do our best to meet it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:38 p.m. at the Sheraton Hotel and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to United Negro College Fund president and chief executive officer William H. Gray III; former presidents Stephen Wright and Vernon Jordan; former executive director Arthur A. Fletcher; former chief executive officer Christopher Edley; Viola Trent, wife of William Trent, first executive director; founder Frederick C. Patterson; and author Maya Angelou.

Statement on Proposed Maritime Security and Trade Legislation
March 10, 1994

Today my administration is sending to the Congress the "Maritime Security and Trade Act of 1994." This legislation represents an important step forward to assuring America's future as a maritime nation.

A modern merchant United States flag fleet, with skilled U.S. mariners, will provide not only jobs and economic benefits but also an important sealift capability in times of national emergency. My administration's proposal calls for a $1 billion, 10-year program to revitalize the U.S. maritime industry. I look forward to working with the Congress to secure approval for this important legislation.

Remarks Announcing the Summit of the Americas
March 11, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen. Today's announcement is good for our Nation and good for our hemisphere. This has been a very important year and a couple of months for this hemisphere. Late last year, in an historic choice, the American people and the Congress embraced NAFTA, which will establish the world's largest free-trade zone, create jobs, and bolster the growth of democracy in market economies. In December, right after the NAFTA vote, the Vice President went to Mexico City, as he said, and announced my intention to host a meeting of democratically elected heads of state and government in this hemisphere.

Today I am pleased to announce that the Summit of the Americas will be held in early December in the city of Miami. [*Applause*] Thank you. The diversity, the dynamism, the applause meter—[*laughter*]—all make Miami an ideal site for this meeting. Miami's economy is fully integrated with the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean. In so many ways, it represents the promise of hemispheric integra-

tion. The Summit of the Americas will be an historic event, will be the first meeting of hemispheric leaders in over a generation, and it will be the first-ever hemispheric meeting of democratically elected leaders.

Let me say a word about why this summit matters so much to us here at home in the United States. Our Nation has a major stake in the prosperity and freedom of the entire hemisphere. Our exports to Latin America and the Caribbean have more than doubled in just 7 years, rising to nearly $80 billion in 1993. That has generated hundreds of thousands of new jobs for American workers. If we can continue to bring down hemispheric trade barriers, we can create a million new jobs by the turn of the century. At the same time, the rising tide of democracy in this hemisphere helps make us more secure. Democracies tend not to fight one another; they make better partners in trade and diplomacy. And as we work with our neighbors to build more free, prosperous, and secure relations throughout this hemisphere, this summit will advance our common efforts and our shared interests.

When the Summit of the Americas convenes in Miami, we will crown a process of intensive consultation that will begin next week when the Vice President travels to Bolivia, Argentina, and Brazil to meet with the leaders of those nations. In the coming months, I will be working with my hemispheric counterparts to develop a full and productive agenda for this summit. We want to consider two broad themes: first, how to strengthen our democracies, defend them collectively, and improve our governance; second, how to promote economic growth while advancing a strategy of sustainable development that protects the environment and alleviates poverty. To help to define our agenda, we will also encourage business, labor, and nongovernmental organizations all across the hemisphere to exchange ideas and propose initiatives that can enrich the summit deliberations.

We've arrived at a moment of very great promise and great hope for the Western Hemisphere. Democratic values are ascendant. Our economies are growing and becoming more intertwined every day through trade and investment. Now we have a unique opportunity to build a community of free nations, diverse in culture and history, but bound together by a commitment to responsive and free government, vibrant civil societies, open economies, and rising living standards for all our people.

So as we prepare for this Summit of the Americas, let us think boldly and set forth a vision of progress for all our people. Let us begin the work of building a genuine new community for all of us in this hemisphere. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, Christopher Thomas, Assistant Secretary General, Organization of American States; Muni Figueres de Jimenez, External Relations Advisor, Inter-American Development Bank; and Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida made brief remarks.*]

The President. I'd like to just say, in closing, a couple of things. First of all, I don't think anyone who is not aware of this process can possibly understand the energy and the persistence and the thought that went into the application that Governor Chiles pressed for Miami to host this conference. I compliment him and my long-time friend Buddy MacKay for the work that they did and the way they did it. They did not make me witness grown men crying—[*laughter*]—but all short of that was tried.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to my former colleague, as a Governor and a Senator, Bob Graham, and to the other members of the congressional delegation for the work that they did in pressing this cause. But most of all, I have to tell you that I have been deeply moved over the last few years when I've had the opportunity to go to Miami and to south Florida and see the heroic efforts that people have made to deal not only with the aftermath of the hurricane but to build a genuine multicultural, multiracial society that would be at the crossroads of the Americas and, therefore, at the forefront of the future. In the end, I think that this decision was made on the merits, because our best hopes to do things that democracies find difficult to do—get people together across racial and economic and ethnic lines—lies in the efforts that are being made there now. And I believe that in December, we will have a great gathering in a place that can symbolize the future toward which we are all tending.

Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:37 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Budget Legislation
March 11, 1994

I commend the House for passing our budget. This budget continues to bring down the deficit and makes needed investments in our people and in our economy. Our commitment to fiscal discipline and targeted investments is paying off in strong economic growth and job creation. Working together, the Congress and this administration are building a stronger economy for today and a future of opportunity for our children.

The President's Radio Address
March 12, 1994

Good morning. This morning I want to talk with you about what we're doing here at home and abroad to create better jobs for our American workers and about a breakthrough we've had in our trade talks with Japan.

Let me begin with this important news. Today we've reached an agreement that will open up Japan's cellular telephone market to high-technology products made here in America. This is a big win for everyone. Workers in the United States will gain because the agreement means more demand for cellular telephones and related equipment made in America. Japanese consumers win because they'll have access to better service and better technology at better prices. Even Japanese manufacturers may win because of the increased demand for cellular telephones. This agreement is designed to produce results; both countries will be able to measure progress. And it demonstrates that the United States and Japan can work together to open up jobs in America by opening up markets in Japan in ways that help both Americans and Japanese.

Our trade negotiations with Japan are just one example of the challenges and opportunities that face us in this new global economy. That's why tomorrow I'll join leaders of the world's seven major industrial nations in Detroit for a conference on creating more and better jobs for our people. For two decades, all these wealthy countries have struggled to protect the jobs of our working people and to create new jobs in an extremely competitive and rapidly changing global economy. None of us has had the success we would like. That's why I asked for this meeting.

But remember this: Of all the advanced nations, America is doing the best job of creating new jobs, and we should be proud. After 12 years of drift, we were able to get the deficit and interest rates and inflation down and to get productivity and investments in growth up. As a result, our economy has generated 2 million new jobs in a little more than a year, and 90 percent of them are in the private sector. And if we stay with our program when it comes to jobs, there will be 2 million more in 1994.

But we can't rest on this record. Too many Americans haven't yet felt the benefits of recovery. Too many middle class Americans are still working harder for the same or lower wages. And too many lack the education and training they need to prosper in today's competitive environment.

Our trading partners all have similar problems. Advanced nations are experiencing chronic unemployment and stagnant wages. Powerful new technologies and global communications have created the most competitive world markets ever, and we must compete and win in it.

These are very serious problems. They require new ways of thinking, and no nation has all the answers. But all of us are trying, and we all have something to learn from each other. That is the purpose of the conference in Detroit.

In Detroit, I will reaffirm my belief that the global economy is not an obstacle to progress but a great opportunity for us. We can't build walls around our nations and refuse to compete. Turning inward won't change the world or improve our jobs. Preparing for change and em-

bracing change, however, and using it to create more high-wage jobs will do what we want to do. That is our goal. And here's how we plan to do it:

First, we'll continue to expand trade in open markets around the world. International trade is an engine for growth that creates jobs, that lifts wages. That's why we've signed more trade agreements and lowered more trade barriers this year than in any recent memory. Our commitment to opening new markets to American goods is unshakable.

Second, we must invest to develop new technologies and products like the information superhighway or new technologies for dual use in both defense and civilian markets. And we'll continue to demonstrate that protecting the environment can be good for the economy. For example, there are hundreds of thousands of good jobs in producing clean cars and alternative fuels, and we believe those jobs should be American jobs. Sound fiscal policies at home, opening markets abroad, investing in the technologies of the future, that's how to create more high-wage jobs.

The final piece of this puzzle is to invest in the education and skills of our people so they are prepared to fill those jobs. That's why we've already invested more in getting our children off to a good start in Head Start, in the Women's, Infant, and Children nutrition programs. That's why we've already reformed the student loan program so that all children, including children of the middle class, can afford to go to college by borrowing money at lower interest rates and paying it off as a percentage of their incomes after they get jobs. That's why, just a few days ago, I asked Congress to discard the old unemployment and training program, which is too big, too old, and too slow, and replace it with a system to retrain our workers quickly for the high-skilled jobs of tomorrow and to link them to those jobs within weeks, not months or years.

We're pushing Congress hard to pass a safe schools act, to reduce violence in our schools and to make our children safer on the streets on the way to school. Congress now is finishing work on our Goals 2000 education bill, which will establish world-class standards for educational excellence and on our school-to-work initiative, which will allow our young people who don't go to college to get the skills they need to find good jobs. Each of these important measures stands a good chance of becoming law, many in just a matter of weeks.

Meeting this challenge head-on is never easy. Change is always difficult. But these are things we have to do and something we've proved we can do. Our economic policies have sparked a real recovery and begun to put our economic house in order. The Congress seems determined to continue working with me this year. Just yesterday, the House of Representatives, in record time, okayed our new budget. If it passes the whole Congress we will have 3 consecutive years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

Our trade policies continue to open markets in ways that will boost exports, create jobs, and share the benefits of growth. We can defeat any obstacle to change, we can create millions of high-wage jobs for our people if we have the courage to confront our problems boldly, not to be diverted or deterred, and we make a commitment to solving these problems together.

That will be my message to all the nations gathered this Monday in Detroit, and it is my commitment to all of you hearing this broadcast today.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. A table listing education, training, and reemployment legislative priorities for the 2d session of the 103d Congress was attached to the release.

Remarks at Focus: HOPE in Detroit, Michigan

March 13, 1994

Thank you so much, Father, Eleanor, Donald, ladies and gentlemen, for welcoming me here and introducing me to Focus: HOPE. I have met your ambassadors to the world, Father

Cunningham, and Donald is a great ambassador for you. Where did he go? Is he hiding? You would have been so proud of him in Washington, speaking about you to the whole country. He was terrific. Thank you, Congresswoman Collins, for welcoming me and my good friend Senator Levin. I think if I had not come here to Focus: HOPE, he never would have cast a single vote for me again in the United States—[*laughter*]. You know, all of us are obsessed by something or another in life; it's a good thing to be obsessed by something good and noble. Carl Levin is obsessed with Focus: HOPE, in the best possible way.

The best tribute I can think of is to look around this room. We have two United States Senators, Governor Engler, Mayor Archer, all these Congressmen here, Chairman Dingell, Congressman Conyers, Congressman Barcia, Congressman Bonior, Congressman Kildee, Congressman Sandy Levin—I think that's everybody. And then we have the Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, and the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, which represent two of the three Departments, along with the Department of Defense, that have made direct investments in Focus: HOPE. This is a great tribute to this work. But the most important thing I want to say to you is that you heard Donald read the creed of Focus: HOPE, which was forged 26 years ago this week, on March 8th, 1968, and it sounds as if it could have been written yesterday, doesn't it?

I guess I have spent as much time in manufacturing facilities of various sorts as any person who ever occupied the Presidency, because I was a Governor for 12 years, I had to do that. I have never been in a place as advanced, as upbeat, as hopeful as this place. And I can tell you, when we were pulling in here today, I was talking to Senator Riegle and Senator Levin—we were in the car together—and Carl looked at me, and he said, "This is what you ran for President to do, 'focus hope.' This is what you wanted to bring to the entire country. You are going in to see why you wanted to be President of the United States."

I think all of you know that I am here, along with the leaders of six of the other world's great industrial powers, to talk about the jobs crisis in the advanced economies. In every wealthy country now, there is difficulty creating new jobs. The United States has the lowest unemployment rate of all the so-called G–7 advanced industrial nations. In every advanced economy now, there are problems rewarding work with higher wages year-in and year-out, and many, many people are stuck with wages that do not go up, even when they work harder. And we are looking for answers to unlock this. We're looking for ways that we can work together to create more opportunity for people like you.

But you know and I know that no matter what policies we pursue in Washington or around the world, unless people are trained, unless they have a skill that enables them to compete and win in the global economy, to produce a high-quality, world-class product or service, nothing the Government can do will make any difference. What you are doing is guaranteeing America's security here and America's future by guaranteeing your own.

I want you to be proud of that. I also want everybody in America to see you. Here we are, in an inner-city neighborhood, with building after building of plants that were closed down which could have become a symbol for the loss of hope, which could have become yet another excuse for why people can't make it if they are poor or if they are minorities or if they are women or if they've been on welfare or if this or if that or if the other thing. And instead of saying "if," this is a place that says "when": When you work, when you learn, you can do, you can have a future.

And this makes the point, for all the problems with this world that we're living in, if you know how to do something and you're good at it, no one can take that away from you, and you can be rewarded for that. And you have proven if those skills can be acquired and that talent can be demonstrated, without regard to race or gender or income or background, if only we will give everybody a chance and invest in the future of the American people, this model here could be seen sweeping across America, if we had the kind of local leadership that is manifest here by the stunning examples of Father Cunningham and Eleanor Josaitis and if we had the kind of help you've had here from the private sector to work with Government in a partnership. There is not enough Government money in the world to create these opportunities without a partnership. But if we can do this here, we can do it anywhere. And if here, if here you can be the best in the world, then America can be the best in the world every-

where. That is our mission, all of us, to be that.

I just want you to know that I got a lot more out of seeing you today than you did out of seeing me. I got fresh, clear, strong evidence to prove what I have always believed, that if we could get rid of all these hangups we've got in this country, if we could stop majoring in the minors and minoring in the majors and start thinking about what is really important, if we could really believe that all people are created equal and that people can do anything, if we could remember that the purpose of coming together is to get people together to share beliefs, to share convictions, and to get things done, then we would be able to revolutionize this whole country. If it can happen in these few square blocks of Detroit, my fellow Americans, can it not happen throughout our country? I believe it can.

So I want you to know you have inspired me, and I will talk about you all across this country. I remember I used to say when I was running for President, because of the little town that I was born in, that I still believed in a place called Hope. And now I can say I also believe in a place called Focus: HOPE.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:39 p.m. at the Center for Advanced Technology. In his remarks, he referred to Focus: HOPE director Father William Cunningham, associate director Eleanor Josaitis, and student Donald Hutchinson.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Group of Seven Ministers in Detroit

March 14, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, do you think rising interest rates are hurting the U.S. economic recovery?

The President. I don't think we can say that for sure yet. They were bound to go up some after the fourth quarter growth figure came in; we had the highest growth rate in a decade. But I think that since there's no inflation in the economy, interest rates should not continue to go up. We'll see. If they moderate, tail off, then we'll be all right.

China

Q. Is the U.S., Mr. President, backing away from its human rights stand in terms of MFN for China?

The President. I was disappointed at the results of the meeting with the Secretary of State. And our policy is the same. We'll just have to wait and see what happens between now and June. I'll make a judgment at the appropriate time.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:25 a.m. at the Westin Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Group of Seven Jobs Conference in Detroit

March 14, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and your wonderful service and for your commitment to this project. The Vice President will be here for the entire day and a half, working with the distinguished ministers from other countries as well as our own Cabinet members and other leaders here in America.

I want to thank the State of Michigan and the congressional delegation and the city of Detroit. You know, it is true that the Mayor runs faster in the morning than the President and

the Vice President do. [*Laughter*] He took us out to Belle Isle; I made him quit after 3 miles. And if that weren't enough indignity, I got back to the hotel room and I read the newspaper and discovered that in the NCAA basketball championships, my beloved Arkansas basketball team has been paired with Michigan in the Midwest regionals. The only thing I can say is they are in much better shape than I am, Mayor. [*Laughter*]

I want to say how wonderful it is for me to be back here in this magnificent theater which represents the cultural richness and the indomitable spirit of this wonderful city. I want to thank Michael and Marion Ilitch for restoring this theater and for doing so much else for downtown historical—[*applause*].

I am delighted that the ministers of the G–7 nations and representatives of the European Union have come here to America's industrial heartland for this important meeting at an historic and hopeful time. In some nations, people are pessimistic. And in all nations, some people are pessimistic, and in all nations, there are people with difficulties. But there is real cause for hope. Technology that was once the province of science fiction now fills our factories, our schools, and our homes. Nations that once aimed missiles at each other now cooperate not only here on Earth but also in space. Jobs that challenge the mind instead of straining the back are now within reach of virtually all the people who live in these nations.

For the past half-century, our great common endeavors, from containing communism to defeating aggression in the Persian Gulf, to expanding world trade to promoting democracy in the former Soviet Union and helping to solve the tragic conflict in Bosnia, all have depended on common bonds among the countries present here today. I asked for the conference to summon the same collective energy and intellect and ideas and experience to one of the greatest problems of our era: The challenge of creating and maintaining a high-wage, high-growth society in mature industrial countries confronted by the challenges of a global economy.

In different ways, every advanced nation faces a stubborn, persistent problem of jobs and incomes. Some are having difficulty creating new jobs; others are having difficulty lifting their people's incomes. In the United States, we have created a lot of new jobs in the last two decades. But for almost two decades now, the wages of hourly workers in America have remained virtually stagnant. The average American worker is working a longer work week than 20 years ago for about the same income.

None of us has all the answers. We are here because we have something to learn from each other and, hopefully, something to teach each other. We can all do better, and if we work together, it is certain that all of our people will do better.

For the first time, this conference brings together our ministers of finance, labor, commerce, and economics. We know that the riddle of job creation cannot be solved entirely by low interest rates or better training policies or high tech investment alone, but we need these. Some of the ministers told me that if we can get the finance ministers and labor ministers within each country to talk to each other, we will have made a real step forward. There's no better place to address these challenges than here, in this city, this State, and this region. They tell us not only that we must change but that we can.

When I was growing up in Arkansas, many of the people that I knew and lived with were farmers. Almost no one my age can go back more than one generation in my State without having a farmer in his or her family. But as agriculture mechanized and more and more people were thrown off the farms, literally hundreds of thousands of people were forced to leave the farm. Many of them came to places like Detroit for jobs in the factory. When I campaigned in Michigan 2 years ago, I realized I actually had a chance to be elected President when one of three Democratic primary voters I met in Michigan was born in Arkansas. [*Laughter*]

That is the pattern of America. For most of this century, the industrial Midwest symbolized economic opportunity. People thrown off the farm in the rural areas could come here and expect to find, without regard to their race or their educational level before they got here or their income before they got here, a job which would permit them to support their families, take a vacation, have health care, send their kids to college, live in their own home, and have a decent retirement when they finish. That was the great hope and promise of Detroit, of Chicago, of this whole regional mecca that led the industrial revolution of America.

Industrial America was hit hard by economic changes, which all of you know as well or better than I. But I have watched the people of this region fight back. A few years ago, people said the American automobile industry was doomed. But the Big Three auto companies worked hard with their partners in labor to improve quality, safety, and fuel efficiency. Now they are regaining market share at home and abroad. They are back. For the past dozen years Michigan has made the journey to a new economy. Small and mid-sized companies here have created nearly 400,000 manufacturing and industrial service jobs. The British magazine The Economist calls Automation Alley, the 40-mile corridor between Detroit and Ann Arbor, and I quote, "the fastest growing technology corridor in the entire United States of America."

And yet, let us not be too Pollyanna about this. With all the good news, there's also the continuing challenge. Too many people have been left behind. And that was the challenge that I think brought this fine young Mayor to the mayor's job here and is bringing so many of you together across party and racial and income and background lines to try to figure out how we can unlock the human potential of all of our people.

This morning I want to begin by introducing you to eight extraordinary people throughout the Midwest who exemplify the changes that we must all make—and I want to ask them to stand up when I call their names—because it is important for all of us in public life never to forget that there are real lives behind the actions we take and the mistakes we make as well as the things we do right.

Anna Satur—where are you, Anna? Stand up. They should all be down here. She's not here? If you are here, you stand up when I call you. Steve Choate. I know he's here, I saw him yesterday. Stand up, Steve. Don't sit down. Steve Choate is a near neighbor of mine. He started out as a janitor, and he's now a plant manager for Megavolt in Springfield, Missouri, part of an employee-owned company that practices, and I quote, "open-book management, sharing its financial figures with its workers and asking their help in planning new products."

Debbie Colloton started as a machine operator, took advanced training, and became the quality control officer of Rockford Process Control, a metal assemblies maker in Rockford, Illinois. Bruce Wirtanen founded Waterworks America. I met him yesterday, and he gave me one of his products. He never stopped selling. [*Laughter*] In North Royalton, Ohio, they make crystals that save water in places like Saudi Arabia, where water is more expensive than oil. Kathy Price, of Chicago, learned new skills at the Martin Luther King Community Services Center and moved from welfare to work as a programmer analyst. Frank Rapley is the superintendent of the Kalamazoo, Michigan, public schools, where they help young people who are not going to college move from school to work. Harold Wright learned new skills in heating and air conditioning after he lost his factory job right here in Detroit, and now he's an instructor for the International Union of Operating Engineers. And Ocelia Williams—I saw her—is a lead person and metal slitter operator at the Cin-Made Corporation in Cincinnati, Ohio, a unionized company with profit sharing and self-directed work teams.

All these people have been forced to change to do well in the global economy. But they are your friends and neighbors, and there are millions of them like them not only here but in every one of the G–7 nations here represented. We are here to help them find new ways to create new jobs, better jobs, and better opportunities for their families. And we dare not let them down. Thank you very much.

Let us begin by recognizing the fundamental reality that private enterprise, not Government action, is the engine of economic growth and job creation. Our vision of the good society depends as much on a thriving private sector as anything else. Let us also recognize that there are things that Government can and should do, give our private sector the tools to grow and prepare our people for the jobs of the new economy. A big thing that we'll be discussing here in the next 2 days is what the responsibility of the Government is and what must be done in the private sector and how we can reconcile the two better than any of us has done in the past.

Here in the United States, I think we are moving in the right direction. Our economy has produced 2.1 million jobs in 13 months, and 90 percent of them are in the private sector. In the 1980's, a lot of the net new job growth in America was in the government sector, mostly at the State and local level. These new jobs are coming in the private sector. But too many middle class people are working harder for less,

and too many people in America are still unemployed. Too many lack the training to prosper in the competitive environment, and there are too many areas where there is simply no new private investment, especially in large sections of inner cities and isolated rural areas.

The growing gap in incomes between the skilled and unskilled threatens not only the strength of our economies in these countries but also the very fabric of our democratic societies. A year ago, for example, unemployment in America was 12.6 percent for people with no high school diploma, 7.2 percent for high school graduates, 5.7 percent for people with advanced training, and 3.5 percent for college graduates. And unemployment, as I said before, is also highest in places where people are isolated from investment opportunities, principally in our large inner cities and our poorest rural areas.

All of us, in our own way, must face these fundamental challenges to find new ways to equip people to succeed, harnessing the dynamism of the marketplace and somehow finding a way to bring those forces into the areas where people have been left behind. I have to say that here in the United States, I sometimes think we do a better job in giving people incentives to invest in some of our trading partners that are developing economies than we do in some of our inner cities and isolated rural areas that are also developing economies where we have opportunities to grow.

We all know that a global economy is taking shape where information and investment move across national lines at stunning speed, competing for jobs and incomes. For economies at the cutting edge, there is no place to hide. Rapidly developing nations strive to improve their living standards by showing that they can do what we do just as well at lower costs. As the old era gives way to the new, our nations face a clear and crucial choice at the very outset. Are we going to hunker down and build walls of protection and suffer a slow and steady decline in our living standards, or are we going to embrace eagerly the challenges of this new economy, create high-wage jobs, and prepare people to fill them?

Every advanced economy is now facing that choice in many different ways, a choice between hope and fear, between stagnation and change, between closing up and opening up. If we ever needed evidence that we should choose change and that we can, I received that evidence yesterday when I visited Focus: HOPE here in Detroit, where I saw people from the inner city being trained for world-class jobs, getting world-class jobs, and able to compete.

America has chosen the path of change. We have seen, among other things, these other countries in the G–7, all of our guests here today—my fellow Americans, you need to know that they used to meet once a year, and every time they met for 10 years, the G–7 nations passed a resolution that was, frankly, embarrassing to the United States. They did it in very polite language, but they essentially said the global economy cannot grow if America continues to expand its budget deficit, every year spending more and more money than the taxpayers are paying in. They said, "Please, America, do something about your deficit." And so we did.

By cutting the deficit by $500 billion, we now have a deficit that is a smaller percentage of our annual income than all but one of our other G–7 nations here represented today. And I'm proud of that. And if the Congress adopts the new budget, as they seem on the way to doing, we will have 3 years of reduction in our deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President. So we are moving in the right direction.

You need to know that our nations here have adopted a strategy that recognizes that each of the great blocs here have a role to play, that the United States should continue to bring its deficit down, that Japan should increase domestic demand, that Europe should continue to work for lower interest rates, so that these three things together can spark a new round of worldwide growth which will create more economic activity and more jobs in the European countries, here in North America with the United States and Canada, and in Japan.

We're also working hard together to tear down trade barriers with NAFTA, GATT, a meeting with the Asian-Pacific countries. Last year we did a generation's work of worth in supporting global growth and jobs and incomes through increased trade.

During the debate on NAFTA, we heard the concerns of working people—legitimate concerns—who were vulnerable to changes in the economy and don't believe that any of these changes will benefit them. But we had to face the simple truth: Export-related jobs in the United States pay on average 22 percent more

than jobs having nothing to do with the global economy. And trade is not a zero-sum game. If the world economy declines, we all lose, and when it grows, we all win.

One lesson is clear: There is no rich country on Earth that can expand its own job base and its incomes unless there is global economic growth. In the absence of that growth, poorer countries doing the same thing we do for wages our people can't live on will chip away at our position. When there is a lot of growth you can be developing new technologies, new activities, and new markets. That is our only option.

We also, therefore, must create those new markets. That means we have to be investing in job-creating technologies, from dual-use military and civilian technologies as we reduce defense spending to an information superhighway connecting every classroom and library in the country.

Many of these technologies will be in the environmental area. We now know for sure it is possible to protect the environment and promote the economy. Together with the Big Three auto companies and United Auto Workers, we're promoting clean cars that will cause less pollution and create more markets. From Theodore Roosevelt to Walter Reuther to our own distinguished Vice President, our wisest leaders have always cared about both our workers and our environment. And we aim to prove that that's a big ticket to new jobs in the 21st century.

Now, what are the obstacles to change? Here in the heartland and throughout the industrial world, too many people have worked hard only to see their incomes stagnate or decline. We have to restore confidence in people that if they do acquire the skills they need and help their countries move forward, they'll be rewarded and not punished. These ingrained political, almost psychological barriers to change have to be addressed in every country.

I'll be candid with you. One of the things that I hope will come out of this G–7 meeting is that by talking together openly and honestly about the problems of growth and sharing our common experiences, each of us who are leaders in our countries will be able to do more within our own countries because we'll be able to say, "See, the Germans and the French and the Canadians and the Italians and the Japanese, well, we all have the same problems."

We have talked about that a lot around our breakfast table this morning. And everybody made the same observation, that if we can just honestly debate these problems, we can help people overcome their fears of change and still recognize that there are some legitimate concerns associated with these changes going on.

This conference, I think, must address three critical problems that discourage people from supporting change. Unless people believe they are prepared for the jobs of the future, that productivity benefits them, and they can have both strong work lives and strong families in a dynamic economy, they will turn against change. We have to reassure our constituents in all these countries on all those points.

Our first challenge is obvious, preparing our people for a world of work that offers high wages but demands high skills. When I address audiences of young people, I tell them they will probably change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime. That's why we're moving forward with a lifelong learning agenda in Congress and why Congress is preparing to pass bills establishing world-class educational standards, promoting grassroots reform, helping to facilitate the movement of people who go from high school into the workplace and who don't go on to college.

Learning must never stop. We've got an unemployment system today tied to an economy that hasn't existed for over 10 years, an unemployment that assumes that if you just give people enough to live on, they will be called back to their old job. Well, the truth is most people aren't called back to their old job today. When they lose a job today it's not because of some cyclical regular downturn in the economy, it's often because there has been another structural change in the world economy, and what used to be done by a person in America is now being done by a machine in America or by a person somewhere else. So that person has to find something new to do. That means it is wrong to charge employers an unemployment tax, to put it in a trust fund to pay people when they are unemployed to hang around until the unemployment runs out, when they still won't have a job. That is not right. So last week we presented a plan to turn our unemployment system into a reemployment system, to consolidate all these training programs, create one-stop career centers, and start people training and preparing for new jobs from the day they lose their old jobs.

This is a big problem in many industrial countries. The length of time people are unemployed

is growing longer and longer, and very often because they don't get training they are forced to take a new job at a lower wage than the old job they lost. We can change this, and in so doing, we can make our people feel more secure about embracing the changes of the global economy. And besides, it's good business. We need all our people right now. We shouldn't be paying for people to be idle when we could be paying for them to work. It's not good business.

Yesterday, as I said, when I went to Focus: HOPE, I saw young people who were learning advanced jobs in engineering, robotics, other fields of the future, proving once again that all people can learn. I met a man the other day from northern New York who had worked in the defense industry for 29 years and is now an executive in a hospital, because he was given the chance to learn a new skill and given the chance to be hired by an employer not blinded by age bias. We have too much age bias in this country on both—[*applause*]. We have people that won't hire kids because they don't have any experience. How are they ever going to get any experience if they don't get a job, right? Then we have people who won't hire older people because they've got too much experience. Let me tell you, the older I get, the more I believe this, so I think I can say this with great passion. The fastest growing group of Americans today are people over 80. People who follow sensible habits are going to be very vigorous well into their 70's, able to work, able to contribute, able to do things. If people are going to lose their jobs throughout a lifetime, if we are going to have to change jobs eight times in a lifetime, a lot of people will have to change jobs into their 50's, even into their 60's. They cannot be denied the opportunity to contribute. If you want people to embrace change, we all have to change our attitudes about who is employable and especially on each end of the age spectrum. This is a very, very important thing. The issue should be, are people prepared for the jobs that are opening up? And if they are, they should be given a chance to do them.

The second challenge we face is one we talked about a lot at breakfast this morning. And the representative from the European Union from Greece made a very passionate comment about this. We have got to make our people believe that productivity can be a source of gain, not pain. And here is the trick. Productivity on the farm when I was a boy meant people lost jobs on the farm, right? But productivity in Detroit meant that more jobs were created in the automobile industry than were lost on the farm. Throughout the whole 20th century, ever since the Industrial Revolution, every time we had productivity in one area that meant that fewer people could do more work in that area, technological changes were always creating more jobs in another area.

Now, that is still true today, but the problem is there has been an explosion of productivity in manufacturing. It's not stopping. And now it's in the service industries, so that banks, for example, or insurance companies or you name it can do more work with fewer people because of information productivity. And at the same time, all these other countries are able to do things that they were not formerly able to do. So in our countries there is this great insecurity that productivity, for the first time, may be a job threat, not a job creator.

We have to fight that. Because last year we saw our companies here in America begin to rebound: 13 months, 2.1 million jobs. And I promise you they would not have been there had it not been for increasing productivity in the private sector. We cannot turn away from the notion that modernization is the key to employment. The trick is for us in Government and people in the private sector to keep finding new areas in which productivity can succeed. Therefore, even though we're cutting back on Government spending this year, for example, we're spending a lot more money to try to give funds to defense contractors to figure out how they can use the technologies we all paid for to win the cold war, to win the post-cold-war era, in new technologies for new jobs for the future.

That is the trick. We've got to prove to our people that change can work for them and that increasing productivity is still the key to jobs and growth. If we forget that, if we allow our fears to blind us to the fact that we must always be on the side of productivity, we're going to be in real trouble. That's what created the middle class. The ability to do more per worker created the American middle class. It created the economic miracles in Europe and Japan after World War II. It will still create opportunity. It just is going to be different and more challenging and more complicated and more rapidly moving than before. But if we allow

ourselves for a minute to try to resist the growth of productivity, we are in deep trouble.

From 1947 to 1973, productivity grew by over 3 percent a year in America, and wages grew at the same rate. Since then, the growth of productivity has slowed down and so have wages. Productivity is now coming back in many sectors of our economy, and as it does, jobs and wages will improve. Because we need to work smarter and not harder, this issue is more important than ever before.

Today the United States Senate is debating a bill to help business conduct research and development to create manufacturing centers where businesses can work together as smaller manufacturers have been doing in northern Italy, for example, for quite a long time now, to help put new technologies in the hands of companies that can use them, even though on their own, they wouldn't have the money to develop them. These are the kinds of things that all nations must do to keep their own people on the side of productivity and to keep our own economies going.

There will always be restructurings; there will always be some job loss. The best Government policies, the best business practices cannot stop these changes. But what we can do is to help our people shape the change. Government has to equip people with lifelong learning, reemployment, health care security. Businesses have to keep pushing for productivity improvements. Leaders in the private sector have to strive for new ways to help their own workers benefit from productivity increases throughout well-conceived strategic planning and new innovations and creating high-performance workplaces and letting workers participate in more decision-making.

We talked this morning at breakfast about how Japan still has basically a lifetime employment policy. In order to do that, you have to be willing to carry your workers through the tough times and always have the companies find new things to do, because that way you don't have to go to a new company. However we do it, there is a big responsibility here that can only be borne by the private sector, not by Government. From companies that make cars to those that write software, some of the greatest gains have been achieved by those who treated their workers as their most important asset, who gave their workers the most respect and the largest role in figuring out how to do what has to be done to compete and win in the global economy. These are the high performance workplaces that train and retrain their employees, empower them to take personal responsibility for the quality of the products and services, and treat the workers and the unions as friends, not adversaries.

Today I am going to visit a company called Detroit Diesel that's working with the UAW to make high-quality engines for domestic and foreign markets. The chief executive, Robert Penske, is known to most of you for sending championship teams to the Indianapolis 500 race. And he's also, however, building a championship team here at Detroit Diesel, a team succeeding in the face of change.

The third challenge we have is to offer people security in their own lives while maintaining the dynamism of market economies. This is a big deal, and it's a difficult one. How can we give workers the security they need? What kind of unemployment system must we have, what kind of health care must we have, what kind of training system must we have, what kind of policies must we have for family leave and for child care or for caring for parents that enable people to succeed as workers and as family members?

We have seen in the United States, more than in any other country present here, the awful price we pay if the family disintegrates as an institution. It is a more fundamental institution than the workplace. It is the most fundamental institution. But we know that most of our people are now in the work force. Most mothers with children over one year of age are now in the work force. How can we make it possible for people to do what they have to do as workers and do what they have to do as family members? How does the Government intervene in that in a way that makes work forces more productive instead of putting so many burdens on the work unit that they can't compete in the global economy? This is a tough, difficult, even painful thing for most of us to discuss, but we have to be honest about it. And I look forward to the next day and a half, to seeing some very stimulating discussions about this.

In every country we have to find the right formula. We can't just fall into dogmatism or ideology and pretend that one or the other doesn't matter. But we know that when secure workers with secure families, knowing they are succeeding as parents, show up for work, they

are free to be the most productive workers in the world. We also know that there is a limit for the cost any operation can bear and still be productive. So we are going to have to talk through and work through these difficult issues.

I know the United States has benefited from the resilience of its firms and its workers and the flexibility of its labor markets. I also know we have been hurt by the gnawing insecurity of millions of our people when they lose their health care or they can't change jobs because they've got somebody in their family that's been sick with a preexisting condition.

I know that the family leave law, in my own mind, that we signed here last year, which simply brought us into line with every other country that's here at the G–7 and 170 others around the world, is going to make the American workplace stronger because people won't have to lose their jobs when they take care of sick children or parents in need. These are things that we have to face.

So as we seek to find these proper balances, to help people deal with these three challenges, let us recognize two simple truths: First, the market, with all of its unruly energy and all of its dislocation, is still an unstoppable, unstoppable and absolutely indispensable force for progress. We have to have markets where people are making choices. Second, our societies can promote human values from the strength of our families to the skills of our workers. We can do that, and in so doing, empower people to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by a vibrant market economy.

Now, I believe if you believe these things, then you say, "Well, why are we all here? Why must we act together? Why must we act together in our own countries? Why should these nations that share so much try to act together among themselves?" I want the ministers to explore these questions honestly and openly. But it is perfectly clear, again I will say, that it is easier for us to do what we need to do at home if we know people in other countries are working with us and that we're all going to win over the long run.

So let us ask the hard questions. First, what really is the jobs problem? Why is unemployment too high even when growth occurs? Can we really talk about one national unemployment rate anymore? Does the national unemployment rate mean anything to any of you here in Michigan? No, you want to know what the unemployment rate is in Michigan or what it is in Detroit or what it is in Wayne County, right? Is there a national unemployment rate that is meaningful? Are there trends in all these countries that make the overall rate of unemployment in each less important than the rates among different sectors of the society, especially among people who, because of their long-term unemployment, their lack of skills, or their isolation from investment opportunities, have absolutely lost touch with the labor markets?

Second, what's the best strategy for worldwide cooperation on monetary and fiscal policy to stimulate growth and create jobs? How do we balance our fears of inflation with the need for economic growth?

Third, how can we build a social safety net that helps our people advance and helps our economies grow? Can we provide lifelong learning, help people to balance the demands of work and family, give people health security, and still keep our economies dynamic? And if so, what is the best way to do that?

Fourth, history has shown productivity brings better jobs and higher wages. But how do we, when change is so rapid, make the case to our people that this will be true in this time as it has always been true in the past? And with the rapid technological change of the information age, how can Government policies and business practices show workers that change and productivity can be harnessed for their advantage?

None of us can find the answers to all of these questions just within the borders of our individual countries. At this conference, as we share our insights, our views, and our practical experiences, every one of our nations will benefit. If we find new and effective ways to generate jobs and increase incomes, the working people of all nations will be the winners. It is my hope that this conference will continue the work that we began last year where these great industrial nations work together to get things done.

For years, the G–7 nations consulted with each other about the great issues of macroeconomics and global finance. Today we are beginning a serious conversation about the economic well-being of ordinary people in each of these countries. This is an historic, important, and long-overdue moment.

We all must succeed. If any of us fails to convince our people to embrace change, then

that nation might well retreat from the global economy. That could set off a downward spiral of protectionism and lower growth and turning backward which could affect us all.

If the faces of the new economy, these fine people I introduced here today, can have the courage to change, then so can we, each of us as nations. We can proceed in the spirit that President Roosevelt called bold, persistent experimentation. If we can move forward from this conference filled with the faith that we can make change work for the ordinary citizens in these countries, for all of our people, then we will succeed. And we will go from this conference to the meeting of all of the leaders of the G–7 countries in Naples with a real agenda where we can all be committed to going forward here.

Let me say that, in closing, we've faced a lot of difficult and decisive choices like this before. We haven't always made the right decision. At the end of World War I our nations turned inward, and it led us to depression and another world war. After World War II, our nations turned outward. They faced the future courageously. Old enemies embraced each other in a common cause of human development. Alliances were built, institutions were created that kept the peace, promoted prosperity, advanced democracy, and won the cold war.

Now we have to choose once again. And this conference is a part of that choosing. Will we have the courage to embrace change and build our people up? I think I know the answer. Together we have to find it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in Fox Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Dennis Archer of Detroit and Roger Penske, chief executive officer, Detroit Diesel, and owner and manager, Penske racing team.

Remarks to Detroit Diesel Employees in Detroit
March 14, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for that wonderful welcome and for the tour and the opportunity I had to shake hands with so many of you. When you were asked how many of you had roots in my home State, I met seven or eight people just walking through the line. And I read in the morning paper that the University of Arkansas now has to be in the same NCAA championship bracket as Michigan, so some of you are going to have divided loyalties. [*Laughter*] I'm just scared about it. I don't know.

I want to thank my good friend Congressman John Conyers for being here and for his eloquent remarks. And I want to thank Senator Don Riegle for what he said and for all the years of service he gave to Michigan and to the United States. He didn't speak like he was retiring from the Senate today, but he says he is, and I thank you, sir, for your service. Two other members of your congressional delegation came with me, and they're over here somewhere, Senator Carl Levin and Congressman John Dingell, who is going to help me pass a good health care plan for all the American people. Thank you both for being here. Thank you, Owen Bieber, for being here and for being my friend and comrade. And I want to thank Lud for this wonderful tour of this plant and also Jim Brown; your local UAW leader is not up here with us, but he met me. He challenged me to go running with him next time I came. It was all I could do to run with the Mayor today. I don't know if I can handle him. [*Laughter*] And I want to say a special word of thanks to Roger Penske for saving all of your jobs and giving you something good to do.

You know, I'm in Detroit today because we are having a day-and-a-half meeting of the finance and economic ministers of the so-called G–7 nations. They're the big industrial nations of the world that have been meeting together for many years now, Japan and Germany and France and Great Britain and Canada and Italy and us. I think that's seven; I didn't keep count when I was going through. And all of these countries, interestingly enough, are having real problems either creating jobs or raising the incomes of their working people, even when their economies are growing. Every one except the

western part of Germany has a higher unemployment rate than the United States. And yet we know in this country, for about 20 years, the average wages of working people have been almost stagnant, barely keeping up with inflation, if at all. So this is a worldwide problem. We know part of it has to do with global competition, part of it has to do with not changing with the pace of technology.

There are a lot of things that we know. I wanted to come here today to illustrate that while nobody can fully describe the problem, we do know how to solve it with people like you and plants like this. You know, I'm a racing fan, so I knew all about Roger Penske. I've actually been to Indianapolis and seen the 500. But I think the race he's winning here with you and your lives and your children is far more important than any Indianapolis race he will ever win, because our country is riding on it.

We know it works if labor and management work together. We know it works if there is good technology. We know it works if there's a commitment to sell abroad as well as at home. We know it works if everybody has a passionate, abiding commitment to quality. I like the fact that you no longer have a check for quality at the end of the line, but everybody has to do it all along the way, so that everybody has responsibility for the final product. We know that stuff works. And when you strip it all away, I want you to just think about it: What works in this plant would work not only in every other workplace in America but would go a long way toward solving our other problems.

I always tell people that I got into this work, and I certainly ran for President fully aware of all the hazards and pitfalls, because I had the old-fashioned view that the purpose of public service was to bring people together and to get things done and really to exalt the dignity and potential of every individual. And if you think about it, the reason this deal is working for you is everybody is important, everybody counts, and people work together. And if we could, in everything we do, think about what we could do to exalt the dignity and the potential in every person, we'd be a long way ahead. All these little children growing up in troubled family situations, in neighborhood situations, in difficult and even dangerous schools, nobody's thinking about their dignity or their potential. Every day so many things happen in this country from so many forces of power designed to strip people of their dignity, to undermine their potential, to weaken their ability to become what God meant them to be. And I just wanted to come here because what you have done is terribly important not only for you and your families but as an example of what we ought to do economically and socially as a country as we look toward the 21st century.

I am convinced that in spite of all of the tough times we've been through as a people over the last 20 years, I am convinced that we can go into the next century as the greatest country in the world, with our children looking forward to the most exciting future and the most peaceful future any people have ever known, if we remember that we're going up or down together so we might as well get together, and if we remember that we have to build on one another's strengths and we have to build each other up, not tear each other down, and if we remember we can fight over dividing the pie all we want, but unless we're growing the pie, unless we're making a better life for everybody and producing something that is good, we are not going to succeed.

Those basic lessons that have led you to double your sales, that have given you markets around the world, and that got the kind of cheer that you gave Roger Penske today are lessons that America ought to learn, that every other advanced country in the world ought to learn, and that I am trying as hard as I can to make sure guide every decision I make as your President and every decision our administration makes. So you just remember that. What you're doing here is what America ought to be doing: getting people together, getting things done, building human dignity. If we can do that, there is nothing we cannot achieve.

Thank you. God bless you all. I love being here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:26 p.m. at the Detroit Diesel plant. In his remarks, he referred to Owen Bieber, president, and Jim Brown, plant chairman, United Auto Workers; Ludwick Koci, president, Detroit Diesel Co.; and Roger Penske, chief executive officer, Detroit Diesel, and owner and manager, Penske racing team.

Exchange With Reporters on the Resignation of Associate Attorney General Webster L. Hubbell in Boston, Massachusetts

March 14, 1994

The President. I haven't talked to him yet, and I haven't talked to him since this whole issue came up, but now I will call him as soon as I possibly can. I do think, based on what I understand the facts to be, it's the right thing. He strongly feels that he will be vindicated, but it's going to take some time for him to do it and that he shouldn't be working at a public job while he's doing that. And I think that's right.

Q. Do you think he did something wrong, Mr. President?

The President. I have no—I do not know—I have no knowledge of the facts. Based on my knowledge of him, I find that hard to believe. I mean, the most—I think if you talk to the hundreds and hundreds of people who feel they know him, they'd all have a hard time believing that. He's one of the most widely esteemed people that I've ever known. He had very few detractors. So I think that we just have to take him at his word, give him a chance to go home and deal with this, and see what happens. I think he did the right thing.

He also, I want to say, has been an enormous contributor at the Justice Department, really had an enormously positive impact there from the early days of my administration. I am very grateful to him. And he is a good personal friend of mine, as all of you know. I just—I wish him well. I hope that it works out. But I think he made the right decision because he wants to go home and really defend himself and work through this thing. And we'll just see what happens.

Q. Do you feel, Mr. President, that this is another perceived setback for your administration? It seems like you've come under a lot of deep fire lately.

The President. Well, this is something—as I've said, I have no knowledge of this. We'll just have to see what happens. But I'm not worried about that. We'll proceed with the Justice Department, and we'll go right on. This is, for me, more of a personal deal for Webb Hubbell and for his many, many friends at home and around the country. I'm hoping that it works out for him, and I think he made the right decision.

Q. Has it adversely affected operations at the Justice Department?

The President. Oh, no, not at all. Not a bit. And I feel that it won't. I can assure you nobody will let that happen.

Q. Will you invite him back?

The President. Well, as I said in my letter to him—he said he'd hoped he could return to public service, and I said in my letter that I hope he would be able to.

It is, frankly, kind of typical of him. His first concern was that nothing be done that would in any way cause any harm to the Justice Department or any difficulty for anybody else. So he just wants to get out, go home, clean this up, and he said he hoped that he would be able to come back. And I hope that it will work out so that he can, too.

Q. Do you think he was honest with you, sir?

The President. Thank you. I have no reason to believe he wasn't.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:45 p.m. at Logan International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter Accepting the Resignation of Webster L. Hubbell as Associate Attorney General

March 14, 1994

Dear Webb:

It is with profound sadness and regret that I accept your resignation as Associate Attorney General.

I know better than anyone the spirit of citizenship and devotion to the law that inspired you to join our Administration and to take part, as Holmes said, in the actions and passions of our time. In the last year, these values came shining through as you worked for civil justice reform and immigration enforcement, fought to end discrimination in public housing, and to protect the civil and voting rights of all Americans.

In these tasks you affirmed our commitment to justice, always with keen judgment and good humor, especially at vital times of challenge for the Department. The Attorney General and I will miss the service and advice you gave us. And I know your accomplishments in office will outlast any interest in the private matters that have arisen from your prior law practice and that motivated the difficult decision you announced today.

Like you, I hope that you will return one day to public service. I remain, as always, grateful for your long and lasting friendship.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

Dear Mr. President:

For over a year, I have had the privilege of serving you, the Attorney General, and the nation at the Department of Justice. I am deeply grateful and honored for this opportunity to serve as the Associate Attorney General of the United States. I have tried to serve with honor and distinction and to follow your lead in trying to make a difference in the every day lives of the American people.

As a public servant, I owe it to you and to the American people to evaluate constantly whether my continued service can be as effective as you would expect of me, whether it furthers or distracts from your agenda, and what effect being in the public eye is having on my family and colleagues. Over the past weekend I have undertaken such an evaluation, and I have decided to submit my resignation as Associate Attorney General. My resignation shall be effective as soon as possible, allowing the Attorney General the time to effect a smooth transition at the Justice Department.

I am proud of the reputation I have established over the past 20 years as a private lawyer, Arkansas Supreme Court Justice, public official, and private citizen. Unfortunately, because of public speculation about me and my former law firm, I will have to spend a significant amount of my personal time on an internal matter with my former partners. I am confident of the outcome.

I will leave the Department of Justice with great admiration for the Attorney General, high regard for the professionalism and dedication of its employees, and with great pride in the Department's accomplishments during the past year.

Public service has always been one of the greatest joys of my professional life. It is my sincere hope and belief that by devoting sufficient time and energy now to my family and other private issues, I will reenter public service in the future. Thank you for allowing me such a wonderful opportunity and, most of all, thank you for your friendship.

Respectfully,

WEBSTER L. HUBBELL

NOTE: Originals were not available for verification of the content of these letters.

Remarks to the Community in Boston
March 14, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you for this wonderful, warm welcome to this magnificent old city that is forever young. I am so happy to be back here. I'm thrilled by this enormous crowd, honored by your enthusiasm and support, your concern, and your commitment for your country. I thank all those who are here with me, your State attorney general; your State auditor; the State chair of our Democratic Party; your wonderful new mayor, Mayor Menino, it's nice to see you; Congressman Moakley, who said that you can tell how much I love Massachusetts by how many times I come to his congressional district—that's a good political remark if I ever heard it—[*laughter*]—Congressman Markey, Congressman Meehan who are here. I want to say a special word of thanks to your two United States Senators, first to John Kerry for his steadfast leadership to try to help us pass a crime bill in the United States Congress that is both tough and smart, that gives our young people something to say yes to while we're being tougher on crime, that takes assault weapons off the street and puts policemen on the beat and gives our kids a better future. I thank him for that, and so should you. I also thank him for the work that he has done in putting the credibility he justly earned as a valiant veteran in the war in Vietnam on the line to help us reconcile with Vietnam and move forward to a new chapter in our relationship with that country and get a full and fair accounting of all of our MIA's and POW's. And I want to thank Senator Ted Kennedy not only for his warm personal support but for being the lion, the champion, the stalwart of the elemental principle that health care is a fundamental right and every American ought to have it. He's been fighting for that for almost two decades now, and he has the President by his side. And we're going to get it done this year.

My fellow Americans, I have just come from Detroit, a city which was racked during the 1980's with massive job losses in the automobile industry, a city which is rebuilding itself even as our car industry comes back with increasing productivity and quality, taking back market share all across our country and in other countries. We have there going on now a conference of the world's great industrial nations, where the finance ministers and the commerce ministers and others have come together to discuss this vexing question: Why is it that all the wealthy countries in the world are having trouble either creating new jobs or rewarding their workers with higher incomes? This is not just an American issue.

But I can tell you I was proud to go there today and say to them, "You said to us for years we should bring down our budget deficit; well, we have. The other guys talked about it, and we did it. And if the Congress passes our budget this year, for the first time since Harry Truman was President, the deficit will go down for 3 years in a row." And what has happened: low inflation, low interest rates, high investment, over 2 million new jobs in the first 13 months of this administration, 90 percent of them not in Government but in the private sector. I know there is more to do, but we are making a beginning.

I also want to say that we are doing what we can to give our young people access to the education and training they need. With the leadership of Senator Kennedy and others last year, we completely rewrote the student loan law, a very important issue in this bastion of higher education, so that when this law becomes fully effective, our young people will be able to borrow money to go to college, whether they are middle class or poor, at lower interest rates and pay it back on easier terms not based on how much they borrowed or loaned but also based on how much they make when they go to school, so they will never be discouraged from borrowing the money to go to college and get the education they need.

Finally, last year we did something that I was inspired to do by all these wonderful young people from City Year, we passed a national service program. This year there will be 20,000 more like them all across the country and year after next, 100,000 more earning credit against college, solving the problems of this country, building up America instead of tearing it down. And let me say, the most important sign I saw of all the wonderful signs you held up today was the sign the young people from City Year had

on that boat. They said, "Thank you for believing in the youth of America." I do, and I think you do, too.

My fellow Americans, this year we have much work to do. In the Congress, we are working on totally revamping the unemployment system of our country so people can begin to get new training from the moment they lose their jobs. We are working on reforming the welfare system so that more people can move from dependence to independence, can be successful parents and successful workers. We are working on a dramatic change in our criminal justice initiatives, as Senator Kerry said, to put another 100,000 police officers on the street, take assault weapons off the street, stiffen our ability to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them—the Brady bill is already beginning to work in that regard—and provide alternatives for first-time youthful offenders so they will have a better future. Those are the kinds of things that we are doing.

And finally, as Senator Kennedy said, we are going to do our dead-level best this year, and I believe we are going to make it, to finally, finally, finally join the ranks of every other advanced nation in the world and give our American families health care security that is always there, that can never be taken away from them.

I know there will always be problems that we have to address, with all the changes that are coming on into our economy. On the way over here, I spoke with your congressional delegation about the difficulties that the fishermen in Massachusetts and New England are facing. Let me tell you something: We are going to make sure that you do not become an endangered species. You have earned the right to go forward, and we will work on that. We have defense workers from Connecticut to California who are threatened, and we are working on that. But what I want to tell you is, we are going in the right direction, and we can keep going in the right direction if we remember to keep our eyes on those things which really matter and if we do not become diverted.

Just before I got on the plane to come here, I visited a fascinating plant in Detroit, owned by a man named Roger Penske. You may know him because his teams have won eight Indianapolis 500 races. But let me tell you what he did. This plant was about to be closed several years ago. He went in and bailed it out, made an agreement with the union that they would solve all their problems together. Grievances on the plant floor dropped to virtually zero. A new spirit of partnership took over. They began to sell their diesel engines all around the world. They began to increase production and sales. They hired more people. And today, this plant that was on the verge of being closed, with 3,000 people losing their jobs, have doubled their sales, added employment. They have the best labor-management cooperation anyone can imagine.

Do you know how they did it? They did it because fundamentally they were interested in building up one another. They recognized the dignity of every man and woman in that plant. They understood that people wanted to be able to be successful as workers and as parents, building their families and their future. And by doing that and focusing on that, everything else worked out all right. I tell you today, my friends, if we can go back to Washington and wipe away all of the forces that seek to demean, to divide, to downgrade, and just focus on the spirit and the hope and the dignity that we see in the faces of these young people here, we could solve the problems of this country and do it in short order. That is what we ought to be about.

And I pledge to you that I will honor the support the people of Massachusetts gave me in 1992. I will honor the signs that greeted me here today. I will never forget the spirit, the drive, the imagination, and the talent that the people of this State have. And when I go back to Washington, I will be there working with your friends here to make sure that we restore the kind of spirit and dignity and possibility to our National Government that will make it possible for us to keep this economy on the move, to pass health care and a crime bill and welfare reform and redo the unemployment system, and do all those things that in the end will just allow all of us to live up to the fullest of our God-given potential as one united nation, moving into the 21st century, with the kind of pride and success that you deserve.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:42 p.m. at Rowes Wharf, a commercial and residential development. In his remarks, he referred to L. Scott

Harshbarger, Massachusetts attorney general; A. Joseph DeNucci, Massachusetts auditor; Joan Menard, Massachusetts Democratic Party chair; and Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston.

Remarks at the New England Presidential Dinner in Boston
March 14, 1994

Thank you. Thank you, Mayor, for your strong and supportive words and your good leadership and for the wonderful, wonderful entry into Boston today. When you had the boat out there spewing water and all those thousands of people and all those young people from City Year out there cheering, I began to feel like a real President. [*Laughter*] I thank you, Lea Salonga, for traveling thousands of miles to sing for me tonight. And I'm glad I got to shake your hand. You're a great talent, and we were graced by your music. Thank you so much. I want to thank Alan and Fred and Elaine and my good friend Paul Montrone, in his absence, and all the rest of you who made this dinner possible tonight. I want to thank David Wilhelm for the hard work that he's given to the Democratic committee and for that fine film that makes my speech irrelevant. [*Laughter*] It was wonderful, wasn't it? It was a good movie. It reminded us of—[*applause*]

I thank Senator Kerry for his remarks and for his leadership, for his defense of the spirit and the objectives of this administration on the floor of the Senate and his leadership in so many areas but especially now in trying to enact a crime bill that is both tough and intelligent and his belief that we could enact a major piece of anticrime legislation that would really begin to attack some of the root causes of crime and to adopt some things that actually work to reduce the crime rate instead of just to raise the decibel level of the rhetoric that is in the air. John Kerry was the first Member of the Congress who convinced me we might actually be able to persuade people of both parties to approve a bill in the range of $22 billion and that we might actually be able to put 100,000 more police officers on the street and take these assault weapons off the street and give our young people some things to say yes to and have adequate drug treatment and do some things that really make sense. The whole country is in his debt, as am I and are you.

I want to thank, too, as strongly as I can say, your senior Senator, Ted Kennedy. I'm glad that he seems to be well on his way to a strong reelection. You know, long before I had ever really thought about the obligations of this country in the area of health care, when I was the youngest elected Governor in America but not yet in office in 1978, the Democratic Party had a mid-year convention in Memphis. And I received a call from the White House when President Carter was in office, asking me if I would moderate a discussion of this issue featuring Joe Califano, the then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and Senator Kennedy, neither of them being shrinking violets. [*Laughter*] I was 32 years old at the time and mortified. So of course I said I would do it. And people were there from all over the country. I only had to cross the Mississippi River from home to be there. But I remember—it's been 16 years ago now—as vividly as if it happened yesterday, when Ted Kennedy stood on that stage and said for the first time, I think, to a truly national audience that the health care that had been given his son when he was desperately ill should be available to every American. He said it then, and we're going to make it happen now.

The film was about what we did last year, only a little about what we're trying to do this year. I can say that in a couple of minutes and then make the one central point I wish to make to all of you tonight. Last year we had a very good year. This year we have to keep working on the economy. If we can keep the growth going, we'll have a very good year indeed. We've had 2.1 million new jobs in 13 months, 90 percent of them in the private sector—most job growth was in State and local government in some years of the 1980's, or at least a huge percentage of it was—and we want to keep that going. We want to pass health care, health security that is always there in a way that keeps what is best about health care, which you can appreciate in this shining tribute

to the American health care triumph, and fix what is wrong. We want to pass a comprehensive welfare reform bill that will liberate people from the dependence of a system that has aggravated some of the worst pressures in the breakdown of the family in this country. We want to pass this crime bill. We want to pass, as John Kerry said, a campaign finance reform bill, a lobby reform bill. We want to pass a comprehensive overhaul in the unemployment system, which is designed for a time which no longer exists. It used to be when people went on unemployment they needed a little money to get by on until the economy picked up again and they were called back to their old jobs. Now the huge majority of people who are unemployed don't get called back to their old jobs, they have to find new ones. It's wrong to tax employers to pay for an income system that's inadequate, that is leading nowhere. We need to change the whole system and begin immediately to prepare people when they lose their jobs for another—a different job, one in which they can succeed and win in the global economy. These are all things we need to do. And we mean to do them this year, in spite of the fact, or maybe because of the fact that it is an election year.

Now, this is a Democratic Party dinner, and it occurred to me that those of you who are here have supported this administration and me personally and the fine people who are associated with our efforts in spite of the fact that on April the 15th almost all of you will get a higher tax bill—[*laughter*]—because you know all the money is going to reduce the deficit and you know it's meant lower interest rates, record-high markets, new investment, and a growing economy.

As has already been said, our trading partners around the world beat on us for a decade to get the deficit down. If my new budget passes the Congress, and it's well on its way already, we'll have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, and we will have laid the foundation for a strong private recovery.

These things are terribly important. But that's not the point I want to make tonight. The point I want to make tonight is that there have always been differences between Democrats and Republicans. And these differences have taken different forms at different times. On occasion, the Republican Party has been the party of true and progressive change. The best example was, of course, the first and greatest Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. Another example was Teddy Roosevelt, who helped to usher in the modern era of new Presidents, of activist Presidents, a man who wanted to save much of our natural resources, a man without whom there would be no buffalo in America today, just for example, and many of our national parks would not be there, a man who understood the dangers of great concentrations of power, whether in Government or in the private sector; people like President Eisenhower, who really tried to build a bipartisan foreign policy to help to move us away from the military industrial complex but leave us strong enough to win the cold war. Even Richard Nixon, though he's been much maligned, signed the bill to create the Environmental Protection Agency and first proposed that all employers should contribute to their employees' health insurance so that everyone could be covered.

I say that to point out that there have been good and bad ideas embraced, I guess, by both parties at different times. I'm a Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction because I believe most of the time in American history we've been on the side of ordinary people, on the side of bringing people together, and on the side of the future. We have been the party of change in a constructive and profound way. I thought when I ran for President I would have the chance to enter one of these great debates and we would see what would happen, whether I was right and wrong or my ideas were right and wrong.

Almost from the beginning I saw a very different edge to the Republican Party in this time, not the party of Lincoln and Roosevelt or Eisenhower but the party dedicated just to being against whatever we were for and committed to the politics of personal destruction. They were so busy with it they even tried to look in my passport file in the campaign in '92, something that didn't bother me. I was happy to have them rummaging around in my passport file instead of coming up with a good idea that might sound better than one of my ideas. Let them go. Now, as you pointed out, they are at it again. They have a little health retreat, and they can't agree on a health care plan, so they come back and get at it again.

I just want you to know something. You look at the people that are in our administration;

they get up every day and try to make something good happen for America. Senator Kennedy mentioned my wife, well-known to many of you here because she went to Wellesley and spent a lot of time in Massachusetts, has just committed herself in a passionate way to trying to figure out how to solve this health problem to give ordinary people the chance to get health care. Let them come and debate her. Do they want to do that? No, they would rather take out after her. It saves them the trouble of having to come up with an alternative health care plan. The Vice President of the United States, I think the ablest and most influential person ever to hold that office and someone who has been a credit to this country, who cares passionately about what he is doing. Eli Segal from Boston—we passed the national service bill; it will stand as the symbol of what this administration tried to do. Did you see those kids holding that sign when we came in the harbor today, "Thank you for believing in the youth of America"? This is a big deal.

This is a very important time in our history, sweeping changes going through our economy and society, terrible problems that beg for honest debate from people of different perspectives. Even if we get the economy going, even if we provide health care to all, even if we revise the unemployment system, if we do all the things I said, how can we survive as a country if within a few years over half of our kids are born into families where there was never a marriage? How will we transmit the kinds of coherent values to our people? How can we expect the young people, if they are born into fairly chaotic circumstances where they're not isolated so someone can come in and help them, to behave in 15 years from now?

These are profound problems. They beg for debate. We need to think about new and different things in totally different ways than we have in the past. No one, even our party—let's be honest about it—we don't have all the answers. We need an honest debate about the future of family in America, about how we're going to rebuild our communities in America. People say they're concerned about crime and violence; they ought to be. But you tell me how you can avoid it if you have people living in square block after square block after square block where the family, the community, and the work base is broken down and where vacuums are created into which drugs and crimes, gangs and weapons move. We need a serious debate about that.

We need a serious debate about the fact that wage earning—hourly wage earners have been working in this country for 20 years now with virtually no increase in their income and that every country—I just came from Detroit, from our G–7 jobs summit—every wealthy country in the world is now having trouble creating new jobs even when their economy is growing.

We have always known in the past that productivity was good for jobs and incomes. I came from a part of the country where everybody used to work on the farm. You can't go back more than one generation older than me without finding somebody in your family that was on the farm. The farm jobs went away; people went to Detroit and Chicago and got jobs in the plants. Those economic changes have always happened. And every time technology and productivity took away jobs in one sector, more were created in another sector. Now we find that these wealthy countries are really having trouble with the explosion of technology, the explosion of productivity, and the globalization of the economy creating new jobs. Is something new happening in world history? I don't think so; I just think there are different lags. But the point is no one knows for sure. This begs for honest political debate and genuine conflicts of ideas.

Why then are we confronted in this administration with an opposition party that just stands up and says, "No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no"? When I was a Democratic Governor and they had the White House, I constantly sought them out, engaged them in debate, offered to work with them on issues from education to welfare reform to crime to you name it. I never did them the way they are doing us in Washington, DC, today. It is wrong, and it is not good for the United States of America.

I'll tell you something else. The mayor talked about me being a marathon runner. The marathon comes from a certain place inside me. I am an old-fashioned, really old-fashioned American. I believe more than half the time, in the contest between good and bad, good wins. In the contest between truth and falsehood, the truth wins out. I believe that most people want something that will elevate them and bring them together with different people, instead of something that will demean them and divide them from others. That's what I believe.

I believe fundamentally in the common sense and the essential core goodness of the American people. Don't forget that Alexis de Tocqueville said a long time ago that America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, she will no longer be great. We have to appeal to what is good in this country. And we have to ask people to face hard truths and debate hard issues and come together and think new thoughts about problems that we are, frankly, not solving today. That is what I wanted to do when I became President and what I am doing my best to do. And I am only sorry that too often, in too many ways, on too many days, it is a debate which engages only members of my party.

I will say this: Senator Kennedy has had some good success in getting a substantial number of Republican Senators to talk seriously about health care. We are having some help in dealing with the issues of crime. But this overriding negative, intensely personal, totally political, devoid-of-principle attack is not good for the country, and it is inconsistent with the tradition of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt.

If I ask you to go home tonight and make a list of the greatest Presidents who ever served here and the greatest things that were ever done in Washington for the American people, you would have members of both parties on your list. But every one of them would have done something good for the American people, would have tried to elevate the dignity and the human potential of the men and women of this country, tried to give the children of this country a better future than their parents had.

I got into this work because that's what I wanted to do. And I am old-fashioned enough to believe that in every age and time the central purpose of our common political life will be to find new and important ways to get people together and to get things done so that we can elevate the meaning and content and direction of people's lives and do right by our children and by our future. That is what I think. And I'll tell you something. In 1994, in 1996, if there is only one party that believes that, the American people in droves will come to us.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:08 p.m. at the Boston Park Plaza. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston; entertainer Lea Salonga; Alan Leventhal, Fred Seigel, Elaine Shuster, and Paul Montrone, dinner organizers; David Wilhelm, Democratic National Committee chairman; and Eli J. Segal, Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

Statement on Nominations for the Department of the Navy

March 14, 1994

I am pleased to announce that I have nominated Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda to succeed Admiral Frank A. Kelso II as Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Boorda is currently serving as Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe where he is responsible for coordinating and planning NATO military actions over Bosnia-Herzegovina and in the Mediterranean and Adriatic Seas.

Admiral Boorda brings to the job of Chief of Naval Operations a keen appreciation of operational requirements in the post-cold-war world and an outstanding ability to work with our allies in complex and challenging circumstances. He has distinguished himself as one of the foremost military leaders serving in the armed services today, and his counsel and guidance on the many national security issues facing our Nation will be of great value.

Admiral Boorda assumes the post of Chief of Naval Operations at an important time in the history of the United States Navy. I will depend on him to continue the progress that Admiral Kelso has made in restructuring the Navy to meet the new domestic and international security environments.

I have also nominated Vice Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., U.S. Navy, to relieve Admiral Boorda and be promoted to the rank of admiral. As the former Director for Operations, U.S. Eu-

ropean Command, and the current Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Plans, Policy and Operations, Vice Admiral Smith possesses a thorough understanding of NATO structure and the requirements of the European theater of operations.

Remarks at a Town Meeting in Nashua, New Hampshire
March 15, 1994

The President. Thank you so much. I want to thank the principal of this school for calling the assembly to order and Mayor Wagner for welcoming me here and Senator Barbara Baldizar, of whom I am so proud, who served with such distinction in our campaign in 1992, and Congressman Dick Swett for that fine introduction and for the work he does in your behalf in Washington. There are many others here today, legislators, other officials. school officials, and personal friends. I'm glad to see all of you here.

I announced my candidacy for President in New Hampshire, here in Nashua, in October of 1991. I told you I'd keep coming back. I know I'm a week late for your traditional town meeting, but I'm not 4 years late. I did show up.

I have so many vivid memories of this community. I remember I was so nervous the first day I came here in October of '91. I said, "Nobody knows who I am, nobody knows where I'm from, nobody knows anything." And we were on our way to a restaurant where some people had probably been dragged kicking and screaming to come and meet me for the first time. And on the way, there was one other cafe, and I just decided I would go in and shake hands there and start, just cold. And so my wife and I walked in, and there was one guy sitting at the counter drinking a cup of coffee. And he turned around and he said, "I know who you are. I'm a construction worker from Leachville, Arkansas, and you're the best Governor we ever had." So I said to myself, these people are so shrewd up here, they will never believe I did not place this man on this stool—[*laughter*]—and that I never saw him before or since.

I remember going to the Moe Arel Center and talking to the people who live there about their health care concerns. I remember in the hotel where I stayed last night, an early morning meeting I had with Senator Jay Rockefeller from West Virginia, before we had a big health care forum where people came from all over New Hampshire and all over New England. I remember so many things that I have done in this community, and I'm very grateful to be back.

I've just come from Detroit, where I was meeting with finance and other economic officials from the G–7 nations, the world's largest industrial nations, Canada and France, Great Britain and Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States, talking about the problems that every wealthy nation in the world is now having, even in times of economic growth, in creating new jobs and raising incomes; talking about how we are in an entirely different global economy that is changing very rapidly, opening up new opportunities but also imposing new obstacles to the fulfillment of human potential everywhere, and what we can do together to deal with the problems we face.

I learned a lot about those problems right here in New Hampshire. I think it is no secret to anybody who knows me the depth of affection and commitment I developed to the people of this State, even those who didn't vote for me, because of the experiences I had here in 1991 and 1992, because of the laboratory you provided for all of us who sought the Presidency to learn about the continuing problems and the enduring promise of this great country.

Ever since I started this campaign here, and in every day I have been President, I have been focused on what it will take for us to do what we need to do to move into the 21st century as the greatest country on Earth, giving our children a better future and getting our people to live up to their potential. I always believed that the purpose of public life was to get people together and to get things done and to lift human dignity and human potential.

When I first took office, my first line of business was to get our economic house in order. We had seen in only 12 years a quadrupling of our national debt. We had seen America with such a huge deficit that all of our trading partners every year for 10 years got together in these great G–7 summits and passed delicate resolutions pointing their finger at the United States, saying, "If you don't bring your Government deficit down, you're going to wreck the world economy."

And so we went to work on that. Last year, Congress passed an economic plan that will reduce the deficit by $500 billion. If they pass the budget I presented this year, which passed the House in record time, we will have 3 years of reduction in the Federal Government's deficit in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

Now, that has led to lower interest rates, low inflation, increased investments, increased activity in any number of sectors of the economy, and a real economic comeback for the country in 13 months, 2.1 million new jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector. In the 1980's, a far higher percentage of new jobs coming into our economy were in State and local government, not in the private sector. So I believe we have made a good beginning. The unemployment rate in New Hampshire is about a point and a half lower than it was when I was elected President, and I'm proud of that.

The economic plan also, as people will find out on April 15th, contains some very important changes in our Nation's tax laws. Yes, income tax rates were raised for the top 1.2 percent of income earners, and all the money was dedicated to deficit reduction. But almost 17 percent of our taxpayers will get an income tax cut. Almost all of them will be working people with children on modest incomes. It is a very important thing to do to encourage people to work, to make it possible for them to be successful workers and successful parents, and to discourage people from going on to welfare. Here in New Hampshire, it will cover 41,000 taxpayers.

In addition to that, the small businesses will find—and this is terribly important to you—this new economic plan contains several incentives to try to help deal with some of the problems that I learned about here in New Hampshire. Most of your job loss has been in larger companies; most of your job gains have been in smaller companies. This new program makes 90 percent of the small businesses in America eligible for a tax cut on April 15th by increasing the expensing provision for small business by 70 percent and provides dramatic new incentives for people to invest in new and small businesses, with a long-term capital gains cut of 50 percent for people who invest in those businesses for 5 years or longer.

In addition to that, we are doing a lot to try to change the regulatory environment in which our financial institutions make loans. In the end, that is the ultimate test of our success. It was here in Nashua that I first heard horror story after horror story after horror story about people having their loans foreclosed when they had never missed a payment. I think it's fair to say that our success record there has been substantial but uneven and that practices are still different around the country. But we are moving deliberately to try to do that so that we can free up capital to invest in America, to grow jobs in the private sector.

A lot of your firms here in New Hampshire and throughout New England are high-tech firms that depend upon markets abroad as well as at home. We've lifted export controls on $37 billion worth of high-tech equipment and opened new markets through a generation's worth of trade agreements concluded last year, the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico, a new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade throughout the world.

And for our young people, we've reformed—as I said I would in town meeting after town meeting after town meeting here in this State—we've reformed the college loan program so that now more loans will be available at lower interest rates and young people will be able to pay them back not just based on how much they borrow but as a percentage of their income after they go to work, so that it will always be manageable, the repayment of the loans, and no one will ever be discouraged from going to college. Last year, the Congress passed the national service program that I talked about in all the town meetings here. This year, 20,000 young Americans will be able to serve their communities, solving hard, concrete, human problems at the grassroots level, and earn credit against their college education. Year after next, 100,000 young Americans will be able to do that, and I am proud of that.

The first law that I signed into being that was really the product of my campaign was the

family and medical leave law, a law that had been twice vetoed before I became President. Just yesterday in Detroit, I met a woman in a plant I visited who came up to me with tears in her eyes and said, "I have already taken advantage of the family leave law. It matters; people should not have to lose their job to take care of their children or their parents."

So we are changing the country together as a result of the campaign which began in these dialogs in New Hampshire. This year, the Congress has a full schedule. First, we are trying to enact a new crime bill that is both tough and smart, building on the passage of the Brady bill last year, to put another 100,000 police officers on the streets not only in big cities but in small towns, to take assault weapons out of the hands of criminals, to try to make sure that we punish serious offenders more severely but that we give first-time youthful offenders another chance and something to say yes to in life as well as something to say no to, and that we provide drug treatment on demand to deal with the fact that an enormous percentage of these crimes are the direct result of the drug problem.

We are trying to pass, in addition to the crime bill, a dramatic set of improvements in education laws, a school-to-work bill that will provide at least another year first and then 2 years of training for people who don't want to go to 4-year colleges but need further training, people like those whom I met with at the graduation at New Hampshire Technical College last May. This is a dramatic thing. The unemployment rate for people who have 2 years of post-high-school education in America today is 5.7 percent. The unemployment rate for high school graduates is about 7.5 percent. The unemployment rate for high school dropouts is over 11 percent. It makes a huge difference.

We are attempting to reform the entire unemployment system to change it to a reemployment system, to consolidate the programs and put unemployed people to work in new training programs as soon as possible. We're trying to give our school systems incentives to reach world-class standards with grassroots reforms and give them the support they need to do it. All these things are on the plate this year. We're going to try to pass a comprehensive welfare reform bill that will end the welfare system as we know it and give people a chance to move to independence.

Finally, we are determined that this will be the year when finally America will join the ranks of other advanced nations to provide comprehensive health care to all of our citizens. [*Applause*] Thank you.

There is one of your citizens here in New Hampshire to whom we owe a special debt of gratitude, and I want to acknowledge him today, and that's Dr. Everett Koop, who was, as all of you know, Surgeon General under President Reagan and who lives here in New Hampshire and who works here and has been of enormous help to the First Lady in the work they have done conducting forums throughout the country, trying to get doctors and nurses and medical centers involved in developing this health care plan and making sure it will work. He has played a major role in that, and I am very grateful to him for that.

You may have seen in the press reports, my wife was out in Colorado yesterday and had huge crowds of students at Boulder with big signs saying, "Give 'em health, Hillary." Make no mistake about it, some of the people who are giving me hell in Washington are doing it so I can't give you health. But I'm going to try to give you health and take whatever it is they want to give me in return for making sure you get what it is you're entitled to.

Now, I'm anxious to answer your questions. But let me just make a point or two about this. New Hampshire has a lot of strengths in terms of the health care you already have that many other States don't. And so you may say, "Well, what's in this for us?" You have, for example—only about 5 or 10 percent of your people don't have access, physical access, to good medical care. Most States as rural as New Hampshire have a far higher percentage of people who don't even have access. You have one of the finest immunization programs in the country. You've already done a lot of what the rest of the country needs to do in community-based mental health services. There are a lot of things that you can be very proud of. You have a higher percentage of your people who are insured and therefore a lower percentage of your people who are uninsured.

So you say, "Well, what do we get out of this?" First, there will be no more uncompensated care, so the people who are providing health care will have some reimbursement because everybody will have insurance. Second, the people who are covered by Medicare but

aren't poor enough to be on Medicaid, the kind of people I met at the Moe Arel Center, will, for the first time, have access to prescription medicine. And we'll phase in support for long-term care over and and above and in addition to nursing home, so that there will be some support for in-home care or community-based care.

This is very important. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. And more and more people over 80 are quite vigorous and quite able to live good and full lives but may need some support. Over the long run, if you look at the population trends in this country, where we are going with our age groups, over the long run we will save money if we provide a broader range of long-term care support and enable people to be as independent and as strong as they can for as long as possible. You will benefit from that.

The other thing I think is terribly important—I had a wrenching encounter at the hotel this morning, just before I left to come over here, where a woman came up to me with tears in her eyes, just crying, and she said, "My husband just lost his job, and we have preexisting medical conditions in our family, and I do not know how we are going to get insurance." Even if you have insurance today, the only people who know they can't lose their insurance are people who work for employers that aren't going out of business and aren't ever going to lay anybody off. Everybody else is at some risk of losing their insurance, until you get old enough to get on the Medicare program. And that is a serious problem, because we have—I don't know how many people I've met in this State—we've got millions of Americans who have someone in their family who's been sick before and have a preexisting condition and therefore either can't change jobs for fear of losing their health insurance, can't get insurance now because they've fallen through the cracks, or pay higher rates. So even here in New Hampshire, I assure you, there is something to be gained from having a system in which everyone always has some basic health insurance.

We are going to work very hard to make sure we don't mess up what you're doing right here and give the States the flexibility they need. But we still deal with the fact that we have not solved this problem as a country. And I can tell you that we will never get the deficit erased, we will never balance the budget, and we will not restore long-term health to this economy or security to our people until we face this problem.

So these are the things that are going to gather the attention of the country this year. And they will command the attention of the people of New Hampshire. I hope you will continue to debate and discuss them. And let me say again, as I open the floor to questions, this is the way I think public life ought to be conducted. I love the town hall meetings I had in New Hampshire in 1991 and 1992. And I never fail to be inspired by the fact that they were so different from the tenor and tone of political debate and discussion in the Nation's Capital—my guess is they still are—not because there were no debates, no arguments, no disagreements but because they were about big things. They were about you, your future, and your children, and that is, after all, what we ought to be about. Thank you very much.

Is this on? Questions? How are we going to do this? First of all, let's identify the microphone holders. Who's got the mikes? Stand up; raise your hands. All right, I'll tell you what. I think we will do—I'll just start over here, and we'll just go around the room and then turn around and go back again. Why don't you pick someone?

Community Service Programs

Q. President Clinton, with the new community service bill giving money to individual States, how would a city like Nashua be able to receive funding, and how could individual groups get involved in this?

The President. Well, each State will have the opportunity to certify a community service group. So if, for example, if you've got a community service group in Nashua where young people would like to do work before, during, or even after college and earn credit for education, $4,750 a year while being paid to do the work a very modest amount, then you just have to have your group certified. It's nonbureaucratic, it's done at the grassroots level, and each State has a community service operation that is related to the national community service effort.

So that's all you have to do to get approved. Then you get approved, then you say how many people you want, who want to be in the community service program and want to qualify for the aid, and then we just have to—we will fill

up the slots every year, basically as the approvals come in, and everybody will be approved until we run out of positions. We've got 20,000 positions this year; we'll have 100,000 positions the year after next. I hope that this thing becomes so popular that we'll get up to a half million a year. That's my goal. I hope we'll have a half million young people every year in community service projects, earning credit against their education. If we do, we will solve an enormous number of problems in this country with no big Government bureaucracies but with the power of people at the grassroots level. So we're going to try to keep it very nonbureaucratic like that.

Health Care Reform

Q. I wanted to ask what would happen to someone in the health plan that has insurance already but exhausts it because of preexisting conditions. How will they benefit from your program?

The President. If you have insurance now—what did you call it?

Q. It's exhausted?

The President. It's exhausted?

Q. Well, mine isn't at the time, but I'm worried about it in the near future.

The President. You're worried about running up against the limits.

Q. Exactly.

The President. Yes. About three-quarters of all health insurance policies have what are called lifetime limits, which means if you get real—maybe there's an aggregate amount of $1 million, let's say, so that you could lose your health insurance under your existing policy, even if it's a good policy, if you get real sick. Now, a lot of insurance companies under the present economic setup feel like they have to do that because they're relatively small companies, they have a relatively small number of people insured, and they just don't think they can afford it.

Under our system, we abolish lifetime limits and we end discrimination against people for preexisting conditions, but we don't bankrupt insurance companies writing health insurance, because we also go to something called community rating. I want to level with you about this, because some of you will pay a little more. Basically, young, single workers will pay a little bit more for their health insurance so that older people and families with preexisting conditions aren't discriminated against. But that's very important because you're going to have people in their fifties and sixties changing jobs in this environment. I met a man from upstate New York the other day who had a job in a defense company for 29 years. He was 59 years old; he changed jobs and went to work for a hospital. So we're going to go to something called community rating, which means people will be insured in very large pools, and that's how we'll be able to afford to guarantee that you will not come up against your lifetime limits. There will be no lifetime limits, without bankrupting the insurance industry; everybody will be insured in great big pools. It's much fairer.

Young, single, healthy people will pay slightly more but not a great deal more, and it will permit us not to discriminate in rates against older people and people who had an illness in their family.

Q. I'm a resident of Nashua, New Hampshire. I have a comment and then a question. The comment is—and I'm 68 years old—Whitewater is for canoeing and rafting. Shame on those who would detract and distract from the important work you're doing with universal health coverage and jobs. And now my question. I have a former husband and two sons with major or chronic mental illnesses. I'm a member of the Nashua Alliance for the Mentally Ill. I've been on the board of the New Hampshire Alliance for the Mentally Ill, and I'm a member of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. And I would like to join Rosalynn Carter and Betty Ford in asking and urging that we pass parity for people with mental illness in the health bill that you're proposing, now, not in the year 2001. And finally, I'm also a volunteer the Nashua's new one-year-old Neighbor To Neighbor Clinic, which provides health care for those who have no insurance. We want to go out of business, and we need your help.

The President. Bless you. Let me also say that in regard to the mental health comment you made that in addition to Rosalynn Carter and Betty Ford, that position is most strongly urged in our administration by Tipper Gore, who is a real mental health advocate and has done a wonderful job on this issue.

Let me explain what the problem is to everybody else. This health care plan basically has a guaranteed set of benefits, which means that every plan after this, if you have a plan that gives these benefits or gives more, you won't

be affected. If you don't have any insurance or your insurance doesn't provide some of these benefits, then the benefits would have to be included if the bill passes. The principal new things we do that oftentimes aren't in health care plans are primary and preventive things, tests like cholesterol tests or mammograms or things like that, things that we believe save a lot of money over the long run, primary and preventive care.

We also begin to phase in alternatives to nursing home and long-term care, as I said. And we phase in full parity for mental health benefits, as she noted, up to the year 2000. The mental health community says, and by the way, I think they're probably right, that you ought to start with full mental health coverage as soon as all other coverage is phased in. You know, if it takes 2 or 3 or 4 years, whenever you put all the other stuff in, put mental health in right then and you will probably save money on it.

Now, let me just explain what the problem is, because, in principle, I agree with you. But any bill I pass—any bill the Congress passes, as Congressman Swett can explain, has to have a price tag on it that has been certified by the bipartisan or nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. They have to say, "Here's how much the bill will cost, here's how it's going to be paid for, and here's why it won't increase the deficit." That's the law under which we're operating now.

The problem is that under the budget rules, no one knows—we know how much mental coverage will cost, but we don't know how much it will save. So, to try to get full parity, we went—I didn't—the First Lady and her group went to 10 different actuaries to try to get the best possible figures we could get on what mental health coverage would cost. And we couldn't ever get a consensus that the Congressional Budget Office would buy. I'm not trying to paint them as the bad guys, by the way. They're not the bad guys; they just don't know.

So what we may have to do is to start off with the mental health benefits phased in, then show what the costs are of the new things we're doing, and if they're lower than they're projected to be, then we can accelerate the time in which the full coverage comes in. That's the only possibility that I see right now because of the budgetary problem we have.

And this is a problem, by the way, we face in lots of other areas where we're doing something we know will have a good benefit, but we can't prove it. I'll give you another example so it might be clearer to you. When we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement for trade with Mexico, everybody said it would increase trade with Mexico and jobs in the short run. Everybody said that. Even the people that weren't for it thought it would increase jobs in the short run. But we had to count it as a net negative for the budget because we had to reduce tariffs which weren't coming in. So we counted all the losses; we could count no estimated gains from increasing sales. So if some company from New Hampshire sells more in Mexico, it earns more money and pays more Federal income tax, right? We couldn't count any of the estimated increase in Federal income tax; we had to count all the losses.

That's what happened in mental health, which is the problem I'm facing. If we can figure out a way around it, we'll try to accelerate the coverage. But it's a budgetary problem. You're absolutely right. It has to be done, but better it be done in 2000 than not at all. And I'll try to figure out how to do it quicker.

Who's got the mikes here in this column here? Let's do a couple here.

Unemployment

Q. The job training concept proposed for the unemployed and welfare participants, in principle, is an excellent idea. However, currently there are a large majority of recent college graduates, myself among them, who are underemployed. What does your administration plan to do about broadening the middle tier of the job market so that there will be jobs for those who complete your job training programs, as well as job opportunities for college graduates?

The President. I think there are two things that we have to do. First of all, I should have said this earlier, even though 30,000 new jobs have been created in New Hampshire, almost all in the private sector, in the last 13 months, it would take about another 20,000 jobs to get you back to where you were in 1988 or 1987 with the growth in population. The truth is, we're going to have to have more jobs created here. But I noticed—I don't know if I still have it—there was a column in the Manchester newspaper, which is not exactly the house organ of the Clinton administration—[*laughter*]—talking

about how many new jobs are coming into the State, particularly in the southern part of the State and particularly with smaller businesses. So I think the truth is, for young people with no previous experience to be able to get into a good job market, we're going to have to have probably about 15,000 or 20,000 more jobs created here. But I think we're well on the way to seeing that happen.

The second thing that I'm trying to do—we had a job training conference in Washington, and then we had this meeting in Detroit yesterday where I'm trying to make a real plea in this environment against age discrimination on both ends. In other words, there are a lot of people who won't hire young people because they only want to hire people who have had experience. Well, how are the young people ever going to get any experience if nobody ever hires them? And there are a lot of people who don't want to hire older people because they say they've got too much experience, they're too old. But if you're going to—in the environment we're in, where the average person will change jobs eight times in a lifetime, we are literally going to have people changing jobs in their sixties. So employers are going to have to have a whole change in attitude about who is a potential good employee. I think that's something we're really going to have to talk through as a country and deal with.

But the most important thing we can do is just try to keep generating more jobs, because that's how—because younger people without previous experience have a tougher time breaking into the markets if there are still people 10 years older who are unemployed from the last recession. We're getting there, but we're not quite there yet.

Health Care Reform

Q. I'm a recovering Republican. [*Laughter*] We made you the "Comeback Kid" a few years ago, and we hope to send that message from this town meeting to Mr. Dole and his friends in the media, that we're very focused, the people are very focused. We're concerned with jobs and health care. And my question is very focused on health care. My husband's job just changed to HMO's, and they chose for us the doctors that we would see. I had to leave the doctors in Salem and go to Massachusetts to where the HMO was. In your health care plan, will I have more freedom to choose and maybe go back to my own doctors that I've used, a specialist I've used for my son who is disabled and myself, than I do now with this HMO?

The President. Yes. The short answer is yes, but let me explain. Let me try to explain. The short answer is yes, but let me try to amplify it a little bit because I don't want to be misleading in any way. If we do nothing, if we walk away one more time from this health care crisis, what's going to happen is more and more employers will turn to HMO's because they have to to pay their medical bills, because the cost of medical care is going up 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. Many of these HMO's will do an excellent job and will be widely supported and be well and warmly received. Some of them will be not so well received because people either won't want to give up their personal physicians or especially if they've had—you mentioned you had a son with a special problem—if they've had someone that required special treatment, they'll have a particular anxiety about that.

Now, if our plan were to pass as it is today, here is how your situation would be different. Your employer could choose to do work with the HMO and could point out that the HMO would provide all the services required in the health care plan and could even provide a discount for it, that is, could give you a financial incentive to do it. Under our plan, every year you would be given at least three choices, at least three choices: this HMO; some other plan, let's say a PPO, a group of doctors get together and offer their services and maybe would let any other doctor, including your doctor, sign on if he would agree to give the services at the same price; and then strict fee-for-service medicine, the situation you have now. You might have to pay a little more, but your employer would still have to make a contribution. So you would have those choices.

In addition to that, we are trying to set up in our plan the situation where, if someone has a specialist like you do for a special problem, if the specialist will provide the service for the same price that the HMO specialist will provide it, then the specialist should be able to provide that even if you go to the HMO. So you could maybe do the—[*applause*]—so you could maybe get a compromise. We're working on that.

But I don't want to kid you. The employer would still have the option to pick an HMO, and that would still be a less expensive option

than the fee-for-service. But you would be able to get the fee-for-service, and your employer would have to make the same contribution to that plan as he or she would to the HMO. So you would have much more choice than you have now.

Right now—I think it's important that everybody understand this—right now, most people who have insurance are insured in the workplace, and only about half, actually slightly fewer than half have any real choice of providers today who are insured through the workplace. So the amount of choice is going down.

Now, as I said, there are some very, very good HMO's. New England has some very good HMO's that have done a terrific job. But a lot of people want to have the choices. Under our plan, we will promote and facilitate the growth of good HMO's because there will be economic incentives for people to compete for lower cost but higher quality medicine. But we will protect the choices people have, which are vanishing at a very rapid rate today. We're really trying to work out the specialist problem, because that's the thing people are most traumatized about. Someone has been taking care of a family member with a special problem and have to give it up; it's really tough on them.

Q. I come from a town called Amherst, where I'm a distinct minority, I'm a Democrat. [*Laughter*] And my husband and I have just become editors of a small newsletter, and we sent you a copy to the White House, as a matter of fact. I'm concerned about health care because I'm one of those people with lots of preexisting conditions and my husband is a contract engineer and insurance doesn't come with his job. I'm afraid when I hear news reports of you having to compromise to get this bill through Congress. I'm afraid that one of the things you may have to compromise on is people like me. Is that so?

The President. No, there will be no compromise on everybody being covered. There's no point in doing it if we're not going to cover everybody. There is no point in doing it if we're not going to cover everybody. But what I want you to understand, I want every one of you to understand that there are consequences to all human behavior, including inaction. We all know that, but sometimes we forget it.

If we do not act, certain things will happen. Some of you will go into HMO's and you'll be very well satisfied and you'll get good health care at lower costs. Some of you will go into HMO's and you'll lose your choices of doctors and you'll feel that the quality has suffered and you'll be frustrated and angry. Some of you will lose health coverage, because every year we lose about 100,000 people a month in the United States who lose their health insurance permanently. And every year, at some point during the year, there are over 50 million of us who don't have any health insurance.

So what I want you to understand is I won't pretend to have all the answers; I don't pretend that we're right about everything. This is a complicated subject. But there are consequences to every course of action, including doing nothing. And they are quite significant, the consequences of doing nothing.

It also means, to go back to the lady over there, it means no mental health coverage; it means no medicine for people on Medicare but not on Medicaid; it means no medicine for working families who have health plans that don't cover medicine now, may have kids with high medicine costs.

So the one thing we have to do is to find a way to cover everyone, which means you can't lose your coverage because you have preexisting conditions. And in my judgment, it means that people who work for small businesses or who are self-employed should have access to insurance at more or less the same rates that those of us who work for Government or big companies do. I don't think people who have access to the Federal plan—which is terrific by the way; it's a cafeteria plan. Any of you who are Federal employees, you know that. I mean, we've been able to manage our costs. Some of our plans have even gone down in price this year. We have all these choices. I don't think people who work for the Federal Government who don't know anybody else or talk to them can possibly imagine the level of insecurity that grips people that don't have this level of certainty. That may be one of our problems now in Washington.

But the answer to your question is, if we're not going to cover everybody, if we can't find a way to find universal coverage, there is no point in doing this. That's what I said in my State of the Union speech. I'm very flexible; a lot of people have good ideas. A lot of people have better ideas, perhaps, than I do on certain things. We may have to be flexible to pass a plan around the edges. But we have to provide

coverage for everybody. Otherwise we haven't done what we set out to do.

Q. Mr. President, I have a certificate of appreciation from you for being in the Marine Corps, and I was wondering if you could sign it for me.

The President. You bet. I'd be honored to do it. I might say—I like this guy. He meant sign it right this minute, no delay. [*Laughter*] Thank you for your service, Corporal.

Foreign Aid

Q. First of all, Mr. President, I'd like to thank you for your accomplishments in the past year. I think we all appreciate it. And my question is pertaining to foreign aid. I'm a little puzzled as to how we can be sending such large figures out in foreign aid, for instance, $300 million per year to Israel, when we need funding for our own domestic programs for our own people and for deficit reduction.

The President. Let me say, first of all, I don't want to hedge this, I want to try to disagree with you, and I want to tell you that I have—this is something on which I have changed my mind more since I have become President than before. And I want to try to explain why. But let me first say that even though we give quite a lot of money in foreign aid, it is a tiny percentage of our overall budget, and the United States gives a far smaller amount of its public money in foreign aid than any other Western country. All the major European countries and Japan give a higher percentage of their budgets to foreign aid than we do. We give less than others. Now, in our defense, that's because we spent more on national defense defending the whole world during the cold war. So we spent a bigger percentage of our income on defense than any of those countries. So we did more.

But let me explain why, if I might. If we can, through the judicious use of this aid, succeed in making peace between Israel and the PLO, the Palestinians, the Syrians, the Lebanese, the Jordanians, we will remove the huge possibility not only of another war, which could send a lot of children from New Hampshire off to fight, but also of spreading terrorism and weapons of mass destruction arising out of that troubled part of the world.

Give you another example: Turkey is a very important country to the United States. It's a tough issue. Every time—we have a system which says the Turks and the Greeks don't get along, so we give them both money at the same time. And they are very important to us, both of them, but they don't get along with each other. But Turkey is a secular Muslim country, that is, it is not a fundamentalist country. They have allowed us to try to save the Kurds when we went to war in the Persian Gulf; they helped to support us. By a modest amount of money there, if we can continue to relate to those people and support economic growth and opportunity there, they may save another war 4 or 5 years hence.

If we can help to build the economies of the democracies in Latin America, we spend a little bit of money to support democracy there, then all those countries may wind up buying products from New Hampshire and New England and creating jobs for us. We're going to have a Summit of the Americas in December in the United States, and all the heads of all these democratic countries in Latin America are coming up. They all want to be our trading partners. They want to buy more from us. They don't ask much from us, a tiny amount of support for doing that.

So can you waste money on foreign aid? You bet we can. Do we have higher priorities here at home than a lot of things we may do? Yes, we do. Do we need to spend some money on foreign aid in order to protect our security interest and our economic interests long-term and diminish the threat of terrorism and the spread of weapons of destruction? I believe we do. And I see it now much more clearly, in all candor, than I did when I was a candidate running. Sitting in the office, I have a totally different view of it than I did before I came.

Go ahead. We'll take one or two more. The principal called the assembly to order and can call it off, I think.

Deficit Reduction

Q. I've heard you speak about the decline in the deficit over the last 3 years. My concern is that, as we go further into the nineties, the projections are for it to start to increase again. I've been very taken with the Concord Coalition, with New Hampshire's own Warren Rudman and Paul Tsongas and their proposals. I would heartily hope that you would work to continue to reduce the deficit and not reverse the trend that you have started.

The President. Thank you very much. Let me just make a comment about that. You're abso-

lutely right about that. Let me try to explain or amplify on what you just said. The estimates are that if this budget that I have now presented to the Congress passes, we will have 4 years of declining deficits in real dollar terms. If they adopt this budget, it will be the first reduction not only in defense spending but discretionary domestic spending since 1969 that I have presented. Don't ever let anybody tell you the Democrats are the big spenders. I've asked them to cut spending over last year, the first time since 1969.

Now, it does start to go up. And Senator Tsongas and Senator Rudman and Pete Peterson and the Concord Coalition group, what they believe we should do is to do something to restrict the increases in expenditure on Social Security, which are growing, as well as on Medicare and Medicaid. But let me explain to you why I think we should deal with the health care issue first.

Social Security expenditures are about the same percentage of Federal spending as they were 20 years ago. There is a cost of living increase associated with Social Security, but it's been more than covered by the increases in the Social Security tax. So here's what your budget looks like. Defense is going down; all the domestic programs are flat. That means if I propose spending more on education and more in new technologies for former defense firms to make money in commercial enterprises, I have to cut a dollar in something else for every dollar I've put in there. So, no increase in discretionary nondefense spending; a decrease in defense spending; Social Security is going up, but at the rate of inflation, and the revenues are covering it, the Social Security tax.

So what's going up? Well, interest on the debt is going up, but at a slower rate now because interest rates are down. The thing that's going up now and the only thing really going up in the whole Federal budget is Medicare and Medicaid, going up in 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And the reason for that is that people are being constantly—pressures are being constantly dumped into those programs because we don't cover everybody and we have no system to bring health care costs in line with inflation. So I believe the next big step, if you want the deficit to keep coming down, is to try to bring that problem under control.

The Congressional Budget Office, even though they disagreed with our cost figures in the first 3 years, say that 10 years from now our health care plan will be saving the Treasury $150 billion a year, a year. So you're absolutely right, if we don't do something else, we can't keep the deficit coming down. I think the next something else should be the health care.

Yes, there's a gentleman over here. I don't want him to think I was stiffing him.

Q. Mr. President, I want to apologize to you. I do not have a question, but I want to tell you—when my many friends over in the southwestern part of the State—you're on the right track. Don't let the people on the other side of the aisle give you all that rhetoric. They're all running for office, and you're going to come out on top in the long run.

The President. Bless you. Thank you all very much. We've got to quit. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. at Elm Street Junior High School. In his remarks, he referred to Pauline Caron, the school's principal; Mayor Rob Wagner of Nashua; and Barbara J. Baldizar, New Hampshire State senator.

Exchange With Reporters in Nashua
March 15, 1994

Q. Does it make you angry?

The President. No, but let me show you something. Look at this. This is what people care about. Here's a child with a preexisting condition. He can't get health insurance. So I went out there, was shaking hands in the crowd, the mother gave me a picture of this child. That's where America is, with these people——

Q. Why do you think it's been so hard for you to get your message to——

The President. I haven't been out here with them.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. You can draw your own conclusion about that, but you heard from a lot of wise people here today.

Q. Are you angry, Mr. President? You sounded awfully angry last night.

The President. I wasn't. I was happy. What I said last night, I was not angry, but I'm determined. That was a deliberate—I wanted to tell those people how I felt. And I'm very happy being here today. This is America; this is where they are.

Q. It sure looks like you started the '96 campaign——

The President. It's not about the '96 campaign; this is about what we're going to do in Congress for the American people in 1994. That's what this was about.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 11 a.m. outside Elm Street Junior High School. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to Employees of Markem Corporation in Keene, New Hampshire
March 15, 1994

Thank you very much. First, thank you, Jan. She did it like a real pro, didn't she, just as if she'd been there her whole life. Give her a hand. [*Applause*]

I want to thank Jim Putnam for that fine tour and for his remarks. I also want to recognize your Congressman, Dick Swett, who is with me, who's made the tour with me, and he's been a real friend to this company. He's been telling me about Markem for a long time and telling me that I should come here. And I'm very glad I took the suggestion. I had a great time today, and I thank you for that.

I want to thank Jim for the tour and all of you who welcomed me along the way and showed me the work you're doing. It's very, very impressive. I appreciate the message that was read from Tom Putnam and the fact that he's opening new markets for you in another part of the world. I know there are other leaders of this company, Jim Baute whom I met today and Dave Putnam who's not here. And I thank all of you for giving me a chance to see something that is very important for America to think about today, which is how people work together in partnership and win in a tough global economy.

Mayor Lynch, I want to say I'm glad to be back in Keene today, and with you, Senator, and all the other people that are here. This community and this county have been very good to me. Cheshire County gave me more votes than anybody else on the ballot in the primary here in 1992 and in the general election. And so I'm indebted to the people of this community and this county.

Yesterday I was in Detroit, the center of our country's automobile industry, a place that is full of change, where first thousands and thousands of jobs were lost in the car industry and now automobiles are coming back and other industries are coming back in and around there. We had leaders of the world's seven large industrial nations meeting there—Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and the United States—talking about an interesting phenomenon which is the difficulty all the wealthy countries are having creating jobs in a tough global economy, even when their economies are growing. It's not a problem confined to America. And I asked for this meeting last summer so that we could begin to plan together what we could do to reward the work of our people and to try to cooperate more with one another even as we compete.

One of the things that we know is that there are some things that work. And you live it here every day. This is an old company that, as Jim said to me on the tour, keeps young by looking always to the future, being always willing to change; a company that's had, as I understand it, no layoffs in four decades. And that goes through a long recession in the 1980's. That's something you can be proud of. Would that every company would do that.

And it's obvious that you have a combination here of good management, strong workers, good partnership between the people who work here and the folks in management. You're keeping

on the cutting edge of technology. I saw the computer change the two different labels for my visit here today, not with any plates or anything but with simple software. And a real commitment to open markets: I thank Jim and his company for their support of our attempts to open more markets to American products through the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico, through the new worldwide trade agreement, through the outreach we're conducting to Asia.

One of the things we know is that a rich country can't grow richer unless it finds more customers for its goods and its services. And I am committed to finding more customers and to making sure that we have a chance to sell in every market in the world. I was encouraged at the Japanese that after years of conversation and controversy, you've finally worked out an arrangement to give our cellular telephone companies, Motorola specifically, access to the entire Japanese market.

We don't want any favors. We just want a chance to sell American wherever people are willing to buy American. I think that's what we ought to want and what we ought to insist on. If we let other countries have access to our markets, we should ask for the same thing in return and give you a chance to compete in the global economy.

Since I became President, I have worked on a coordinated economic strategy designed to give you a chance to do well by opening more markets to exports, because export-related jobs pay 22 percent more on average than jobs that have no connection to the global economy, by trying to improve the economic climate in this country, bringing interest rates down and increasing investment, by bringing our deficit down.

Last year, the Congress approved a deficit reduction plan to reduce our deficit by $500 billion. This year's plan has just been approved in its outlines by the House of Representatives. And if it passes, and I believe it will, we'll have 3 years of constant reduction in our Government deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States. And it's paying rich dividends for the economy of America and New Hampshire. The unemployment rate in this State has dropped 1.5 percentage points since the election of 1992, 30,000 more jobs in New Hampshire.

But there is a lot more to do, and I ask you to work with me to make sure we do these things properly. And I just would mention three things if I might. First of all, we have to continue to harness technology to the future and make the best technologies available to all of our people. One of the ways we're doing that which has benefited some in New Hampshire already is by taking some of the money that we're reducing defense spending by and putting into domestic technology development so that a lot of the defense companies can find ways to hold onto their jobs by making nondefense products.

Another thing we're trying to do that Jim Putnam has been an expert about—in fact, he's closer to Vice President Gore than I am in what he knows about it—and that is the information superhighway. We want to hook in companies like this one but also every library and every public school and every hospital in the United States of America into a vast information network fueled by high technology to make information readily, quickly, inexpensively accessible to all the American people. This can explode our economic opportunities and improve our quality of life. And your company and your leader are on the cutting edge of that. We intend to continue to push it.

Second thing we want to do is try to improve the continuous training opportunities for America's workers. Unfortunately, as you know, very few companies have a no-layoff policy, and a lot of companies in a dynamic economy simply don't make it at all. Most of the new jobs being created in America are being created by smaller employers, but they have a record of not only coming into business in a hurry but often going out of business.

That means that we need to change the whole unemployment system because, frankly, companies pay unemployment taxes into a fund designed for an economy that doesn't exist anymore. Most people who lose their jobs today don't get their old jobs back the way they used to. They have to find new jobs, which means instead of maintaining people in idleness for a protracted period on unemployment payments that are inadequate anyway, we should use that money immediately, as soon as people lose their jobs, to begin to immediately retrain them so that they can get jobs in companies that are growing with a better future that require higher skill levels. We should turn the unemployment

system into a reemployment system. That will be a heavy priority for the Congress this year.

The last thing I'd like to talk about briefly is health care, for a couple of reasons. First of all, I know this company has a good health care package and, therefore, that you all feel secure in your health care. And I honor you for that, and I'm glad you do. But you should know that every major company in America like this one that provides good health care to its employees is paying more for that health care than it should because so many Americans don't have any health insurance, and when they show up at the hospital at the emergency room, their health care gets absorbed by the hospitals, and they pass the cost on to the companies that do have health insurance. That adds to the cost of doing business.

It also means that a lot of Americans are at risk of losing their health insurance all the time. So what we're committed to doing this year is to preserving the plans that are good, like yours; preserving what works in the American health care system, but fixing the system of finance which has led a lot of people into very difficult circumstances.

I just left a town hall meeting in Nashua, where I talked to a woman who lost her health insurance because she had a sick child and because she lost her job, and now nobody will hire her because they don't want to take her son's insurance on because the child is sick. In any other country they would have a broad, big pool in which people like that could be insured, so no company would be unduly burdened by hiring an employee.

With people changing jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime, we have to make it possible for all American families to work and to have access to health care. And we can't stop people from moving in the job market just because they've had a child or a parent who was sick. And furthermore, it is not right when we are trying to export our products all over the world to punish good companies that provide good health insurance benefits by making them pay more than they should just because some people don't pay anything.

So we're going to try to provide health security for all Americans in a way that preserves what is right about our system but fixes what is wrong. It will be good for the economy, and I can also tell you it'll be very good for this budget deficit, because every year now the only thing that's really growing in the entire Federal budget are health care costs, going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation for reasons directly related to the fact that we're the only advanced industrial country that doesn't provide health care to everyone. So we have to do that, and I hope you will support that.

Finally, let me say that one of the things that I'm trying to do as your President, with mixed results, I guess, is to bring the same sort of values and method of operation that made this company great into the operation of the National Government. So many of the problems that we have today are people problems. They don't fit neatly within the partisan political categories of the past. So much of what we have to do today is to get people to work together in teams to develop human potential and to exalt human dignity and give people a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given ability. That is our job, to get people together, to get things done, to help people make the most of their lives.

And I think that we do very well in Washington, DC, to remember the model that we see here, the model that puts people first: no layoff policy, heavy emphasis on productivity, use technology, but never forget people are the most important thing. Sell to the whole world. Keep the competition in mind. Those are things I wish we could be driven by in Washington. And I promise you, every day I'm trying to bring Washington a little closer to that way of doing business, your way.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:17 p.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Janet Morse, employee, James A. Putnam, president, Thomas A. Putnam, chairman, Joseph A. Baute, director, and David F. Putnam, director emeritus, Markem Corp.; and Mayor William F. Lynch of Keene.

Remarks to Soldiers and Their Families at Fort Drum, New York
March 15, 1994

Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you for this beautiful, beautifully decorated place of welcome. Thank you for letting the band play "Yakety Sax." That was an interesting little twist. And thank you for letting me sit next to a distinguished soldier who was from my hometown; our grandparents knew each other. Command Sergeant Major Johnson, stand up. You know, we were sitting back there talking, he was looking at me thinking, "I don't know about you, Mr. President, but I've come a long way." [*Laughter*]

I thank all of you for being here. I also want to acknowledge the presence in the audience today of the Lieutenant Governor of New York, Lieutenant Governor Stan Lundine, and Congressman John McCue from this district. Thank you, gentlemen, for being here.

I also want to thank the eight couples that are here behind me and Major Tony Smart, who was sitting up there with me. The nine of them gathered over at General and Mrs. Meade's house a few moments ago to talk to me about what it was like to be in Somalia and what it was like to be the family members left behind. They represented you wonderfully well. I loved my time with them. And it must not have been all that easy for them to do, but they were terrific. I'd like for you to acknowledge them all. [*Applause*]

I thank General Meade for his welcome and General Shali for his fine remarks.

You know, this is a great day, but it is March 15th and there's still a couple of feet of snow on the ground up here. I know that there are a fair number of men and women in our Armed Forces who come from the southern part of the United States. When I realized you'd had 160 inches of snow, 26 days in January below zero, one day at 43 degrees below zero—that's real temperature, not wind chill—I'm surprised we have anybody who didn't go to Somalia. [*Laughter*] I'm surprised anybody stayed behind. Some of the ladies who were meeting with me said that shoveling the snow was maybe a harder duty than their husbands had to endure. But I'm glad to be here. I thank you for the hat. Look at my nice tie, here. It's your tie. I will wear it with pride.

It's also a privilege for me to welcome back "Triple Deuce" today. I say on behalf of all the American people, thank you, job well done and welcome home.

Fifteen months ago, our troops went to Somalia to help stop one of the great human tragedies of our time. Already 300,000 people, many of them little children like those here in this audience, had died of starvation and disease; twice as many were in danger of dying very quickly. Relief supplies were rotting on the docks of Mogadishu, hostage to a small number of armed Somalis.

To help relieve this suffering, our Nation acted. President Bush deployed 28,000 American troops in support of a United Nations humanitarian mission. It was after the election, I was coming in, and I gave him my full support. Joining with other soldiers and relief workers from around the world, our troops helped restore hope and save hundreds of thousands from certain death. This proud division, the same division that helped the citizens of Florida rebuild after Hurricane Andrew, knows something about restoring hope. I saw some of you there, too.

Today, in Somalia, the crops are growing; food and medicine are flowing; roads, schools, and clinics have reopened. No longer are thousands of children dying every day. Leaders are sitting down today at peace talks in Nairobi. You helped make all that possible. And by March 25th, a week ahead of schedule, the last American military units in Somalia will be heading back to their loved ones and home.

There are those who will say we have not done everything that could have been done because Somalia has not yet found an enduring peace, because factions continue to fight for advantage, indifferent to the deadly chaos they threatened to recreate. But never forget, because of your efforts and the efforts of so many others, the starvation has ended and the Somali people have been given a serious chance to build their own future. That is all we or anyone else can provide. We cannot rebuild other people's societies. You have given them a chance to seize their own future. That is what we do in the United States, and that is what others must do as well. You have given them that

chance, and for that, the world should be grateful to you.

Let me say that we must honor not only those who returned hale and healthy but also those who came home wounded and those who did not return. I met in Walter Reed Hospital one of your numbers, Sergeant Chris Reid, a very brave and terribly impressive soldier who is still in the hospital nursing his wounds. And I know that our prayers, all of our prayers are with him.

Just yesterday an American AC–130 crashed off the coast of Kenya on its way to Somalia and several of the crew members perished. On behalf of all the American people, let me express our sympathy to the loved ones of those who were lost in that accident.

On Veterans Day I had the honor of meeting three other members of your great division, Specialists Michael Carroll and Duane Bevitt and Lieutenant Colonel Egon Hawrylack. They came to the White House. I thought I deserve a cheer for pronouncing his name right. [*Applause*] Let me tell you, they came to the White House, those three people, with some others who served there, with a simple message. They said, "We are proud of what we did."

When most of our troops came home last May, General Robert Johnston came to the White House, and he said this about you and your colleagues who served in Somalia: "A lot of 18- and 19-year-old men and women in uniform," he said, "demonstrated enormous discipline, good judgment, and a good deal of patience in performing a rather unique mission." That is putting it mildly. People who were not there do not know how much patience was required on how many circumstances under difficult, difficult conditions. And General Johnston said, "I don't think any other country in the world could have done what we did." I say that is true, and we are all proud of what you did.

In this new era, you all know that we may ask our military to undertake a range of missions, fighting aggression in the Gulf, helping to contain the conflict in the Balkans, working to build a democratic peace in Europe through NATO's Partnership For Peace. But whatever the setting, our people in uniform carry the same message of strength and hope and freedom. That's why our forces must always be the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared in the world, and the people with the best spirit, the best morale, and the deepest conviction—people like you. That is my commitment, to keep you there and keep you strong.

I want to say one other word about the mission in Somalia. General Shalikashvili just described that work as a great victory as measured in the thousands and hundreds of thousands of children and men and women who are alive today. In that sense, the mission you undertook was without precedent. American soldiers did not go to Somalia to conquer but on a mission of mercy, a mission accomplished, a mission to be proud of. Let history also record that here at Fort Drum and at other bases across our Nation that it was not just the troops who earned their stripes but the spouses, the families, the children, the civilian colleagues and the communities.

I want to say again, I am profoundly grateful to all the families and all the family support groups and all the civilians who made this possible. And these fine people behind me, who spent about an hour talking to me today, taught me things and made me see things and understand things from your point of view that I could never have learned otherwise. I am in your debt, and I believe I will be a better President and a better Commander in Chief because of the time they spent to share your lives, your experiences, and your hopes with me. I thank them for that, and I thank you for that.

Finally, let me say, if there are any debates still to be had about our mission in Somalia, let people have those debates with me, but let there be no debate about how you carried out the mission. You answered the call. You did your job. You served your country wonderfully well. More than that no one can ask. So to all the American men and women who have served with honor in this difficult and dangerous mission, I say you have shown the world what Americans are made of. Your Nation is grateful, and your President is terribly, terribly proud of you.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:02 p.m. in the soldiers' gym.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on International Agreements
March 15, 1994

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

Pursuant to subsection (b) of the Case-Zablocki Act (1 U.S.C. section 112b(b)), I transmit herewith a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Nomination for the Federal Communications Commission
March 15, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Susan Ness as a member of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

"As a former communications lender, Susan Ness brings to the FCC valuable perspective. Her extensive experience covers many communications industry sectors including telecommunications, radio, television, cable television, programming and publishing," the President said. "She will be an excellent addition to this important Commission."

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

Memorandum on the White House Conference on Small Business
March 15, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: White House Conference on Small Business

In September, I appointed the White House Conference on Small Business Commission. The Commission is charged with convening a series of State and regional meetings that will culminate in a national White House Conference on Small Business in June 1995.

These 66 meetings will attract up to 40,000 participants who will discuss the challenges facing small businesses. These representatives—small business owners and entrepreneurs—will develop specific recommendations for executive and congressional action. These recommendations will help constitute the small business agenda for the 21st century.

I ask each of you to support this important effort, by taking the following measures. First, each department and agency should prepare a list of significant policy initiatives affecting small businesses undertaken in the past year. Second, each department and agency should identify one or two potential new initiatives that would improve the economic or regulatory climate for small businesses. These two items should be forwarded to Gene B. Sperling, Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, no later than April 1, 1994.

The White House Office of Cabinet Affairs, working with the National Economic Council staff, the White House Office of Public Liaison, and the Small Business Administration, will coordinate various departments' and agencies' participation in the Conference. To facilitate that process, please designate a deputy-level contact

on your staff to serve as a liaison and to work directly with the White House offices and the Small Business Administration. Each liaison will be asked to attend regular meetings and charged with oversight of the department's or agency's contribution to and participation in the Conference. Please forward your designee's name to Christine A. Varney, Deputy Assistant to the President for Cabinet Affairs, by April 1.

Thank you for your support of this important effort to assist our Nation's small businesses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 16.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Proposed Legislation on Reemployment

March 15, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and prompt enactment the "Reemployment Act of 1994". Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis. This legislation is vital to help Americans find new jobs and build sustainable careers.

Our current set of programs was designed to meet the different needs of an earlier economy. People looking for help today confront a confusing, overlapping, and duplicative tangle of programs, services, and rules. Job seekers—whether unemployed or looking for better jobs—have a difficult time getting the information they need: What benefits and services are available to them? Where can they get good quality training? What do they need to know to find and hold good jobs and to build sustainable careers?

The underlying problem is the lack of a coherent employment and training system. Instead, we have many disconnected, category-based programs—each with distinct eligibility requirements, operating cycles, and program standards. We need a true system of lifelong learning—not the current hodgepodge of programs, some of which work, and some of which don't. The legislation I am transmitting today is an important first step in building this system.

We need to build a reemployment system because our current unemployment system no longer delivers what many American workers need. In the past, when a worker lost a job, he or she often returned to that job as soon as the business cycle picked up again and the company was ready to rehire. The unemployment system was designed to tide workers over during temporary dry spells. Today, when a worker loses a job, that job often is gone forever.

Our economy has generated new jobs. In 1993 alone, 1.7 million new private sector jobs were created—more than in the previous 4 years combined. While the jobs exist, the pathways to them aren't always clear.

The Reemployment Act of 1994 strives to fix this. It is based on evidence of what works for getting workers into new and better jobs. Programs that work are customer-driven, offering customized service, quality information, and meaningful choices. Programs that work provide job search assistance to help dislocated workers become reemployed rapidly, feature skill training connected to real job opportunities, and offer support services to make long-term training practical for those who need it.

The Act reflects six key principles:

First is universal access and program consolidation. The current patchwork of dislocated worker programs is categorical, inefficient, and confusing. The Reemployment Act of 1994 will consolidate six separate programs into an integrated service system that focuses on what workers need to get their next job, not the reason why they lost their last job.

Second is high-quality reemployment services. Most dislocated workers want and need only information and some basic help in assessing their skills and planning and conducting their job search. These services are relatively simple and inexpensive, and they have been shown to pay off handsomely in reducing jobless spells.

Third is high-quality labor market information, which must be a key component of any reem-

ployment effort. The labor market information component of the Reemployment Act of 1994 will knit together various job data systems and show the way to new jobs through expanding access to good data on where jobs are and what skills they require.

Fourth is one-stop service. At a recent conference that I attended on "What Is Working" in reemployment efforts, a common experience of workers was the difficulty of getting good information on available services. Instead of forcing customers to waste their time and try their patience going from office to office, the new system will require States to coordinate services for dislocated workers through career centers. It allows States to compete for funds to develop a more comprehensive network of one-stop career centers to serve under one roof anyone who needs help getting a first, new, or better job, and to streamline access to a wide range of job training and employment programs.

The fifth principle of the legislation is effective retraining for those workers who need it to get a new job. Some workers need retraining. The Reemployment Act of 1994 will also provide workers financial support when they need it to let them complete meaningful retraining programs.

Sixth is accountability. The Reemployment Act of 1994 aims to restructure the incentives facing service providers to begin focusing on workers as customers. Providers who deliver high-quality services for the customer and achieve positive outcomes will prosper in the new system. Those who fail to do so will see their funding dry up.

The Reemployment Act of 1994 will create a new comprehensive reemployment system that will enhance service, improve access, and assist Americans in finding good new jobs. This is a responsible proposal that is fully offset over the next 5 years.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration so that Americans will have available a new, comprehensive reemployment system that works for everyone.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

March 15, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 16.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

March 16, 1994

The President. Mr. Prime Minister, friends, we come together today at an important time for the Middle East. We are closer to a lasting peace than would have been thought only a year ago. Yet we are further from that peace than we expected to be only a month ago.

The events of the past several weeks have demonstrated the risks in this great undertaking. The bloodshed in Hebron was a tragic reminder that the forces of reaction will lash out whenever peace becomes a real possibility. We must not let the enemies of peace triumph. We must not allow them to deny Israel and its neighbors a future of hope. And that is why I applaud Prime Minister Rabin's courageous stance against militant extremism. And it is why I have called upon the Prime Minister and Chairman Arafat to find a way to resume negotiations and to do so quickly.

Today we discussed ways to put the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations back on track. We agreed on the need for concrete measures to ensure security for Palestinians as well as for Israelis and for rapid implementation of the Declaration of Principles to give Palestinians control over their own affairs and well-being.

In our meeting, the Prime Minister and I also discussed ways to make 1994 a year of breakthrough in the negotiations between Israel and Syria. This would not only help bolster the agreement already achieved with the Palestinians, it would also help advance our overall objective of a comprehensive peace, one that encompasses Jordan and Lebanon as well.

President Asad spoke in Geneva of his strategic choice for peace with Israel. Prime Minister Rabin told me today that peace with Syria is a strategic imperative. These two leaders have a great responsibility to the people of their region. As a full partner in the process, the U.S. stands ready to help them achieve that lasting peace that can end the Israeli-Arab conflict and transform the Middle East.

The Prime Minister and I agreed that as the region turns to the business of establishing peace, the Arab boycott of Israel must end. It is a relic of the past, born of animosity and exclusion. For all the peoples of the Middle East to prosper, economic barriers and isolation must yield to dialog and cooperation.

During our meeting today, we also discussed what the United States can do to maintain and enhance Israel's security as it continues to take real risks to achieve peace. We talked about ways the U.S. could help Israel defend against long-term threats to its security. And I reaffirm my commitment to work with Congress to maintain our present levels of assistance and to consider how we might help Israel defray the costs of peace. We've also pledged to do whatever we can to help resolve the cases of Israeli MIA's.

Since the beginning of this administration, the Prime Minister and I have worked to promote the common interest and values our nations share. Today we are working closely together on such issues, including those which now confront the U.N. Security Council. Our efforts have one common purpose, maintaining the principles we both share while doing all we can to promote peace.

This is an historic moment for Israel. And I am profoundly aware, Mr. Prime Minister, of the great burdens you are bearing in your search for peace. You have the admiration and respect of the entire United States and our Nation's pledge of support and steadfast friendship.

As we approach Passover, a time to celebrate freedom and redemption, let us dedicate ourselves to a season of new beginnings and turn our gaze to the future to make it a future of peace.

Thank you.

Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. President, the Vice President, Secretary of State, dear friends, it was important and worthwhile to meet today with the President and his team, to know and appreciate what we have known for a long time: The friendship and trust between our two countries are profound and now as good if not better than they have ever been. We could not ask for more. For this, Mr. President, please accept our gratitude. It is good to know that a great nation blessed with values and democracy stands with us for the greatest battle still to come, the battle for peace.

Mr. President, a few months ago, I stood here with you and many others at an historic occasion. We arrived at the beginning of the end of the bloody struggle that has lasted for 100 years. It was clear from the beginning that in spite of the good will on all sides, it would be difficult to bridge in days or in months differences in positions, perceptions, points of view, and hatred that have devastated and grown over so many decades. But we shall overcome these difficulties and reach the day of peace. We shall remain determined in our goal.

In our talks today, I told you, Mr. President, that in my view, we were near the finish line of the talks with the Palestinians on the first stage of the Gaza-Jericho first. Some problems and details have yet to be solved. I am sure that we shall find the right solution once the negotiations are renewed. We will not let the extremists derail the peace process.

On behalf of the state of Israel, I condemn the terrible terms of the killing in Hebron. I repeated this today in our conversation. Since that time, the Government of Israel has taken tough measures that are unprecedented in Israel. We will implement them with determination.

But, Mr. President, we are also victims of terror, whether organized or spontaneous. Our women and children have lived in the shadow of terror for decades. Not a week passes that we don't have to bury our dead. And if only for this reason, we don't think it appropriate to wage new demands after every terrorist attack. Security is a two-way street. Real leadership must rise above the realities of the day, even if they are painful and bloody, in order to arrive at our strategic goal. Peace is not a tactical option but a strategic objective which takes precedence over everything else.

With you, Mr. President, I call on Chairman Arafat of the PLO to resume talks immediately and act like me, to fight terror as if there were no negotiations and conduct the negotiations as if there was not terror.

We have to complete the negotiations so that in the spring or in early summer, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of Palestinians in Gaza and Jericho will at last be able to conduct their own affairs. We don't seek to rule them anymore.

Mr. President, there is no time to waste. We feel that the window of opportunity that opened after the Gulf war is narrower than we thought. Time is running out. Therefore, 1994 has to be the year of great decisions in the peace process. In this framework we spoke of the options that can be presented to President Asad in order to achieve peace with Syria. I hope that President Asad will respond appropriately and we shall be able to sign a peace treaty by the end of this year. President Asad said that Syria had made the strategic choice for peace with Israel. That was encouraging. Peace with Syria has always been our strategic choice. We recognize the importance of Syria to a comprehensive peace in the area. We are ready to negotiate peace with Syria that takes account of our mutual needs and interests. There must be give and take on both sides.

We know that as we engage in serious and authoritative negotiations, the point will come where painful decisions will have to be made. The promise of peace and its genuine benefits for all Israelis justifies making such decisions vis-a-vis Syria. We will not compromise on our security. But we will stand ready to do what is required of us if the Syrians are ready to do what is required of them.

At the same time, we would like to promote and advance the negotiations with Jordan as well as with Lebanon. We are hopeful that with them, too, treaties of peace can be achieved this year.

All of us know the time for the Arab boycott of Israel, a remnant of a period of hate and rejection, should be lifted. Mr. President, Prime Ministers of Israel have come in the past with impressive shopping lists. On my list today, I have one item alone, the pursuit of peace.

As Passover, our feast of freedom, is approaching, let me take the opportunity to remind all of us of the fate of the Israeli soldiers missing in action and prisoners of war. I would like to thank the President for the United States support in this regard and express the hope that Passover will also be a time of redemption for them. Mr. President, thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, since security is a two-way street, what do you plan to do to wipe out the acknowledged double standard in the treatment of Palestinians? And also, if you're willing to make peace with Syria, Lebanon, Jordan now, why don't you make the quantum leap and go for permanent negotiations on peace with Palestinians instead of the step-by-step, very slow struggle of the peace process that means more strife?

Prime Minister Rabin. First, about the second question. You have to refer to the letter of invitation to the Madrid peace conference. This letter of invitation served as the basis agreed on by all the parties that were invited to the Madrid peace conference and the negotiations that followed this conference.

What was written there? That the purpose of the negotiations with the three neighboring Arab countries beyond Egypt would be to achieve peace treaties and with the Palestinians to move by two phases. Phase number one—something that was never offered to the Palestinians in the past, not by Jordan when Jordan was in occupation of the West Bank, not by Egypt when Egypt was in occupation of the Gaza Strip—we offered them self-rule, to run their own affairs, to have a Palestinian council, self-governing authority as an interim agreement.

What was agreed in signing between the PLO and us? In the Declaration of Principles that was signed on the lawns of the White House, we divided the phases by agreement to Gaza-Jericho first; then to create the overall arrangement; and not later than 2 years after the completion of the implementation of Gaza-Jericho first, to start negotiating a permanent solution.

I believe that sometimes what might look the shortest way is the longest and the one that will not lead to a change in the realities. Therefore, we are committed to the letter of invitation to the Madrid peace conference. We are committed to the Declaration of Principles that was signed here between the PLO and Israel. We are committed to the Cairo agreement that was reached between the PLO and Israel. And I believe to be committed to agreements that were reached is a basic precondition for the efforts to reach more agreements.

Second, you talked about different situations. Let's face it, most of the terror attacks are

aimed against Israelis. We, the Government of Israel, in accordance to the international law, are the sovereign, true military government of the territories. It's our responsibility for the safety, the welfare of all the residents, Jews and Palestinian alike. This government, as a result of the terrible tragedy that took place in Hebron, has taken measures that are unprecedented in Israel vis-a-vis those who violate the law.

But we are a lawful country. I can give you an example. I used, in my responsibility as a Minister of Defense, orders for administering detention of two Israeli residents, not the territories. But in accordance to our laws, they have to be approved by a president of a district court. I ordered administrative detention for 3 months; the president of the district court reduced it to 6 days. I cannot violate the verdict of the court. Whatever the government does comes under the supervision and decision of our courts.

I believe that many people in Israel believe that we have done almost encroaching the line of the law. But we are determined to do within the law whatever is needed to fight terrorism from whatever direction it will come.

The President. The question from the Israeli press.

Q. The two alternative issues—[*inaudible*]—Jerusalem and settlements, are now de facto on the table. Do you agree that they should wait until the final stage, or should you tackle them right now?

The President. You are asking me?

Q. I am asking both of you, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister.

The President. Well, in terms of the resolution of Jerusalem, the position of the United States has not changed. But that is a matter for the parties to decide in accord with the declaration. It is something to be ultimately decided at a later point. That's what we think should be done.

Prime Minister Rabin. My answer is basically simple. We signed here in Washington the Declaration of Principles. It is written very clearly there that issues that have to be settled once we negotiate permanent solution will not be dealt with now. And it is written very clearly as examples for this kind of issue: Jerusalem, settlements, borders, refugees, and others. Therefore, by agreement with the PLO, these issues will be dealt with when we negotiate permanent solutions.

The President. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

China

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about China. There are growing calls for the United States to delink the issues of trade and human rights. Former Secretaries of State Vance and Kissinger say the United States has to pay attention to human rights but that it also has to have a pragmatic approach. What are you getting out of your current strategy or your current approach to China? And are you thinking about changing it?

The President. Well, I think you can safely assume that we have been and will continue to be spending a good deal of time on the issue of our relationships with China, that our policy is what it has been, that human rights are important but the other issues are important, too. And I'm confident that we will be able to work through this and strengthen our relationship and our advocacy of human rights over the long run. That's what I think will happen, and we've got some time to do that. And I think you'll see an enormous effort coming out of this administration to try to achieve both those objectives.

Is there another question from the Israeli press?

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you going to urge the President of Syria to meet with the Israeli Prime Minister? And did you ask the Israeli Prime Minister the question, if Israel will be ready to leave the Golan Heights to get peace with Syria?

The President. We had quite an extended conversation about this issue, and I believe that the Prime Minister very much wants to make peace with Syria. I talked with President Asad just a few days ago. I'm convinced he wants to make peace with Israel. Since I think both of them want to make peace with each other, the best thing for me to do is not to say anything which will make their task more difficult.

Q. But we need details, Mr. President.

The President. Yes, but they can't come from me.

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering if you could describe what your view is of the concrete measures that you mentioned early on in your remarks that should be taken to keep peace in

Israel, and whether or not you would support the PLO idea for a police force in Hebron?

The President. I think the Prime Minister would like to respond to that also, but let me say, Israel has accepted responsibility on the security issue for law and order, if you will. And even the United Nations, in the draft that is being circulated, has reaffirmed that. Within that broad framework, I think there are a number of options which can be pursued to deal with this issue. And I think the Israelis have an obligation, as I have said, to come up with some specific initiatives for reassurance on this.

I also think it is important for the PLO not to use this as an excuse not to return to the peace talks. I think the Prime Minister is doing what he can to demonstrate his good faith, has been very firm in reaction to the massacre in Hebron. There are some specifics that have been discussed. I think they will be forthcoming. But I don't think that we should get the two so mixed up that the whole future of the Middle East is, in effect, put on hold.

Would you like to——

Q. So does that mean you don't support the PLO's presence there, sir?

The President. Well, that's not what I said.

Prime Minister Rabin. Well, allow me first to make it clear. In the agreement, once it will be reached and signed, there is a building—in the past it was 8,000 to 9,000 men as a Palestinian police force in Gaza and Jericho. If by now agreement has been reached, by now there would have been 8,000, 9,000 Palestinian policemen in Gaza and Jericho. The more the negotiations are postponed, the longer it will take them to come.

Second, even if there will be some Palestinian police—and there were in the past. At least 900 Palestinian police in the territories were Palestinian residents of the territories in Hebron and in Ramallah and in Nablus. They resigned because of the Intifada. As long as ours is the overall responsibility for the territories under the military government, using our civil administration, their presence will not relieve us from our overall responsibility.

Therefore, we have to look at it in the context of what is our international and practical responsibility. We, as long as agreement will not be reached that will cover all these areas with the PLO, we will remain internationally responsible to the security of all those who reside there, if there will be or will not be part of any Palestinian police. They will have to come under the control of the government there, and the government is the military government of Israel. Therefore, you can't have separate armed groups. There must be one chain of command of those who have to keep and maintain law and order.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, the Israeli Government is seemingly uncomfortable with the sort of involvement that the Russian Government has sought to assume lately in the Middle East process. Are we seeing increasingly a phenomenon worldwide in which Russia, in the way of making a point that it is still a great nation and deserves recognition, gets in the way of restoring stability back in the Middle East, the Balkans, Central Europe, and elsewhere?

The President. I don't think they have gotten in the way of restoring peace and stability in the Balkans. I think that so far they have been a constructive force. They are a cosponsor of the Middle East peace talks and, therefore, have a right to have their say. I think it is very important, however, if I might turn your question back just a minute, that as a cosponsor, insofar as possible, that we coordinate our actions together and that anything they do is not seen as an obstacle to peace but facilitates it. And the answer to your question basically will have to be revealed by the conduct of the Russians themselves in the days and weeks ahead.

I think when we were attempting to get the safe zone around Sarajevo and get the talks back going in the Balkans, the Russians were basically a positive force. Whether they will be such in the Middle East will be revealed by their own conduct in the days and weeks ahead. I hope they will be, and we certainly are willing to coordinate with them. You know, they were here when we had the signing in September, and I have always appreciated the fact that they were a cosponsor of these talks.

Press Secretary Myers. Two more questions.

The President. Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Do you and Mrs. Clinton still stand by the conclusions of the so-called Lyons report on your real estate investment in Whitewater, or are you uncomfortable with those findings?

The President. Look, I don't have anything else to say about that right now. We are cooper-

ating fully with the Special Counsel, which is what all of you asked me to do. I wish you'd let them do their work.

Yes.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you think that Jews should exercise their right to reside in the middle of Arab cities? And Mr. Prime Minister, could you also respond to that?

The President. What was the question?

Q. Should Jews exercise their right to reside in the middle of Arab cities in the West Bank? Should they live in Hebron, for instance?

Prime Minister Rabin. I don't understand the question.

Q. Well, there were ideas of evacuating Jews from the middle of Hebron, for instance.

Prime Minister Rabin. Again, as part of the DOP that we signed with the PLO, it is said very clearly that the settlements remain there for the period of—the interim period. I'm not saying it. It is written very clearly in the DOP. Therefore, since it was agreed, I don't see at this stage as a condition for anything even to discuss this issue.

Ames and Pollard Espionage Cases

Q. Mr. President, I wonder if you could tell us, and Mr. Prime Minister, the extent to which you've discussed the Jonathan Pollard case again, and how much, if at all, the Ames investigation has interfered with action on it that was presented as imminent several months ago.

The President. We did not discuss it. And the Ames case has not interfered with it inasmuch as the Pollard case is already in the hands of the Justice Department, and the White House is awaiting a recommendation from the Justice Department.

Thank you.

Q. Could you let the Prime Minister answer?

Prime Minister Rabin. In today's meeting the issue was not brought up.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 53d news conference began at 1:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria.

Nomination for Director of the Voice of America
March 16, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Geoffrey Cowan as the Director of the Voice of America (VOA) at the U.S. Information Agency. Cowan will serve as the 19th Director of VOA, the international radio broadcasting service of the U.S. Information Agency. His father, Louis G. Cowan, served as the second Director of VOA, from August 1, 1943, to August 31, 1945.

"Geoffrey Cowan has been an important force in almost every facet of the communications world, as a public interest lawyer, best-selling author and award-winning teacher, playwright, television producer, and public servant," said the President. "The Voice of America will be served well with another Cowan at its helm."

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

Nomination for Chairman of the African Development Foundation
March 16, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Ernest Green as Chairman and member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

"Ernie is a close friend whose contributions to the United States have already changed the course of this Nation," the President said. "His talents will be a tremendous asset to this important foundation."

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

Remarks Announcing Antiviolence Public Service Announcements
March 17, 1994

Thank you very much, Alicia. I think your family is here with you—your family members, would you all stand up? Thank you for coming here with her. I want to thank Alicia for that remarkable performance. You know what I said to her when I saw the PSA's? The same thing all of you are thinking; I said, "The one with you in it was a whole lot better."

This is the culmination of a long effort by good people who want to do something about this terrible problem. I thank Phil Geier, the chairman of the Ad Council, and all those who comprise that council and who support this work. I want to thank Jack Calhoun for the work he's done and the 123 organizations that make up his Crime Prevention Coalition and for his remarkable remarks here today.

I thank Saatchi and Saatchi for the work they did and others, members of the creative community who are here with us today who have done their own public service announcements, changed their programming, made a common commitment in an earlier meeting with the Vice President and me to try to make a sustained effort to change the culture of violence that is gripping our country.

I want to say a special word of thanks and greeting to the chairman of our Corporation for National and Community Service, Eli Segal, who is in Miami at the seventh annual Youth Crime Prevention Conference. With 1,200 officers, teachers, community leaders, and others active in crime watch projects, peer counseling, drug prevention programs and others, these people are going to have to carry a lot of the future of our common efforts to reduce violence in America.

You know, if you just read the big headlines in the papers today, a lot of them are very good. There's more growth, more jobs, more opportunity, a real sense of recovery in the country. But we will never become the country we ought to be if we lose another generation of our children to the violence that killed so many and holds the rest hostage.

I can tell you as the father of a teenager, every teenager in the country talks about this issue at home at night, discusses it over the dinner table, is concerned about it, worries about whether they have friends that are going to fall victim to crime. And this is an incredible burden, a burden you can see in the eyes and hear in the voice of Alicia, one that imposes on those of us who are grown an inordinate responsibility to change the conditions and the attitudes which have produced this incredible range of violence.

We now have a higher percentage of our people in prison than any country on the face of the Earth. No other nation has so high a percentage of their people in prison. And yet we worry that we don't have enough jail space and we have to build more.

The broadcast, the cable networks that are here who are supporting this effort and who will make time available are helping us to begin to make a difference. I want to say a special word of encouragement and thanks to them because they've done so much to help change our country for the better with other such campaigns, the campaign to reduce smoking, the campaign to increase seatbelt use, the campaigns to remind so many young people that a mind is a terrible thing to waste, or friends don't let friends drink and drive.

President Roosevelt once said if he hadn't gone into politics he would like to have had a career in advertising. President Kennedy generated his first Peace Corps volunteers through ads like this. Messages can speak to dreams and respond to fears and bring people out of their shells. I hope that we can do that here today.

This industry, the entertainment industry, is working hard now to help America reduce violent behavior by showing young people that there are alternatives to violence. They can help us in the search for a safer and a saner land.

To change, people have to have a willing heart. We're working hard here on a crime bill which I hope so much will be passed soon to put more police officers on the street, to take more assault weapons off the street, to try to change the conditions in communities that exist by giving communities opportunities to help young people have something to say yes to instead of just something to say no to. But we have to have more willing hearts.

The cable industry will air these ads on 32 cable networks. The networks themselves have committed a high level exposure. Already 2,000 movie theaters have agreed to show the PSA on their screens. And we are now getting offers to put these PSA's on movies that are rented at video rental stores. The Motion Picture Association of America, under the able leadership of Jack Valenti, and the video software dealers are really going to do a lot of good work on this.

These commitments are new and unprecedented. I think they reveal an understanding by people in the entertainment industry that our children have and share with us daily. We somehow have to find a way to encourage young people to settle arguments with words instead of weapons. We also have to encourage their parents to do the same thing, for domestic violence is still the cause of a lot of these killings. We have to show adults how common sense can ease tensions. We have to help communities set up programs to deal with this.

Last week, I was in Brooklyn College with nine people who are giving their lives to various efforts to help people turn away from violence. I just want to mention two of them to you. I met a woman named Clementine Barfield from Detroit, who had two sons, two of her teenage sons, shot and one killed in gang fighting. She is devoting her life to try to reach kids to make sure not only that they don't become victims like her sons but they don't become killers like the people who killed her sons.

I met a young man named Sherman Spears from Oakland, California, who is confined to a wheelchair, has had one leg amputated, lost the use of one of his eyes, often still in pain because he was caught in the crossfire of a gun shooting. He is devoting his life to an organization which reaches out to victims and tries to tell them not to retaliate, not to seek vengeance, not to seek revenge, that no one ever gets even and you have to go on with your lives.

These are the kinds of people we want to support. We will send specific suggestions to anyone who responds to the 800 line. It's 1–800–WE–PREVENT. It's mentioned in the ad, and it's very important because the people who are going to air the ads can't do the grassroots one-on-one work after the air is quiet.

In closing, let me just say this. You probably heard Alicia Brown say this; I want to reemphasize it. In a few moments, she is going to the funeral of her sixth friend to die from gunshot wounds, a 14-year-old child, not in a war zone in a far away country, not in Somalia, not in Sudan, not in Angola, not in Burundi, not in Sarajevo, but in the Capital of the greatest nation on the face of the Earth.

That is what has become of childhood, my fellow Americans. While the rest of us have pursued our dreams in life, had our families, raised our children, enjoyed the fruits of freedom, that is what has become of childhood. It is indecent. It is unacceptable. We can do something about it. And we owe it to them to do it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Alicia Brown, a 14-year-old student at Eliot Junior High School in the District of Columbia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Saint Patrick's Day Ceremony With Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland and an Exchange With Reporters

March 17, 1994

The President. It's a great honor for me to be spending my second St. Patrick's Day in a row with the distinguished Prime Minister from Ireland. He has a presentation to make and a few remarks, and then I'll have a word or two, and we'll answer your questions.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Reynolds. Thank you. Thank you again, and I'm really thrilled and delighted and honored to be back again for a second visit to the White House, especially on this traditional day for all Irish people around the world.

In this presentation of shamrock that I'll be making in a few moments, Mr. President, we symbolize the bonds of family, of history, and of common values that our two countries share. Because of the generations of Irish people who have come to these shores, St. Patrick's Day is perhaps even more honored here than in Ireland. Rightly and most importantly, today is a celebration not just for Irish America but for all in this great Nation who share our common values of justice and democracy.

We live in a time when ambitions for peace are tempered by the realization that old animosities and deep distrust often live long in the human heart. They can give rise to terrible and prolonged violence. In this context it is both right and important that I should pay the warmest tribute to you, Mr. President, for your exceptional efforts to bring peace to the tragedies of Bosnia and the Middle East.

We in Ireland know from direct experience that conflicts over territory, identity, and political destiny can only be resolved through peaceful negotiations. That profound belief informs everything that my government and I are doing to resolve the problem of Northern Ireland. Twenty-five years of conflict, the loss of over 3,000 lives, and an immeasurable quota of human suffering have not and cannot advance the search for a lasting and equitable settlement.

As you and I discussed, Mr. President, privately this morning, there has been significant progress in our search for peace. Central to this was the joint declaration signed last December by the British Prime Minister, John Major, and myself. This defines the common ground between our two countries on the issue of Northern Ireland.

At its heart, the declaration states that it is for the people of Ireland as a whole and alone, by agreement between the two parts, to exercise their right of self-determination of the basis of consent. That and the other principles of mutual respect, tolerance, and reconciliation which underline the declaration do not have an expiring date. Rather, in establishing them, we have sought to open a door for all parties to embrace peace and enter the political process.

In our efforts to secure a lasting settlement, we wish, as I said, to embrace all parties to the conflict. We do so in the firm knowledge that the political process can and will resolve fundamental issues and bridge the impasse that presently blocks the road to peace.

It is our fervent wish, therefore, that violence will end and that everyone will embrace the new and inclusive instruments of peace, dialog, and negotiation that are available. We need a positive decision from those concerned to enable a general move in the next and much broader phase of the peace process and to bring to an end the isolation experienced by significant sections of the community.

Mr. President, we greatly value your personal commitment to help to resolve the issue of Northern Ireland. Your support for this has been really inspiring. You share our understanding of the need to bring all communities fully into the political fold in a manner consistent with upholding democratic principles. We take heart in particular from your readiness to contribute to the peace process when and if needed. It is an enormous source of encouragement to all of us devoted to peace and reconciliation to know that your advice and your assistance as a friend to all sides is as thoughtful as it is generous. For that you have our deepest thanks.

Peace comes dropping slow, Yeats once said. But let us hope, Mr. President, that through our combined efforts, on a day in the quite near future, the presentation of shamrock will be made to you in the White House from an island uniquely dear to you and to your people that has at last found peace.

Mile buichos leat agus go n'eiri an bothair duit.

The President. Thank you so much, Mr. Prime Minister, for the wonderful bowl of shamrocks and for the sentiments and the convictions you have just expressed.

From the earliest days of our Republic the American dream has often been the story of Irish-American achievement. I'm reminded of the words of the Irish poet Thomas Kinsella, who urged that we accept, and I quote, "no limit but the possible." That is the spirit that brought many Irish to our shores, and it enriches our lives still today.

Ireland has demonstrated its global commitment to peace time and time again. And I want to thank the Prime Minister publicly today for the work that has been done with the United Nations in Lebanon and with its continuing peacekeeping role in Somalia. But nowhere is that commitment more evident than in the efforts this Prime Minister has made in Northern Ireland.

We have seen historic progress since the Taoiseach and the British Prime Minister made their agreement, and historic progress since Prime Minister Reynolds was here last year. That progress is in great measure the responsibility of Prime Minister Reynolds and Prime Minister Major. They have dealt with considerable challenges in their own countries to pursue this course, and we applaud them.

The joint declaration they signed on December 15th remains the best chance for a future of tolerance and reconciliation in Northern Ireland, especially in the wake of the bomb threats against the London airports. I call upon all those who practice violence for political aims to lay down their arms. Once again, I urge those who have yet to do so to endorse the joint declaration as the best, indeed, the only way forward.

And once again, Mr. Prime Minister, I pledge the support of the United States for your courageous peace initiative.

Across our country today, in parades, in classrooms, in churches, Americans are rejoicing in the kinship and the unique friendship between our nations and our shared heritage and our shared values. Tonight the Prime Minister and I will join what promises to be a lively celebration of Ireland here at the White House, with Irish-Americans from all across America. I look forward to the celebration, and I look forward to working with the Prime Minister on St. Patrick's Day and every day in pursuit of peace and prosperity for both our peoples in the spirit of "no limit but the possible."

Thank you very much.

Northern Ireland

Q. Having been briefed now on the peace process today by the Irish Prime Minister, what would you say now is the role of the United States in helping the peace process along? And more specifically, do you think that you should perhaps urge Britain, not just Ireland but Britain, to go the extra mile—that may be the extra inch now—and perhaps talk to Sinn Fein, which today has issued a very conciliatory statement saying it doesn't want to discuss constitutional issues but just simply wants to talk to see what the way forward can be?

The President. Let me say, first of all, I had a conversation with the Prime Minister this morning that is not all that different from the conversation I had with Prime Minister Major. I believe both of them are committed to keeping this process going. You know as well as I do what the obstacles for inclusion are. I was encouraged by the report I have received. I have not actually read the statement, but I am quite encouraged by the report I have received of Gerry Adams' statement today. It comes at a good time, and I hope it will have a good effect.

Q. Under what circumstances would you envisage granting another visa to Mr. Adams to visit the United States?

The President. I think it's premature to discuss that. I think now what—the issue now is what is going to be the role of Sinn Fein in the ongoing peace effort. Will they join? I hope they will. I still believe that the decision I made on the visa was the correct one. We all have to take some chances for peace. I think when he came here, he saw that the Irish in America want peace. They want him to be a part of the peace process, but they want peace. And I think that there was a sense of what a political process can be and how it can work.

And so I think we have served a good purpose in doing that. And I'm very hopeful. I'm more hopeful today as a result of the report I've received about his comments. But I think it would be premature for me to say anything about any other issuance, because the one thing we don't want to do in this country—not just in Northern Ireland but in the Middle East as well or any other place where we're working for peace

where others are at odds—is to do anything to disrupt the process. We're trying to help make the peace, not to interrupt it.

Q. Would you address Irish-Americans today, that may on St. Patrick's Day especially be listening to what is said here at the White House, who feel incumbent to contribute money to the IRA and for Republican forces in Ireland, since a great amount of the money that goes into that is coming from the United States?

The President. I would hope all Irish-Americans would embrace the declaration and the peace process. That's what I think they ought to do.

Q. Given your role as President of the United States and given your relationship with the Taoiseach, Albert Reynolds, and also your relationship with the British Prime Minister, what active role do you think the United States can play in trying to find peace in Northern Ireland?

The President. Well, right now I think we ought to give Prime Minister Reynolds a chance to work with Prime Minister Major to keep pushing it forward. I thought that we had a role to play in the issuance of the visa because I thought it would make a statement that the United States is searching for peace, wanted to give Mr. Adams a chance to have his voice heard here, make his statements here, articulate his concerns here, see the political process here, and hear from Irish-Americans that we support peace. I think that was the major thing that we could do at this moment. I think now we've seen a very heartening statement, apparently, by Mr. Adams today. I've had both the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Prime Minister of Ireland reaffirm their commitment to the process, and let's see if we get a few breaks.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, on the Hill today you may hear from some Members, even Democrats, that the prospect of hearings on Whitewater is inevitable. What will you tell them?

The President. That it's—the same thing I've always said: It's up to Congress. I read a book the other night that in the early part of our century, one of our first four or five Presidents, a $40 mirror was bought for the White House that was bought in another country, and the Congress in the early 1800's spent several thousand dollars on hearings looking into this $40 mirror. So I don't know that—it's up to the Congress. They're an independent and coequal branch of Government, and they ought to do whatever it is they think is the right thing to do.

Bosnia

Q. Are you encouraged by Bosnia, sir?

The President. Yes, I am encouraged.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:59 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Fein. Prime Minister Reynolds' closing remarks in Gaelic translate as, "A thousand thanks for everything you have done, and I wish you every success."

Remarks at the Celebration of Ireland Dinner
March 17, 1994

We are in the grip of the day, aren't we? [*Laughter*] Thank you so much. Prime Minister and Mrs. Reynolds and to all our guests tonight, a warm welcome. *Ceade mile failte.*

Tonight we sought to honor the Prime Minister, his wife, and his family, and his family of fellow Irish men and women, in a way inspired by the warm and convivial hospitality of the Irish themselves that they have brought to our shores now through the ages.

There was a grand party in this house a long time ago, in 1829, when the first Irish-American was inaugurated as President of the United States. Andrew Jackson was the only President in our Nation's history whose parents were both immigrants to America. They came from Carrickfergus, a little town near Belfast. And their son grew up to be a great Democrat and a man of the people. When "Old Hickory," as he was called then, opened this house to his people, so many came that the furniture was crushed in the excitement. That's probably why so many of you have to stand tonight. [*Laughter*] The crowd squeezed so closely around the new

President in the Blue Room just down the hall that he had to escape by jumping out a window. Mr. Prime Minister, we will try to control ourselves better this evening. [*Laughter*] We promise that neither you nor I will be jumping out of any windows.

I wish I could recognize everyone here this evening of Irish descent. But perhaps I would do better to recognize everyone here who is not of Irish descent. [*Laughter*] I would like to say that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Carol Browner, is here tonight with her father, who is from Limerick.

When people think of Irish strongholds in America, they think of Boston or Chicago or New York. But many people from all over America, including my home region, come from Ireland. According to the 1980 census, Taylorsville, Mississippi, has a higher percentage of Irish-Americans than Boston. Of course, the total—I know what you're thinking—the total population is 24, but it still makes a great story. [*Laughter*] Actually, that's not true; it's larger than that.

My own mother, as John Hume, a Member of Parliament from Derry, said today, was a Cassidy. And he assured me today that the Cassidys back in Ireland are a very nice family. I thank him for that courtesy, inasmuch as I seem to have relatives turning up all over the place from time to time. [*Laughter*] To the Irish who are here, relax, the Americans will explain it to you later.

Maybe I will jump out the window, Prime Minister. [*Laughter*]

This is the one day when we Americans remind ourselves that we are the sons and daughters of Ireland, both southerners and northerners, Catholic and Presbyterian, members of the Democratic and Republican Party, although we still have a few more Irish on our side.

When the Irish toast each other, they say, "*Slainte!*", which we Americans always took to mean health. But the White House did some research on this, and I am reliably informed that in Irish, "*Slainte!*" actually means health care for all. [*Laughter*]

You won't believe this, but one of my erudite and overeducated staff members prepared another set of notes for me tonight, all in Gaelic. And I said, "It looks like Hail Mary and the Lord's Prayer." And he said, "That's exactly what it is." [*Laughter*] So for a keepsake, I'm going to give the notes to the Prime Minister and say that if I could say but one prayer tonight, it would be for peace and reconciliation in Ireland.

This is truly an era of profound change in our world. The Middle East is courageously trying to take steps toward peace. And we are doing our part. South Africa is weeks away from its first nonracial election. Tomorrow, here in the White House, we will witness the signing of agreements between Bosnians and Croats that advance the hope for peace in that troubled region. Our Nation's long cooperation with Ireland has never been more important than today.

In recent months, Prime Minister Reynolds and Prime Minister Major have tried to bring an end to a generation of troubles in Northern Ireland. Both have acted with vision and great political courage in putting forward the historic joint declaration last December. And Mr. Prime Minister, you and Prime Minister Major deserve our admiration and our thanks. And your declaration deserves the support of all people of good faith everywhere.

It is difficult to know what to make of the latest attacks at Heathrow Airport. Like the violence in Hebron or in South Africa, they may be a simple reminder that reactionary forces will always attempt to kill the peace whenever the progress and the prospect of peace becomes a possibility. The United States condemns such acts, as it does all acts of terrorism. As Ireland searches for peace, I assure you that America remains steadfast in our support.

Our late Ambassador to your great country, William V. Shannon, whose wife, Elizabeth, is here tonight and who greeted us all, wrote a wonderful book called "The American Irish" in which he included a beautiful and touching note on the immigrants who came to America from the shamrock shores of Eire. "What did they seek?" he asked. The answer is the same for them as for all. They sought a door that would open and give them access to hope.

Mr. Prime Minister, America has always been a beacon of hope to others around the world. But it is your pursuit of peace that is Ireland's hope today. When you return home, I hope you will tell the people of Ireland that we treasure the contributions the Irish have made to our country and its culture. And in return we

stand with you, as you seek a door that would open and give all of Ireland access to the hope of peace.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:34 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Message on the Observance of Saint Patrick's Day
March 17, 1994

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Saint Patrick's Day 1994. On this feast of the patron Saint of Ireland, we reflect on Saint Patrick's bravery and determination in delivering to the Irish people his message of faith and hope for the future—a spirit passed down through the many generations that followed.

With tremendous courage and strength of belief, Saint Patrick helped his native Ireland usher in a new era. Before Patrick returned to his island home as a Christian convert and missionary, Ireland was the last bastion of Celtic Europe. He encouraged the Irish people to adapt their ancient culture and deep spirituality to the new faith that had already transformed much of Europe. By bringing Christianity to Ireland, Saint Patrick heralded a new Eire and prepared his people to embrace the changing world around them.

In celebrating Saint Patrick's Day, our nation not only remembers the apostle of Ireland for his achievements, but we also honor the many contributions that Irish Americans have made to their adopted homeland. As inheritors of Saint Patrick's legacy, Irish Americans have strengthened the United States with the richness of their unique history. Blessed with educators and business people, political leaders and people of faith, our nation owes a debt of gratitude to this thriving community from the Emerald Isle.

As Americans everywhere gather to celebrate our "Irishness," I extend best wishes to all for a wonderful St. Patrick's Day.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on Signing Legislation on Highway Bridge Seismic Retrofitting
March 17, 1994

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 1789—a bill that responds to January's earthquake in Southern California and will help States reduce potential losses from future earthquakes. This legislation expands the eligible uses of Federal bridge replacement and rehabilitation funds to include seismic retrofitting of highway bridges, regardless of whether the bridges are in need of other repairs or work. S. 1789 will greatly assist States in their efforts to reinforce bridges to better withstand earthquakes.

The California earthquake crippled much of the regional transportation system, serving as a sharp reminder of the vulnerability of our infrastructure to natural disasters and of the need to increase our preparedness for such events. The damage to the transportation network in Southern California had far reaching consequences. People's everyday lives were changed because of the difficulty of travel in the region, most notably in the time and effort spent getting to work. All levels of government immediately pulled together to minimize the disruption and resulting economic losses. That effort is continuing.

In my visits to the earthquake-damaged areas with members of my Cabinet and the Congress, one question was repeatedly raised: "We cannot prevent another earthquake, but can we prevent any of the resulting loss of life and debilitating infrastructure damage?" With regard to much of the damage to bridges and overpasses, the answer to that question is "yes." The California earthquake proved that seismic retrofitting

works. None of the bridges in the Los Angeles area that were seismically retrofitted failed or suffered major damage as a result of the earthquake. The 12 bridges that were severely damaged during the earthquake had not been fully retrofitted.

The Congress responded quickly by providing much needed additional financial aid to victims of the earthquake through emergency supplemental funds. However, we need not only to provide assistance for repairs, but also to provide the flexibility to allow States to make sensible investments to prevent future losses.

I am very pleased that the Congress, led by Senator Boxer, has acted again to provide an additional tool to California and other States that may face similar natural disasters. This seismic retrofitting legislation does not increase Federal expenditures but allows States the flexibility to determine their own bridge needs. Together, these actions will not only speed recovery from the California earthquake but will also help mitigate potential losses to life and property in any State by future earthquakes.

S. 1789 will empower States throughout the Nation to make critically important investments in infrastructure to prevent highway bridge collapses. Ultimately, it will save both lives and dollars.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 17, 1994.

NOTE: S. 1789, approved March 17, was assigned Public Law No. 103–220.

Remarks at the Bosnian Federation Agreement Signing Ceremony
March 18, 1994

The President. President Izetbegovic, President Tudjman, Prime Minister Silajdzic, Mr. Zubak: The Secretary of State, Mr. Lake, the Vice President, and I are happy to be joined by you, as well as by others here today. We have the Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia, Vitaly Churkin; representing the European Union troika, the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Mr. Papoulias, of Belgium, Mr. Claes, of Germany, Mr. Kinkel; and of course, David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, who have been the cochairs of the international conference.

In addition to that, we're very pleased to be joined by the Ambassadors to the UNPROFOR nations who have been so active in working for peace and in preserving the peace, General Shalikashvili, Ambassador Albright, and Members of the Congress. In the front row, Senator Lugar, Senator Stevens, Senator Levin, Senator Hatch, Congressman Lantos, and I believe Congressman McCloskey is here. There he is, in the second row. So we thank all of you for coming today.

We have come to bear witness to a moment of hope. For 33 months the flames of war have raged through the nations of the former Yugoslavia. By signing these agreements today, Bosnian and Croatian leaders have acted to turn back those flames and to begin the difficult process of reconciliation.

Around the globe, the tension between ethnic identity and statehood presents one of the great problems of our time. But nowhere have the consequences been more tragic than in the former Yugoslavia. There nationalists and religious factions aggravated by Serbian aggression have erupted in a fury of ethnic cleansing and brutal atrocity.

The agreements signed today offer one of the first clear signals that parties to this conflict are willing to end the violence and begin a process of reconstruction. The accords call for a federation between Muslims and Croats of Bosnia. This Muslim-Croat entity has agreed on the principles of a confederation with Croatia. Together these steps can help support the ideal of a multiethnic Bosnia and provide a basis for Muslims and Croats to live again in peace as neighbors and compatriots. The agreements are as important for Croatia's future as they are for Bosnia's. And it is the hope of all present today that the Serbs will join in this process toward peace as well.

These agreements are a testament to the perseverance and to the resolve of many people: the Croatian and Bosnian diplomats who kept

probing for openings toward peace; the U.N. soldiers from many nations, here represented today, who have worked to bring both stability and humanitarian supplies; the NATO pilots who have helped put our power in the service of diplomacy.

I want to praise the leadership and courage of those who have come to Washington to sign these agreements, especially President Izetbegovic and President Tudjman. I also want to recognize the tireless efforts of Thorvald Stoltenberg and David Owen and of course our own Cy Vance, who is not here today, and especially to express my personal appreciation to the skilled diplomacy of Ambassador Charles Redman. Thank you, sir, for your work.

All of these people have done much to bring us to this point of agreement. Through Ambassador Redman's efforts and in many other ways, our administration has worked with our NATO allies, the European Union, Russia, the U.N., and others to help end this conflict. The fact that we have done this work together has made a significant difference. And to the Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia, I say a special thank you, sir, for your renewed energy in this area and our common hopes.

We have engaged in this work because the United States has clear interests at stake: an interest in helping prevent the spread of a wider war in Europe, an interest in showing that NATO remains a credible force for peace, an interest in helping to stem the terrible, destabilizing flows of refugees this struggle is generating, and perhaps clearly a humanitarian interest we all share in stopping the continuing slaughter of innocents in Bosnia.

The documents signed here are only first steps, but they are clearly steps in the right direction. If they lead to an overall negotiated settlement, if a lasting peace takes hold in this war-torn land, the ceremony will be remembered as an important event. Whether that comes to pass will depend less on our words today than on the actions of Muslims, Croats, and Serbs on the ground tomorrow and in the days to come.

For while documents like these can define the parameters of peace, the people of the region themselves must create that peace. Economic, political, and security arrangements for the new federation must be given a chance to work. The cease-fire between Croats and Bosnian Government forces must hold. Croats and Muslims who have fought with such intensity must now apply that same intensity to restoring habits of tolerance and coexistence.

The issue of the Petrinja region of Croatia must be resolved. Serbia and the Serbs of Bosnia cannot sidestep their own responsibility to achieve an enduring peace.

The new progress toward peace will likely come under attack by demagogs, by rogue riflemen, by all those who believe they can profit most from continued violence, aggression, and human suffering. Such attacks must be met with the same steadiness and leadership that have produced these agreements today.

Neither the United States nor the international community can guarantee the success of this initiative. But the U.S. has stood by the parties as they have taken risks for peace, and we will continue to do so. I have told Presidents Izetbegovic and Tudjman that the U.S. is prepared to contribute to the economic reconstruction that will bolster these agreements. And as I have said before, if an acceptable, enforceable settlement can be reached, the U.S. is prepared through NATO to help implement it.

All across Bosnia and Croatia, communities and entire peoples were once connected by ancient bridges, like the great stone arch in Mostar which for centuries stood as the city's proud symbol. Today, too many of those bridges have been reduced to rubble or closed by force. The challenge for parties to this conflict is to rebuild the bonds that those bridges represent. The announcement that Sarajevo's bridge of brotherhood and unity soon will reopen is a hopeful sign that the parties can begin to span the divide of hatred and violence.

The work ahead is indeed daunting, but all of us in the international community are committed to help. Together, let us strive for peace.

Thank you.

[*At this point, Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias of Greece, Presidents Alija Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Franjo Tudjman of Croatia, and Bosnian Croat representative Kresimir Zubak each made statements.*]

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, today we have witnessed an act of great statesmanship. Now we must hope that the courage embodied by these agreements will inspire further acts of reason, reconstruction and progress to implement them, to make them real in the lives of

the people whose leaders are represented here today.

We also must hope, I will say again, that the Serbs will join in this effort for a wider peace. We invite them and urge them to do so.

Over 150 years ago, the Balkan poet Ivan Jukic wrote the following line: "Only those are heroes who know how to live with their brothers." Let us hope we are beginning to learn that lesson in this troubled land.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Foreign Minister Willy Claes of Belgium; Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel of Germany; Lord David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, Cochairmen, and Cyrus Vance, former Cochairman, International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia; and Ambassador Charles Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia.

Statement on Additional California Earthquake Assistance

March 18, 1994

The people of southern California are responding courageously to the challenge of restoring their lives and their communities in the wake of the earthquake. From the first day, our administration has been working extremely hard to fulfill the Federal Government's obligation to help make that possible.

This new assistance reflects new costs that have come to our attention in recent weeks. My administration is continuing to monitor the situation, and we will continue to provide the necessary assistance as additional needs become evident.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the release of emergency funds for California earthquake recovery and other recent disasters.

Statement by the Director of Communications on United Nations Security Council Action on the Hebron Massacre

March 18, 1994

The United Nations Security Council has today adopted a resolution condemning the Hebron mosque massacre and calling for measures to safeguard the security of the Palestinians.

President Clinton expressed the horror of the American people at the time of the tragic Hebron murders. The President said, "The enemies of peace must not be allowed to triumph. Prompt resumption of negotiations to begin implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles is the only answer to extremist violence on both sides."

The President's decision to allow passage of the resolution was made in the context of the agreement today by Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon to return to negotiations in April and the high-level contacts between Israel and the PLO that will take place in coming days.

The President endorses the call made by the Security Council today for Israel and the PLO to redouble their efforts to realize this goal as soon as possible. The United States stands ready to do all it can to help the parties, but with passage of this resolution it is time for them to return to the negotiating table.

The United States abstained on two paragraphs in the preamble to the resolution because of our strong objections to references made there to "occupied Palestinian territory" and to Jerusalem. The President said that his position on these matters has not changed. As Israel and the PLO have agreed, these are issues which can be decided only in negotiations on

the final status of the territories. He does not believe references which could prejudice the outcome of these negotiations are helpful. The parties alone must make the decisions necessary to realize the promise of peace.

The President's Radio Address
March 19, 1994

Good morning. Last week I saw American democracy at its best at an old-fashioned town-hall meeting in Nashua, New Hampshire. We were in the Elm Street Junior High School, and people were asking me questions about all kinds of issues but most of them about health care reform. And then when the town meeting was over, a woman came up to me and showed me why it's so important for so many Americans that we fix what's wrong with our health insurance system. She gave me a photograph of her 7-year-old son whom she loves very much. She told me he's had serious health problems, and now she's afraid that he'll never be able to get any health insurance because he has what insurance companies call a preexisting condition.

Everywhere I go, families come up and tell me we're got to do something about health care, and they're right. Here are the facts: Even if you have health insurance today, you can lose it tomorrow. The terrible truth is that 2 million Americans a month lose their health insurance, 58 million Americans find themselves without insurance at some point during the year, and about 100,000 Americans a month lose their health insurance for good.

The fine print in your insurance policy can cost you your coverage. Eighty-one million Americans have those preexisting conditions, just like the little boy in Nashua, that insurance companies can use to raise rates or deny coverage and that as a practical matter prevent many, many people from changing jobs because they know they'll lose their coverage. And three out of four insurance policies—that covers 133 million Americans—have lifetime limits that cut off your benefits when you need them most. In other words, chances are your insurance plan is great unless you get really sick.

Too many of you who do have insurance are paying more, getting less; your choices are more limited every year; your worries are increased, worries about losing the right to choose your doctor, increasing copays and deductibles, or losing insurance altogether. If we don't do something, we face a future of less choice, lower quality care, and larger bills. That's why we've got to build on what works and fix what's wrong with our health care system. And when you come down to it, America faces three choices: Government insurance for everybody, no guarantee of coverage for anybody, or guaranteed private insurance for everybody.

Everywhere I go people tell me they support the idea that is at the core of our health reform plan: guaranteed private insurance for everybody, insurance that can never be taken away. Here's how our health reform plan works. First, we'll guarantee every American private health insurance with a comprehensive package of benefits that can never be taken away. Everyone will get a health security card that will guarantee these benefits, as good as America's biggest companies offer and as good as your Members of Congress and your President get. Your benefits will include prescription drugs and prevention care, things that often aren't covered today. It's common sense to pay to keep people healthy, not just treat them after they get sick and when care is more expensive.

Second, you'll have choices. That's the American way. You'll have the right to choose your own doctor and your own health care plan. You'll make that choice—you'll make it, not your boss and not your insurance company. We trust you to make the best choices to improve the quality of your health care.

Third, we're going to crack down on abuses in insurance practices. No more dropping coverage or cutting benefits, no more raising rates just because you or someone in your family has been sick, no more using lifetime limits to cut off your benefits, and no more charging older people more than younger people. These are unfair practices, and we'll make them illegal.

We'll make sure you can get affordable insurance you can depend on.

Fourth, and this is important, we'll preserve and strengthen Medicare. Older Americans must be able to count on Medicare and to keep their doctors. We also want to cover prescription drugs under Medicare and to give people of all ages new choices for long-term care at home or in their community. There are so many people with disabilities, so many Americans who are in their elderly years who do not need institutionalized care but who can't get anything less expensive and more helpful because it's not covered today.

Finally, we want your health benefits to be guaranteed at work. Most jobs come with health benefits, and all jobs should. Over two-thirds of the small businesses in this country provide health insurance to their employees. But 8 of 10 Americans who have no insurance are in working families. These Americans deserve better. And our health reform plan will guarantee health benefits at work. Small businesses will get these health insurance premiums at a discount. And we in the Government will help to cover the unemployed.

The defenders of the status quo are trying to confuse this issue by making it sound complicated. Well, the present system is complicated, and so there are a lot of details to deal with. But the basic principles of health reform are really pretty simple. You'll get a health security card; you'll pick any doctor you want; you'll fill out one simple form when you need care; you'll know exactly what's covered; and you'll have peace of mind for a change, because your health security and that of your family can never be taken away.

A few weeks ago, the Wall Street Journal explained our health reform to some citizens of York, Pennsylvania, without telling them whose plan it is. The great majority of that group strongly supported our health reform principles over all the competing plans. And the headline in the Wall Street Journal reads: "Many Don't Realize It's Clinton's Plan They Like."

Next week and in the months ahead, I'm going to tell people all across America about our health reform plan and what it really means: guaranteed private insurance, a choice of doctors and health plans, outlawing unfair insurance practices, preserving Medicare, guaranteeing health benefits at work. It's that simple.

I want to cut through the complexity, the confusion, and downright distortions. This issue should be decided by informed citizens, not by special interests spending millions of dollars to prevent progress and to promote their own narrow interest.

Let's face the facts, debate our choices, and make an historic decision to build on what's best and fix what's worst in our health care system. That's democracy at its best, just like the old-fashioned American town meeting I attended in New Hampshire last week. And the lesson of history is that when the American people have the information they need, they do make the right decision.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks at a Children's Town Meeting

March 19, 1994

Peter Jennings. Good morning, everybody. Good morning, especially, boys and girls, and welcome back to the White House, really; this is the second time that President Clinton has invited us back to the White House so that he and a group of children we've invited from around the country can exchange ideas about the state of the country and the state of the world. It's a chance for him and for them to talk about their dreams. So we hope you'll stay with us this morning.

If our timing is right, the President is just coming down from upstairs, in a house which we all know he loves very much.

Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Peter.

Mr. Jennings. Thank you for having us back, sir.

The President. I'm glad you're back.

Mr. Jennings. You really have spent a lot of time studying this house, haven't you?

The President. I have. Every President but George Washington has lived here, and so it's really the story of America. And it's a great honor to live here. So I like to know the history of it, and I like to know the things that happened to the people who lived here and what happened in which rooms and things. I've kept up with it pretty well.

Mr. Jennings. You all know there are a lot of kids in the East Room waiting to see us. But surprising to me at least, a number of them asked us whether or not the President had to live here. [*Laughter*] And I just asked you that a moment ago.

The President. I don't know.

Mr. Jennings. We'll have to find that——

The President. Isn't that funny, I don't know. I don't think anyone's ever volunteered to live anywhere else, except once when there was a big renovation of the White House when President Truman was President, I think he had to spend more than 2 years out of here, across the street.

Mr. Jennings. We have actually a little—we're going to go into the East Room now, but we have just to introduce you, or reintroduce you in many cases, to what this is like, a little history package while you and I walk it. Ready?

[*At this point, a videotape on the history of the White House was shown.*]

Mr. Jennings. And there is the White House, on a very sunny, lovely day here in Washington here. And we are, of course, in the East Room, which has its own great sense of history. And here all these boys and girls have joined us from around the country.

You notice the President's tie, everybody?

Audience members. Yes.

The President. This tie was designed by a 13-year-old named Kelly. It's called "Save the Children," and it's part of a series of ties designed by children for the Save the Children Foundation. It's a group that works on the problems of children in poor communities and poor neighborhoods around America. And my wife and I have been involved in it for a long time. So they take the drawings of children, turn them into ties, and then sell the ties to raise funds. It's great; I have a lot of them.

Mr. Jennings. I bet people send you ties every day of the year, don't they?

The President. Every day of the year, just about. I especially love these. I bet I've had 20 of these ties; they're great.

Mr. Jennings. We have a lot of questions for you this morning, Mr. President, so we're going to go away for just one second, and then we'll have you and all these youngsters from around the country talk to one another.

We'll be right back.

[*The television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, I said a lot of these kids had questions. How many of you have got questions for the President? We're going to be here for several days. You don't mind that, do you?

The President. No.

Mr. Jennings. Let's get right to it. Kevin, how about you?

Education and Employment

Q. My first question is for those children who wish to pursue a college education: What are you going to do to guarantee that there are jobs for them when they get out of college? Today, many adults have graduate degrees, bachelor's; they have a hard time finding jobs. They have as good a chance as those who are straight out of high school. What are you going to do to guarantee that when I get out of college, I have a job waiting for me?

The President. I don't know that I can guarantee it, but I think we can make it more likely. But perhaps the main reason I ran for President was to try to restore the economic health of the country, and what I am trying to do is to follow policies that will generate more jobs in America. I have tried to bring our deficit down, get interest rates down to create more jobs. I've tried to open more markets to our products and sell more American products overseas. I've tried to train people to do the jobs of tomorrow, and I've tried to take the technologies that we developed when we had a big defense budget and turn them into jobs in the peacetime economy. And in the last 13 months, since we had this meeting last, we created over 2 million new jobs in this economy.

And let me also say, I know it's tough for college graduates, but let me tell every one of you one thing: Your chances of getting a good job are still much, much better if you first graduate from high school, then get at least 2 years

of further training, and finally, if you get a college degree. The unemployment rate in America for college graduates is 3.5 percent. The unemployment rate for high school dropouts is 11.5 percent.

Mr. Jennings. So the answer is, stay in school.

The President. So the answer is, even though it's tougher than it has been for college graduates, you still have a much better chance if you stay in school to have higher incomes and to have a job.

Mr. Jennings. Let's go over to the other side, here. Who's got a question there? Yes, go ahead.

Bosnia and Anticrime Efforts

Q. Mr. President, why are you fighting a war in another country when you have a war right here?

The President. Which war?

Q. The war in Bosnia.

The President. We're not fighting a war there. We're trying to help them bring the war to an end because many people are being killed and because the war could spread and because we have an obligation to try to support that. But we don't have soldiers on the ground there.

I am trying to fight the war right here at home. There's a bill in the Congress now that I am supporting, which would put another 100,000 police officers on the street to make the streets and the schools safer, that would give more money for young people for programs to help them resolve their differences peacefully, would take semi-automatic weapons off the street, and would help us to fight the war here at home. I agree that the war here at home is killing more people than a lot of wars overseas, and we're trying to fight that one. And you're right, we should be fighting it.

Mr. Jennings. Right here in the front row. What's your name?

Race Relations

Q. Gary.

I was wondering, with all the racial problems going on, such as people not treating each other the same way, do you have any plans for solving that problem?

Mr. Jennings. A lot of people worked hard on their questions here.

The President. Yes, they're great. There is a lot of racial tension in this country today. And I think there are two things that we have to do about it. First of all, we have to remind the American people that we have always been a multiethnic, multiracial country. We've always been a country with a lot of different racial and ethnic groups. And every time a new group came along, they've often been subject to prejudice. But what's made our country great is that we have been able to successfully blend in people of different races and religions and ethnic groups, let them respect what's different about them, and still live together. And I spend a lot of time working on that, talking to young people, talking to groups, trying to bring people together. I brought more diverse people into my Government than any President has in the past.

The second thing we have to do is to try to give a future back to all of our people. A lot of times people fight with one another if they think they don't have any opportunity. If we had more jobs and better education and a better climate in America, less crime, then people would be more relaxed and better able to appreciate one another.

I don't know if anybody's here from Los Angeles, but just for example, Los Angeles County alone has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. In Bosnia, you mentioned Bosnia, people from basically three different groups have been fighting and killing each other. So we've been, with all of our problems, we've been pretty successful. But we've got to know that our differences—look around this room—our differences in America are our strength. We live in a global economy, a smaller and smaller world. And the fact that we have so many different races and religions and ethnic groups is a good thing for America, and we have to learn to like it.

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, you—Gary, are you happy with that answer, by the way?

Q. Yes.

Mr. Jennings. You are, are you? If you're not, you're entitled to tell him.

We know a lot of these kids, Mr. President, because we went out and we looked around the country to find kids who were sort of representative of various ideas in the country. One of them is Tanya up there. Hi, Tanya. Show the President just a little bit about you on the monitor here, and then we'll get you to talk to him.

[*A videotape of Tanya talking with the Vice President at Dunbar High School was shown.*]

Mr. Jennings. This is Tanya. Tanya sort of came to our attention when she met your Vice President at a meeting.

The President. At Dunbar. Are you a student at Dunbar? Good, I recognize the film.

Mr. Jennings. All right, so let's come out of the film now. All right Tanya, your turn.

Urban Youth

Q. Good afternoon. My question is going towards inner-city kids. We feel as though the baby boomers have forgotten that the chaos that we create was given to us by you all. We want the problem to be stopped, but we need help. A lot of us are tired of hearing that we are a lost generation when we are not. We are a generation of renewal. And we want to know, what steps are you going to take to give us the hope, the pride, and the strength that we need to succeed in the future and to become strong, black, white, Chinese, African-American people in the society, 10 and 30 and 20 years in the future?

Mr. Jennings. Tanya, can I ask you a question before the President answers? Do you think the President can do a lot about that? Do you think he makes a really enormous difference here?

Q. He makes a very enormous difference, but one thing a lot of people fail to realize, if you don't come into the communities on positive notes, when you come for negative notes, it really angers a lot of people. It's angered me a lot. And I want the media and you also to know that I wanted to leave Mr. Gore very baffled, and I'm glad I left him baffled, because I want him to understand that you need to come when positive things happen and not just come when negative things happen.

The President. I agree with that. Let me just make two comments about that, and then I'll try to answer your question.

We, at least, do come. I mean, he and I have been out there. My wife has been out there. We have been in inner-city communities. We have walked streets that you don't normally see the President walking. We have been to places you don't normally see the President go.

And I agree that we should support success stories. I was in Detroit last week, and sure, Detroit has a lot of inner-city problems. They also have perhaps the best job training program of its kind in America for inner-city kids, putting them in very high wage, high-tech jobs. So I visited that program because it's a success story. It proves that all children can learn. So I agree with that. We shouldn't just show up when something terrible happens.

The second thing I want to say to you is that, essentially, everything that I do is designed to try to give young people like you some hope and some structure and some opportunity back. I agree that generations ahead of you have left you a pretty lousy situation. You've got all these kids that are born into families where there was never a marriage. You've got all these neighborhoods where the jobs have disappeared. You've got all these places where the schools have, in effect, been given up on. And that's not your fault. You just showed up. I mean, you're a child; you shouldn't have to deal with that, except to do your best. So what we're trying to do is to find ways to rebuild communities, rebuild schools, and bring the jobs back into the community and, at the same time, to follow policies which strengthen the family unit instead of undermine it, which encourage people to take responsibility for their children and reward them if they do it.

Let me just give you an example. The welfare system has often encouraged families to break up. We're supporting a welfare reform program that will encourage families to stay together as well as to get jobs. We've got a tax system that we've changed so that when taxes are due this year, 16½ percent of the American taxpayers, working parents with very modest wages, are going to get a tax cut to help them raise their children better, to strengthen them. We've got school reform bills going through Congress now to try to help strengthen schools to have more uniform excellence.

Now, those are things we're doing. I also have to tell you though, when kids get in trouble, they get in trouble one by one, and they have to be saved one by one. So we also need, the President needs soldiers, common workers in this battle. And that's why what people do in every school, in every neighborhood and every family and every church is important.

Mr. Jennings. Probably got some potential soldiers here.

The President. You bet, a lot of them.

But you're right, we owe you a better deal than you're getting, and I'm trying to give it to you. But you all are going to have to do your part, too.

President's Schedule

Mr. Jennings. Now, there are a lot of serious questions, I know, here. But somebody had a question about the White House itself and about the President's day. They've all got shy and serious on me. A lot of them wanted to know whether or not you find this too big a job sometimes and wonder how you get everything done in one day.

The President. Sometimes I don't, and sometimes it is too big a job. But I have a lot of help, for one thing. A lot of good people work here, and we work hard to try to organize the day well. So I try to get up in the morning, go run, see my daughter before she goes off to school. And then I come in and I start every day with a briefing on national security: Has anything happened in the rest of the world that could affect the United States, that we have to be concerned about? Then I get briefings on what's happened in the United States, and I read clippings from newspapers around the country to see what's happened. And then we start work, and we just work through these problems. And normally I finish at about 7 o'clock at night, sometimes a little later.

Mr. Jennings. You work every day?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Jennings. Don't take a day off every week?

The President. Sunday. I try to take Sunday off, but I don't always make it. But I try to work half a day on Saturday, take Sunday off, but Monday through Friday I work until pretty late at night.

Mr. Jennings. I think some of us know that.

The President. And sometimes until 12 or 1 o'clock at night at home when I read.

Children and Violence

Mr. Jennings. Now, there have been some pretty trying events on your watch, in the year and a bit since you've been President. And one of them occurred in California. And we have a young lady here this morning—hi, Annie. You're getting tired, aren't you?

Q. Not really.

Mr. Jennings. No, you're not? Oh, good, good. I want the President to take a look at the television monitor here so he knows a little bit more about you.

[*A videotape was shown in which Annie Nichol described her feelings of insecurity since the kidnaping and murder of her sister, Polly Klaas, and said that she kept items such as loud bells and ropes in her bedroom to help her feel safe at night.*]

Mr. Jennings. Well, of course, that is Annie Nichol, who is the sister of Polly Klaas who, as you know, was kidnaped in northern California, became enormous news in the country. We asked Annie to come partly because she wanted to but partly because when we talked to kids around the country, enormous numbers of them are concerned about their safety.

So Annie, away you go.

Q. Well, the other day when I was on the plane coming here, I asked my Mom, "Do you think I'm going to live to grow up?" And my sister, Polly, didn't live to grow up, so I didn't feel that safe. And my question is, I just don't feel very safe, and I want America to be safer for children.

Mr. Jennings. And you think the President can do something, don't you?

The President. I agree. I think I could. Let me say, first of all, you're a brave girl to come here and let us see your story. As you probably know, I talked to some of your family members. And I'm doing what I can to change some laws.

Let's talk about it a little bit. First of all, there are people who get paroled out of prison who have serious problems and who are very likely to repeat them who should not be released. That's one thing that your sister's case has made people sensitive to. And that's why we're working on some laws to identify people who are serious threats to society, who will likely repeat their crimes, and not let them out.

The second thing we have to do is to try to make our communities and our streets safer. That's why I'm trying to pass a bill to take these assault weapons off the street and to put more police officers on the street to make the streets safer.

And then there's a lot of violence against children that occur in their own homes from family members and in schools, and we are trying to start programs now all across America where people learn to resolve their differences in nonviolent ways, to stop hurting each other and shooting each other and acting on impulse.

You do live in a country that's too dangerous. And we have to make it less dangerous. And it is a huge obligation that I feel, and I think about it every day. You know, I have a little

girl, too. I want the children of this country to be able to grow up on safe streets, in safe schools, in safer homes. And I think that there are some very specific things we can all do about it.

We also need to change our attitudes. You may see pretty soon a public service announcement I did with a young woman from Washington, DC, a 14-year-old girl named Alicia Brown. She went to the sixth funeral of a friend of hers just yesterday. Six of her friends have been shot. So we did this public service announcement together—it's going to be on television—talking to young people and asking them to help us turn America away from violence.

Mr. Jennings. When you were young, Mr. President, do you ever remember being in a room with kids and people asked you if you felt safe?

The President. Never. When I was a kid, people beat each other up; I mean, the only thing you ever worried about was somebody coming up to you on the street or in an alley or something and jumping you and beating you up. Nobody ever shot anybody; there were none of this—I mean, to speak of—there was very little of this, the kidnapings, the kind of thing that happened to your sister—much more rare then. It's much worse today.

Mr. Jennings. What do you think. Annie?

Q. Well, for one thing that I think is that I think that other people shouldn't be released from jail, and they shouldn't be stealing as much children as they have been stealing.

Mr. Jennings. I was looking at some figures; 4,600 kids were abducted last year.

That stuff you put in your bedroom, did you really feel the need for that?

Q. I did feel the need.

The President. Did it make you feel better when you did it, that you were taking charge of your life and you were trying to protect yourself?

Q. Yes.

Mr. Jennings. You think the President's on the right track, though?

Q. I think so.

The President. I'll try, Annie. I think about your sister and the children like her all the time. I'm working hard on it.

Mr. Jennings. Okay, let's go over here. Thanks, Annie, my dear. Annie's had such a good time in the White House today. Where's your dolphin? He's had a tour of the White House, hasn't he?

The President. Good for you.

Mr. Jennings. Yes, this was a very rewarding morning for her.

Yes, love.

Q. Well, Mr. President Clinton, I know you get a lot of questions, but this is just a little thing about you. I think you're such a decent and honest person, and I really believe in you in trying to make everybody happy. And I think we kids have to take the responsibility, because we should know who's bringing in the drugs, the guns. And if we just report it in, that would really make a difference. And also that would make a really big difference is that most of the criminals and people who sell drugs, they don't feel loved. And so I think from the moment you're born you have to feel loved. You should tell your child that you love them very much.

Mr. Jennings. What a nice idea.

The President. Let me just say two things. First of all, remember what I said, no matter what I do, the President has to have partners all over America. Everybody's got a role to play. Everybody is important. In most schools where there are drugs and guns, some other kids who don't do drugs and don't have guns know about it. They could report it; they could help to get it done. They could organize themselves into groups in each school and say, "We don't want drugs in our schools; we don't want guns, we don't want knives, we don't want violence in our schools." That could make a bigger difference in that school than anything the President could do.

On the other question, I think you're right. One of the things that we have to do is to find young people who are likely to get in trouble and try to reach them before they get to the point where they are hurting other people, because a lot of young people never felt like they were loved. That's obvious to me; I see it all the time.

Mr. Jennings. Do you know a lot of people who work here in the White House have children? And one of the things—this is a nice treat for you, Mr. President, perhaps—we asked several members of your staff to show us different rooms in the White House with their kids. And if we look at the monitors here now, we can see Henry Cisneros, one of your mem-

bers of your Cabinet, showing his kids the Cabinet Room.

We'll be right back.

[*A videotape was shown, and then the television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Jennings. Welcome back to our morning in the White House.

Physical Fitness Test

Q. I had a fun question to ask you, and I was wondering, Mr. President, in elementary school we had to pass a physical fitness test to pretty much get an A, and you got a President's award or a certificate. And I was wondering if you've ever tried or ever thought of passing the test, or if you've even looked at the test that we have to pass?

The President. I haven't, but I probably should. I imagine that I could pass it since I jog every day and do a little work on my weights and do some other things. I probably could, but I'll do it. I'll check on it. If I don't make it, then I'll have to get myself in shape.

Socks the Cat

Q. I read a book called "Socks in the White House," and it said that Socks had a bulletproof case. Does he really?

The President. He can stand behind something that's bulletproof, but most of the time he's just out in the open. That's just a funny thing to say. It was a joke.

Mr. Jennings. We have a couple questions from around the country. Remember last year, sir, we had some people on the telephone. Well, this year—that was kind of difficult so we've asked some people out around the country to ask you questions they've wanted to, and here's one on tape.

Education

Q. My name is Jessica Jones. I'm 11 years old. I am from Red Bank, Tennessee. My question is, what are you planning for the improvement of public education?

Mr. Jennings. That's pretty general. That should keep you going for a while.

The President. Well, very briefly, we've got two bills in designed to help the public schools. One encourages schools to try all kinds of new and different experiments to improve education, but gives them some real standards so we know whether kids are learning or not, no matter where they live.

The other one gives opportunities for kids to move from school to further training if they don't go on to college. So young kids that don't go to college still have a chance to get a good education and make a good living.

Bosnia

Mr. Jennings. Now, we have a guest from overseas. Somebody mentioned Bosnia this morning. Right over here to your right, sir, is Zlata Filpovic, who comes from Sarajevo. And a lot of the kids in here last night, Zlata, knew all about you because of your diary. Perhaps we should show people at home a little bit first about your recent history.

[*A videotape was shown in which Zlata described the horrors faced by children in war-torn Bosnia.*]

Mr. Jennings. Welcome to Washington again, Zlata. Your question for the President.

Q. Usually people when they start war, they say, "With this war we will get things." But I think usually they—all of them lose things. And I think it's really big stupidity. And I would like to ask you, is it war—is it end of that stupidity close? Is it closer?

The President. I think it is closer. And I agree with you. These people started fighting in your country because they wanted territory for people who were just in their own ethnic group. And yet as you pointed out, people who lived in Sarajevo, they had friends—they didn't know if they were Serbs or Croats or Muslims. They lived together. But people from outside brought this war on to try to divide the country up.

I think it is closer. Yesterday we signed an agreement here in Washington between the Croats and the Government of Bosnia, which is mostly Muslim but not entirely. And now the question is, will the Serbs agree to sign on? Will they agree to give up some of the territory they took so that everybody can live with a fair piece of land and we can stop killing the adults and the children? I think we're closer, and we're working very hard on it.

Mr. Jennings. Okay. You've been very determined back there. Ram, is that your name? Mustaq, I'm sorry, Mustaq. I apologize.

Health Care Reform

Q. Do you like to be known as the President of the health care program?

The President. Be known? Yes.

Mr. Jennings. Sounds a bit like a set-up, doesn't it, sir?

The President. Yes, I do. Because I want every American family to have health care. And a lot of them don't now, and millions who have it can lose it. And every other major country in the world with a good economy like ours gives all the families health care. We don't, and it's not right.

Mr. Jennings. Has anybody else got a question about health care, because—oh goodness, lots of them.

Q. My name's Mickey. I was on welfare. And you say you encourage people to get jobs when they are on welfare. But as soon as I started working, they took away all my benefits, including my medical benefits. I was better living off welfare than I am now working, because I'm not receiving any medical benefits anymore.

The President. I talked about you and people like you in my State of the Union Address. I pointed out—you asked a health care question—if you're on welfare in America today and if you have children or if you're just yourself on welfare, you get covered by a medical program paid for by the Government. If you get off welfare and you go to work in a job that has no health insurance, you start working and paying your taxes so that someone who stayed on welfare can still get health care and you don't get it anymore. It's not fair. And you're right, the best thing we could do to end welfare as we know it is to give everybody health coverage so people would never be encouraged to stay on welfare.

Good for you. Thank you for saying that.

Public Expectations

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, do you think the people have too high expectations of what you can really accomplish?

The President. Well, sometimes. That's why I always try to say, here's what I can do, here's what I can't do, and remind the American people that in a democracy, the people have to do a lot of things. We have to change this country from the grassroots, and a lot of the changes we have to make have to happen inside us: our attitudes about violence and our attitudes about young people, without regard to their race and what they can do. We've got to change our whole way of thinking about things.

Mr. Jennings. Okay, here's a question right over here.

Education

Q. My name is Ebony. My major concern is education. My question to you is, why is it necessary to bus children out of their neighborhoods, to get a, quote, unquote, "equal education"? Shouldn't all schools offer the same programs, since we're all being taxed?

The President. The answer is yes, all schools should offer the same programs and should achieve the same high standards of excellence. One real problem we've had in America—let me just say this real quick, I don't want to get into a long answer—but in America, our school system has usually been a local school system, run community by community, paid for by the State and local governments and a little money from us at the national level. What we're trying to do now is to move toward greater equality. The State of Michigan just voted in a historic vote to take most of the property taxes away from schools and give State taxes so everybody could get a more equal education. And it's going to be one of the great crusades of the next 10 years, giving all kids, no matter where they live, a decent education.

Q. Thank you.

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, I'm going to follow that up, if you don't mind, because we have a young man here more than determined to ask you a question about education. Reginald, right? Reginald, we've got a piece of tape of you at your school. Before you ask the President your question, let's take a look at that.

[*A videotape was shown in which Reginald described how his school building had deteriorated over the years.*]

Mr. Jennings. Somebody observed, Reginald, you're at least going to make an investigative reporter when you grow up. You've got all the moves there.

The President. Didn't he do a great job? Give him a hand. He was good. [*Applause*] Good job.

Mr. Jennings. What's your question for the President?

Q. A lot of the students are drawing away from their education. And one thing, a lot of kids are talking about Super Nintendo and

things like that. What do you think about video games? And do you know that you are on a video game?

The President. No, am I?

Q. Yes, you are. I'd just like to tell you this. On Super Nintendo it's a basketball game called "NBA Jam." And it's a code for Bill Clinton and Al Gore, and you have your own certain slam-dunk and everything.

Mr. Jennings. You're kidding.

The President. I have to confess, the Vice President's a better basketball player than I am, but I like the sport, I think, even more than he does.

Let me tell you something about this. What happened was in the last 12, 15 years, a lot of the schools got in financial problems, and it was easier to put off repairing the buildings and taking care of the buildings, instead of laying off personnel or other things. And it's a terrible problem. And I think there's going to have to be a real effort in every State in the country to fix these schools up. A lot of these old school buildings are better structurally than newer buildings, but nobody's taking care of them. And I appreciate your bringing that to public attention.

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, somebody asked a little while ago what the difference was like between having this and meeting the press. Do you like to go to meet the press in the press briefing room?

The President. I do. I do that there; sometimes I meet the press here when we have foreign leaders here. And when I have press conferences, we do it here sometimes.

Mr. Jennings. We've asked David Dreyer, your Deputy Communications Director, to give us a tour of the press briefing room. We'll be right back.

The President. This is where they ask me hard questions.

[*A videotape was shown, and then the television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Jennings. We have another question on tape from across the country. I'll be curious to know what you think of this one.

Media Coverage

Q. Hello, my name is Michael Marcus. I'm 17 years old, and I live in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida. My question to you, Mr. President, is with all the unfavorable press that you have been receiving, how are you able to focus and concentrate on the policies that you wish to pass through Congress?

The President. Well, what I do is I answer the questions the best I can. And I recognize that the press is like a herd of cattle sometimes, they just get swarming on some issue and they become obsessed with it. But the American people are obsessed with their own lives. Look at the questions I've been asked today. I try to focus on those things. I try to respond to the press, deal with the negative questions, and then keep my time and my attention devoted to the things I was elected to deal with: the crime problem, the health care problem, the jobs problem, the education problem, the things that I've been asked about today.

Mr. Jennings. Is that hard sometimes, though?

The President. Sometimes it's very hard, but that's a big part of the test. I mean, this whole job is like a character test; you're always being measured and tested and pushed. And I believe it is my job to keep focused on the things I was elected to do. So that's what I have to do. And no matter how hard it is, in the end that's how I'll be judged in history, and that's how I'll judge myself.

Cattle Grazing Fees

Mr. Jennings. All of these questions, you're perfectly right, are very much on the news. In fact, you mentioned cattle. This is Cotton over here, Cotton who is from Boulder, Wyoming.

The President. Wyoming?

Mr. Jennings. I know you have a question about cattle. Where's the microphone for Cotton there, guys? First of all, hold it, let's show the President a little bit about where you come from.

[*A videotape was shown in which Cotton described how an increase in grazing fees could be detrimental to his family's cattle ranch.*]

Mr. Jennings. Okay, Cotton, what's your question?

Q. Mr. President, my family are ranchers and so are many of my neighbors. Part of the year, we graze our cattle on the BLM and U.S. Forest Service lands. I know a lot about ranching, and I know a lot about taking good care of the environment. Mr. Babbitt and your administration's new plan is to double the grazing fees. This will really hurt my family, and our business cannot afford it. But it won't just hurt our fam-

ily, it will hurt all of our neighbors and all the businesses in our town.

Mr. Jennings. What's your question, Cotton?

Q. The grazing fees is not the total cost of grazing on public lands. So, Mr. President, I want to know, do you understand what it actually costs to graze on public lands? Because there are a lot of nonfee costs. And if you don't understand that, I'd like to explain them to you.

The President. After the program, I'll be glad to talk to you more about it. But let me briefly say to all of you what this issue is about.

A lot of the land in the West belongs to the Federal Government but has to be used and should be used by farmers and ranchers out there. The fees they pay are about one-fourth the fees they pay to graze on private land, much less. So there's a big push in the Congress, and has been for years, to ask them to pay more fees.

On the other hand, if you charge them too much, they can't stay in business. Your Governor, Mike Sullivan, basically told Secretary Babbitt and me that the original plan that we proposed was too burdensome. And he went out there and started having meetings with the farmers and ranchers and basically changed that plan.

While this plan would call for the doubling of the fees over 3 years, it would also give farmers like you, who take good care of the land, a rebate, that is, the fees wouldn't go up that much if people are actually proving that they're doing their best to maintain the land.

So the real purpose of the fee increase is not to get more money for the Government—it's not that much money—it is to encourage us to keep the land, maintain it, and make sure people will be able to graze it for generations to come.

So it's a question of how to strike the right balance, and I'll be glad to talk to you about it after the program.

Mr. Jennings. Another very contentious subject, right in front here. Brodie.

The President. We'll talk some more after the program.

Go ahead. Brodie, you're up.

Smoking

Q. As you know, Mr. President, this has been concerning me for years, but as you know, all the illegal drugs, we get told how these can really hurt your body, they can mess you up, not to smoke marijuana or sniff cocaine or anything like that. But there's one drug that kills a lot more people than all those illegal ones combined. This drug is legal, and it's a cigarette. And every day, about 1,000 Americans die from smoking. I have a three-part question here. The first part is why are cigarettes still legal? The second part is what is your administration doing to try to help—oh, God——

The President. Discourage people from smoking?

Q. No, it's not that. It's to prevent smoking—cigarette companies from targeting their ads at children, with Joe Camel and all those other people?

Mr. Jennings. Brodie, why don't you just hang on there for a second—there's a third part. Brodie works—I just met him a few minutes ago—he worked so hard on this question overnight. You've done terrific. It's a subject that every kid here is interested in.

The President. The truth is, the reason cigarettes have not been declared illegal is because most Americans don't believe it should be illegal. They know that it's dangerous; the warnings are printed there. But most people believe that it's not as immoral as using drugs or as destructive to the fabric of society. And so there's not much sentiment to make cigarette smoking illegal. It's a deeply embedded part of our culture.

On the other hand, for many years, cigarette smoking was declining, thank goodness, among Americans. Now we see some evidence that smoking is increasing among some people, particularly younger women, which I'm very concerned about. So our Surgeon General, Dr. Elders, who's responsible for talking to the American people about their health, has really launched a real aggressive initiative against cigarette smoking and especially against the second thing you talked about, which is targeting ads to young people, which I think is so wrong. I think it is really, really wrong. And we have to speak out against it and try to get people to change their practices. And I will keep doing that. I also favor increased taxes on cigarettes to discourage people from using them. The people in Michigan just voted for a 50-cent-a-pack tax on cigarettes and to give all the money to the schools. And we need to see more initiatives like that.

Mr. Jennings. How old are you, Brodie?

Q. Ten.

The President. Let me just make one other comment. Just like what Cotton said, there are a lot of good people in America who still raise tobacco. And we should have funds set aside for them in the cigarettes tax to help them convert away from raising tobacco to doing other kinds of farming so they can actually make a living. There are an awful lot of good people who do that work in States in our country, and we can move them, help them to do other things, and we should.

Mr. Jennings. Brodie, let's pass the mike down, just two down on your left there, okay? Oh, it's that third part.

The President. What's your third part?

Q. And I've got the third part to this.

Mr. Jennings. Is what?

Q. And it is, will you commit you and your administration to making the secret list of ingredients on cigarettes public, because food companies have to publish theirs?

The President. Oh, well, you know, we've been making a big deal out of that, about the fact that more nicotine has been put into some cigarettes. And we're going to try to get to the bottom of that and tell all of you what's going on. And I really appreciate your bringing that up. That really bothered me when I heard that there was more nicotine going in to make sure that people were really hooked on them.

President's Wish

Q. I have a fun question. If you had one wish, what would it be?

The President. If I had one wish, what would it be?

Q. Yes.

The President. I would wish for a safe and secure childhood for all of our people, all of our children.

Mr. Jennings. Are you happy with that answer?

The President. That's what I want. I mean, I think if all the families in this country could give their children a safe and happy childhood, a lot of our other problems would be solved. Now, there's a lot of elements in that, but that's what I want. I mean, I think that would be my wish.

Mr. Jennings. Now, if my recollection is correct from a year ago, when the President meets with his staff tomorrow morning, he's going to tell them about a lot of the questions that you have raised. So, how would you like to see the room, now, where the President has his staff meetings every morning? This is the Roosevelt Room, and this is the Deputy Chief of Staff, Phil Lader, showing it to his kids.

[*A videotape was shown, and then the television stations took a commercial break.*]

Environmental Cleanup

Mr. Jennings. Welcome back to the East Room, and we're joined again—nice to have you back, Purnell. Purnell Brewer is 13 years old from Gary, Louisiana. Did the President keep his word to you pretty much?

[*Purnell, who believed his brother's death from cancer was a result of environmental pollution, said pollution had decreased since his appearance on the first ABC children's town meeting in February 1993 but more work needed to be done.*]

Mr. Jennings. All right, Purnell, hang on a second there and let the President maybe talk to that point.

The President. Well, first, I'm glad things are getting better. We can now give people like your families all over America information about what kinds of chemicals are being produced in their areas so they can use it to work at the grassroots level to try to reduce it. We're also trying to reduce air pollution by 90 percent in toxic chemicals. And we're trying to protect poorer communities. You know, a lot of the worst pollution in this country is in poorer communities, in rural areas and cities.

And so those are the things we are doing. We will stay on it; we'll keep talking about it. The Vice President, especially, and I have talked about it a lot. We'll keep doing that, and I'm glad to know it's better than it was.

Mr. Jennings. This is another issue that I know is on a lot of kids' minds.

Kimberly.

Prayer in Public Schools

Q. President Clinton, earlier you said that when you were in high school, went to school, you felt safe. And a lot of times I hear my parents and grandparents say the exact same thing. And I keep wondering—at that time, prayer was mandated in schools, and since the prayer was taken away from public education and public schools, the crime rate in schools has really gone up. I was wondering if you felt

there was a connection, and what is your opinion of prayer in school?

The President. I don't know that you can say that there is a connection. I do believe that 30 years ago, you had more coherent families, you had less violence, you had less unemployment, and values were taught in our schools more explicitly. The reason the Supreme Court made the decision on prayer is that they said that no Government should order people to pray or should say exactly what prayer they should give. And I agree with that. I mean, that's the first amendment. That's what we were founded on.

On the other hand, I think schools should be available to religious groups. I think it's okay to have moments where people pray in silence. I don't think that prayer at sporting events or graduations is wrong, in my opinion. And I think that the most important thing is that we ought to start talking openly about what we need to do in our schools to promote values, truthfulness, law-abiding-ness, respect for others, and to lift those things up and talk about why kids shouldn't have kids, why people should not practice violence. I think those things should be put out there.

I think that we could waste a lot of energy trying to revisit the extent to which the Government could order people to be involved in prayer or order prayer services. But I think that it's okay for schools to permit moments where people can pray on their own if that's what they want to do. But the main thing is, the schools ought to be teaching values. I think they should be, and when they got out of it, it was a big mistake.

Abortion

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering, why do you think that abortions of teenagers and any women should be able to stay legal in America? And what about it makes you think this way?

The President. I believe that it should be—I think that until the child—the present law is that until a baby can live outside his mother's womb on its own, it is up to the mother to make the decision. And that's what I think the law should be, because in America there is a huge difference of opinion. The American people are divided deeply on it, about when the soul goes into the body, when a person becomes a human being. And not everybody agrees that all abortion is murder. Not everybody agrees that every abortion, under any circumstances, is wrong. Therefore, I don't think that all the mothers should be made criminal.

I think that abortion should be safe, it should be legal, but it should be rare. I think we should liberalize the adoption laws. I think we should encourage people to adopt children. I think we should make it easier for people to adopt children across racial lines. But I don't believe—in my own view, I support the decision of the Supreme Court that this decision ought to be a matter between women and their doctors.

I don't think everybody else in society can say with absolute certainty that they know that, and there's even big differences in the religious community over it, so I don't think that one view should be imposed on everybody when there's so much difference of opinion about it.

Mr. Jennings. Patience, why don't you give the mike to the young woman next to you, Jamie. Right beside you. Jamie.

Child Support

Q. I think there is a big problem in America about fathers not taking care of their children, not paying child support. And I'm wondering if there's anything you could do to help.

The President. It's a huge problem, billions of dollars a year. There are a lot of children who are forced onto welfare because their absent fathers don't pay child support. And one of the things that we are trying to do is to make it easier to collect that child support, if fathers cross the State line, if they run away from their responsibility, to be able to have their paychecks have the child support taken out on the front end, to be able to deny the father certain credit privileges and other privileges until they pay the child support that they owe. I think we need a tough national system of child support enforcement and collection. That would do a lot to help families grow up with dignity and children without poverty.

Mr. Jennings. Jamie, you asked that question for a reason, did you?

Q. Yes.

Mr. Jennings. What is it?

Q. My dad is very wealthy. They got divorced about 6 years ago, and he is not paying the amount he should be paying. And we've been going to court for a very long time, and nothing has come out of it at all.

The President. Do you live in a different State from your father?

Q. Yes, he lives in California.

The President. See, that's a big problem because most of the child support laws are State-by-State laws. If the father lives in a different State from the child, it's easier to get out of. What we're trying to do is to set up some national standards so the children of this country will be protected and be taken care of.

Mr. Jennings. Do you think you're getting any closer? This is a question that seems to come up every year.

The President. Well, it's better than it used to be, and it's going to get better. If we pass our welfare reform proposal, it will be better, because people should not be able to bring children into the world and just walk off and leave them. They ought to take responsibility for the children that they bring into the world. And we ought to do what we can, and yes, we're making some progress.

Mr. Jennings. Okay. Right here.

Health Care

Q. Hello.

Mr. Jennings. What's your name, dear?

Q. Sara. Mr. Clinton, I am very concerned that it is very hard to get health care in America. And one of those reasons is because not all doctors take Medicaid. And if you're on Medicaid, then sometimes the people in my area, the doctors, would not see me. For 4 months I could not get medication for asthma, and I missed a month of school. And my school decided to penalize me, withhold all my credits for that semester, because they have a State law in Texas that says that you have to go to school a certain amount of days, and my school is not in compliance with that law. And I was wondering, what can you do to help this problem of, first of all, doctors—more incentive for doctors to take Medicaid, to see the people that need to be seen? And another one is, to help the schools understand that when a person is sick they should be more helpful instead of penalizing that student.

Mr. Jennings. Double-barreled.

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, I can do more about the first than the second. The schools, it depends upon whether the people who run the schools are sensitive, whether the counselors and the teachers really know what the kids' lives are like. And I think that that's something we have to keep working on, and that's beyond what the President can do.

But I can do something about the first. A lot of doctors don't take—I don't think it's right for doctors not to see Medicaid patients, but the reason a lot of them don't is because in many States, Medicaid, the Government health program for poor people, doesn't reimburse the doctors at the real costs of providing the service. And it's a lot of paperwork headache. One of the things that our health care will do is to put Medicaid folks in with other people in the same sort of health care plans. So we'll provide health care coverage for everybody, for the employed, for the unemployed, and people will be able to go into common health care plans so that doctors won't, in many cases, might not even know in the beginning whether they have a Medicaid patient or somebody who works at the store down the street. And Medicaid people will be treated by the same coverage and have access to the same kind of dignified treatment that others do. And it will really make a huge difference.

The Presidency

Mr. Jennings. Put your hands down for just one second. How many of you think that when you bring up a problem to the President, that he can actually go and solve it? They're fairly practical about that, because there are only so many problems a President can——

The President. Yes. Some things I can do. Some things I can't do. Some things I can do if other people will help me. And it's very—that's why I try to tell you what I can do and what I can't when you ask these questions.

Mr. Jennings. We'll be right back.

The President. We ought to say one thing about that when we come back.

Mr. Jennings. Which is?

The President. Which is what Purnell said, that—Teddy Roosevelt, who was President at the early—the first President of the 20th century—McKinley until 1901—Teddy Roosevelt said once that the greatest power of the Presidency was the bully pulpit, the ability to talk about these problems and to give other people the chance to be heard. Some of you, like Cotton, want me to change a Government policy here. But because of the bully pulpit of the Presidency, because Peter came here, he can be heard by people who never saw a cattle ranch before and may not understand that problem. And you get to ask me all kinds of questions. You got to—Patience got to ask me the

question she wanted to ask about abortion; Sara got to ask the question she wanted to ask about health care. That's because this is a bully pulpit. So even some things that I don't have legal authority over, it's still important for the President to talk about and to let others talk about and even disagree with the President on, because that's the way America learns and grows and debates.

So I think it's very important. Like you asked—you said the question about welfare. It's important for the American people to know that the reason most people don't get off welfare is because they or their children lose health care, not because they like being on welfare, not because they want a check from the Government. Most everybody would rather be out working. But when you go to work and you lose the health care, then you wonder what you're going to do if your kids get sick. That's a real pain. So these are important things.

Mr. Jennings. We'll be right back.

The President. Is it time to go?

Mr. Jennings. Yes. We'll be right back.

[*The television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Jennings. Welcome back to our answering children's questions with the President here in the East Room. As it used to look, President Adams and Abigail Adams, the first inhabitants here, hanging up the laundry in those days, I bet it was not as much fun around here then.

The President. That's right.

Mr. Jennings. Such a precious room now that everybody's very, very self-conscious about what happens in here.

The President. Oh, yes.

Electromagnetic Fields and Cancer

Mr. Jennings. We had invited a young boy here today named Kevin Larm, who very much wanted to ask you a question, sir. Unfortunately, last night here in Washington he got sick, and he's in the hospital. But his brother has come. And before you meet his brother, Patrick, perhaps you'd like to see the problem which he has around the country. This is a problem that has come up in the news on several occasions about the kind of environmental problem that you may or may not be able to do something about.

Here's Kevin Larm.

[*A videotape was shown in which Kevin explained that he was one of many children who had cancer associated with electromagnetic fields near their homes.*]

Mr. Jennings. Well, Kevin comes from Omaha, and as I said, he's in the hospital here this morning, sir, but his brother, Patrick, is here.

Patrick, do you want to talk to the President?

Q. I want to ask you his question. I have heard that recent studies have linked EMF's to childhood cancers. Other countries, such as Sweden, are passing laws to set standards. As our President, can you help lower EMF's, so hopefully some childhood cancers can be prevented?

The President. That's something that we can do something about. We had a study in 1990 which was inconclusive about it. But you're right, Sweden has concluded that EMF's do lead to higher rates of cancer. So I have asked the person who runs the Environmental Protection Agency for our Government to do a review of this and to make a report to me in the near future to try to make a decision about what we should do.

I think we've got to see what the best available evidence is. But I, frankly, was somewhat impressed by the arguments made by the Swedes. We just have to look into it and see whether we think there's honestly evidence there. And if there is, then we have to take action. And we're looking into it. And you tell your brother to hang in there.

Mr. Jennings. You can probably tell him yourself, sir. I have a suspicion he's watching.

The President. Kevin, I hope you're watching this, and we're praying for you and pulling for you.

The Presidency

Mr. Jennings. Mr. President, you know, it occurs to me at least, listening to all these kids ask their questions today, that they're in touch with problems that you may be out of touch with sometimes. Here you are in the White House; you're surrounded by an enormous entourage all the time. Do you ever feel out of touch?

The President. Yes, but that's one reason I really work hard to get out into the country and to walk the streets. I went to New Hampshire last week, had a town meeting in Nashua,

and then I walked the streets in Keene, New Hampshire, and just shook hands with people and talked to them and listened to them. When people come to see me in the White House, I always ask them what the cab drivers are talking about. Because it's so easy for the President to get out of touch with what real people are thinking. I mean, it's a wonderful life, but you can see it's not a normal life. So you get really isolated, and you have to work to avoid it.

Mr. Jennings. One other thing I cannot help but to have noticed: There hasn't been a question this morning about Whitewater. We'll be right back. [*Laughter*]

[*The television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Jennings. Well, we've got about a minute left, Mr. President.

The President. I want to talk to you more about the prayer question.

Mr. Jennings. Okay. I must say that this year's group is incredibly eager and determined to ask their question. We've only got a minute or so left. Do you want to try to say something to them all?

The President. Well, do you want to take one more question?

Mr. Jennings. I don't think we have time, to be perfectly honest.

The President. And then I'll try to answer everyone who didn't get to ask a question. When you go through the line or when we go visit, then I'll try to answer your question.

Mr. Jennings. One thing I can tell you about the President, once you get him, when the broadcast is over, grab him. He'll be here all afternoon, driving his staff crazy.

Go ahead, sir. Final comments?

The President. Well, first I want to thank all of you for coming. I want to thank you for your questions. And I want to thank you for caring enough about all the things you raised. And I just want to encourage you in your lives. You know, we've got a big job to do in this country. And I have a big job to do to try to create more jobs and more opportunity, but we also have to have more people like you who really care about their friends and neighbors and family members. We have to rebuild our country from the ground up, safe streets, strong families, better schools, and a better chance. And I owe that to you to do my best, but I need you to do your best, too.

Heather, what were you going to say?

Mr. Jennings. Yes, I was going to say, I just suddenly remembered somebody told me——

The President. Come on, Heather.

Mr. Jennings. ——Heather has a handleable question.

McDonald's

Q. Well, I have a fun question for you. And I know you used to run in Arkansas, so I think you will like it. My favorite restaurant is McDonald's too. What do you get when you go there? [*Laughter*]

The President. What do I get when I go there? Normally, an Egg McMuffin or something for breakfast. Those are the big meals that I eat at McDonald's. My daughter and I used to go there sometimes on Sunday morning before Sunday school, and then Hillary and I would go and pick her up and we'd go to church. But we love to have McDonald's Egg McMuffins on Sunday morning.

Mr. Jennings. I must say, that's the first smile I've seen on Heather's face all morning.

The President. I'm glad you smiled, Heather. You've made me smile, too. You have a wonderful smile.

Mr. Jennings. Thank you, Mr. President, for having us in. And thank you all for coming. You can all come and say hello to him in person now.

The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 11:30 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. Peter Jennings, ABC News, was the moderator for the program.

Statement by the Director of Communications on the President's Discussions With the Presidents of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia
March 19, 1994

Following the signing ceremony yesterday, the President met with President Izetbegovic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The two leaders discussed next steps following yesterday's agreements. The President told President Izetbegovic that the United States will work with the European Union and other states to provide economic assistance for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Bosnia. The President also told the Bosnian President that the United States is prepared to sign a bilateral assistance agreement establishing a framework for future technical and economic assistance.

The President confirmed that the United States would reopen our Embassy in Sarajevo in the near future. Ambassador Victor Jackovich has been resident in Vienna since last fall because of the security situation in Sarajevo. Our decision to reopen the Embassy underscores our commitment to Bosnia's security and stability. The President reaffirmed the intention of the United States to participate in the implementation of a viable peace agreement among the parties in Bosnia.

The President also met with President Tudjman of Croatia. The two leaders discussed Croatia's role in helping make the agreements signed today succeed. The United States will work with Croatia and the Bosniac-Croat Federation toward their full integration in Western political, economic, and security arrangements. The President announced that the United States is ready to sign a bilateral aid agreement to establish a framework for future technical and economic assistance for Croatia. The United States also is prepared to sign a science and technology agreement and to open negotiations on a bilateral investment treaty and a double taxation treaty.

To help alleviate the humanitarian situation and to assist Croatia to care for refugees and persons displaced as a result of the conflict, the United States will provide $2 million for the hospital partnership and $1.5 million for medical supplies.

The President announced that Croatia would be allowed to open consulates in New York, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Los Angeles. To further advance the contacts between our nations, the United States will double the Fulbright program and donate $50,000 worth of American studies books to the recently rebuilt American Studies Library in Dubrovnik.

The President reaffirmed United States support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Croatia and committed to help secure the peaceful solution to the problems of the U.N. Protected Areas (UNPA's). To this end, the United States will continue to use sanctions and other economic pressure against Serbia in the most effective way possible. We also intend to play an active diplomatic role in assisting Croatia in resolving its dispute with the Krajina Serbs.

The United States firmly believes that adherence to the highest standards of human and civil rights for Croatia's Serb community is an essential condition for the reintegration of the UNPA's. President Tudjman's stated commitments in this regard are constructive; his proposals for autonomy for Serb-majority areas provide a good basis for beginning negotiations.

Exchange With Reporters in Miami, Florida
March 20, 1994

North Korea

Q. Anything new on North Korea, Mr. President?

The President. As you know, the Board of Governors of the IAEA is meeting tomorrow. Our goals remain the same. We haven't changed our policy. We did do quite a bit of work yesterday, spent a good deal of time discussing this. But I really don't have anything else to say

at this time. I'm talking to our allies. And we're working through this and what our options are.

Q. Is there any possibility that sanctions can be avoided at this point?

The President. Is there what?

Q. Do you have any reason to believe that sanctions can be avoided at this point?

The President. Well, of course, they can. They can—that really is a decision that's up to the North Koreans as much as anything else. But there are—we also have some hope that they will go forward. They did let the inspectors in; then they didn't; they did. There seems to be a difference of opinion within their country about how to proceed. So to some extent the ball is still clearly in their court. But we are proceeding to consider all of our options and to talk with our allies about it.

Q. What is your hope based on, that they might allow full inspections, sir?

The President. I didn't say I hope. He didn't ask me if I hoped they would.

Q. You said that there's still a hope, you said?

The President. Well, of course, there is. There appear to be people within North Korea that want to proceed to normalize the relations of their country with the international community and people who don't. And we'll just have to see what they do now, where we go from here. But our objectives remain what they have always been. We have been entirely reasonable and forthcoming. And we have also worked very closely with not only our strong allies in South Korea but with the Japanese, the Chinese, and others who share many or if not all of our objectives. So we're going to keep going forward, see what happens in the next few days. But the next step is to see what happens at the Board of Governors meeting.

Q. Are tensions ratcheting up so high—there appears to be some concern that this may evolve into some kind of armed conflict, given the height of the rhetoric?

The President. Well, I have done everything I could to avoid ratcheting up the tensions while being firm in the objectives of our policy and what I think are in the interests of not just the United States but the people of that part of the world and Asia. So we're just working ahead.

I'm not trying to ratchet up the tensions, I'm just trying to work through this in a very deliberate but very firm and disciplined way, and that's what we'll continue to do.

Thank you.

[*At this point, the President moved from White House reporters to a group of Miami reporters and continued answering questions. His remarks are joined in progress.*]

Health Care Reform

The President. ——have a system of comprehensive benefits, leave Medicare alone—it works—but add prescription drugs, and phase in over time options other than nursing homes for long-term care, and cover people who work through the workplace. Nine out of ten people who have private insurance are already covered through the workplace. This is a very, very big deal. And it is imperative if we're ever going to do what we ought to do to give security to the American people.

We've got to reform the insurance system. You can't have in any given time 39 million people without health insurance. You can't have 113 million—30 million Americans with lifetime limits on their policies. You can't have 81 million Americans with preexisting conditions so that they can't change jobs or they're paying insurance premiums that are too high. You can't have rates that discriminate against older Americans when older Americans are the fastest growing group of our population and more and more of them want to work. So these are all things that have to be dealt with. And I think that the Congress is going to face up to their responsibilities this year. We've got the economy turned around. We're going in the right direction with the economy. We're going to have welfare reform, got some very important school reforms going. But we have to face the obligation to deal with health care reform.

Cuba and Crime Legislation

Q. [*Inaudible*]—rule out the possibility to talk with Fidel Castro in the near future?

The President. Yes, I have no plans to do that.

The other thing I want to emphasize to you, that before we get to health care—this is a very important issue here in Florida, and I talked with the Attorney General about it in some length just yesterday—that Congress must move quickly to pass the crime bill. In addition to all the interest groups trying to kill health care reform, delay on the crime bill could cause us significant problems. So that's the other big objective. Next week when Congress meets, or

this week now, we've got to go ahead and pass that crime bill. I feel very good about where we are on that.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—any change in the current policy?

The President. My policy is clear, and I have no plans to change it.

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, on immigration, the State of Florida is talking about a lawsuit against the Federal Government to recoup the monies that this State pays on incoming refugees. Should the Federal Government help pay for that?

The President. We should pay more. And under my administration we are paying more than ever before. This situation had been allowed to develop, in my judgment, to a very severe degree when I became President only a little over a year ago. Since that time, we have moved aggressively to try to alleviate the health, the education, and the welfare costs that States bear because of immigration. The States that have the biggest burdens, California, Florida, and Texas, to some extent New York, have not been fully reimbursed. But I'm moving ahead to try to alleviate this burden. It isn't fair. National policies, or lack of policies, and the inability of our country to control our borders in the face of illegal immigration, are not the fault of any particular State. And it is a national responsibility. But we are moving in the Congress to try to alleviate these burdens. I worked hard—we made some real progress last year. We're going to make some more this year. And I think Florida should do what they can to keep the pressure on us. But they need to know that I'm on the side of the Florida officials on this one. It's just going to take some time to work ourselves out of a very big hole that I found when I came here.

Thank you all.

Q. Welcome to Florida, Mr. President.

The President. Glad to be back.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 3:30 p.m. at Miami International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters in Deerfield Beach, Florida
March 21, 1994

North Korea

Q. Anything new on North Korea, Mr. President?

The President. Let me just say, about North Korea, the IAEA has made their judgment; now there will be consultations at the U.N.

I think you know—I think President Kim has confirmed that I sent him a letter at the end of last week. And we have agreed that it is in our national interest and the interest of the security of the people of South Korea and the security of our armed forces there to proceed with the Patriot deployment, so we will do that.

As to the next issues, I think we have to just wait and see what will happen. I can't say more today. We're going to have to work on this on a day-to-day basis. I will say again, I want to emphasize this decision on the Patriots is purely defensive in nature. But it is appropriate—General Luck has said he thinks it's necessary as the continuing modernization of our forces proceeds. What happens now is still in the court of the North Koreans, and we must hope that they will do the right thing.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:47 p.m. at Century Village East. In his remarks, the President referred to President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea and Gen. Gary E. Luck, USA, commander, U.S. forces, Korea. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks in a Health Care Forum in Deerfield Beach
March 21, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for that sign back there. Can you hear me in the back? Good. Everybody sit down and relax now.

Hillary and I are delighted to be back here at Century Village. We liked it the first time; we like it better this time.

I want to thank Larry Smedley for that introduction; Joanne Pepper for her support of health care; your fine, fine Congressman, Harry Johnston, for his leadership and support of our efforts in Congress; and my good friend Governor Lawton Chiles for his kind remarks and his strong leadership. I also want to note the presence here in the audience today of Congressman Peter Deutsch and Congressman Alcee Hastings; a host of State officials including your Lieutenant Governor, Buddy MacKay, Attorney General Bob Butterworth, and many others, legislators and other State officials. I want to thank the mayor, Mayor Albert Capellini, for giving me a cap. If I put it on in a few minutes, I'll be just like most of you, protecting myself from the sun. I want to thank Mr. and Mrs. Levy for having us here at Century Village and recognize my good friends Michael and Kitty Dukakis who are here with us today. Thank you for being here.

Ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago Hillary and I came here when I was running for President. We sought the support of the people of Broward County and south Florida and all of this State. We did extremely well here on Super Tuesday, much better than anyone predicted that we would. And we nearly carried this heavily Republican State in November, and I haven't given up on it for next time.

I believe it happened because Americans were sick and tired of their politics and their headlines being dominated every day by distraction, by division, by destruction. I said that I wanted to get away from distraction and focus the American people on the real problems that we face and our real opportunities, that I wanted to go beyond division to bring our people back together again across the lines of race and age and region and income and party, and that I was tired of destruction. I thought it was time we started building again. Americans are real good when we work on building things and getting together and moving forward; we're absolutely unstoppable.

Even though I'm kind of a mediocre golfer and not a very good baseball player at all, I'm glad I'm here in Florida for spring training because while the baseball players are working on their swings, I came to tell you that I'm still in Washington going to bat for you, and I will every day I am the President of the United States.

You heard the Congressman mention a little of this, but I want to take just a minute to give you a progress report. When I took office, we had seen the 4 slowest years of economic growth since the Great Depression, almost no job growth. People said our deficit was going to be over $300 billion a year. It is now commonly agreed that the first year of this administration was the most productive in a generation: 2.1 million new jobs in 13 months; the highest growth rate in 10 years in the fourth quarter of last year; dramatic increases in sales of cars and homes; an economic program that led to lower interest rates and higher investments and more jobs and opportunity.

We have done something for your grandchildren and your children. We've reformed the college loan program to lower the interest rates and make the repayment terms better. We passed the national service program that this year will provide 20,000 young Americans and 2 years from now 100,000 young Americans a chance to earn their way through college by serving their communities at the grassroots level to make our streets safer, our people healthier, our people smarter and stronger. We finally passed the family leave bill, after 7 years of trying, to make sure that people don't lose their jobs if they have to take time off from work when a baby's born or a parent is sick and needs the help of a child. And after 7 years we passed the Brady bill, to begin the work of making our streets safer.

This year the Congress is up there right now working on a comprehensive crime bill to put another 100,000 police officers on the street, to take automatic weapons and semiautomatic weapons off the street, to provide alternative

punishment to young people and drug treatment for people who need it, and a "three strikes and you're out" law so we don't parole people who are serious dangers to society.

They're working on a welfare reform law to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life. They're working on a campaign finance reform law that Governor Chiles worked his heart out on as a Senator. We're finally going to get it this year. And most important, we are working on doing something that started 60 years ago, finally, finally providing health care security for all Americans that can never be taken away.

Many of you in this audience remember when Franklin Roosevelt led the struggle to create Social Security. You were there when John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson fought to create Medicare, a solemn pact with our senior citizens. Many of you also remember, I hope, that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson and Jimmy Carter and, yes, even President Nixon all tried and failed in the face of special interest opposition to guarantee health security for all Americans. But we can do it this year, and we must.

There are those who say there is no health care crisis. Well, as always happens when we get up to the brink on health reform, inflation has dropped a little in the cost of health care. That's one thing our health care reform has already done, brought the rising cost of health care in to the point where it's rising more slowly. But you let them kill it this time, and it'll go right back to the way it was for the last 12 years, going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation.

Even now, 2 million Americans lose their health insurance every month, 100,000 of them for good, forever. Fifty-eight million Americans are without health insurance at some time during every year in a country of 255 million. Eighty-one million Americans have a preexisting condition in their family so that they can never change the job they have because they couldn't get new insurance, or they have to pay higher rates for the insurance they have, or they can't get insurance at all. And 133 million Americans, a majority of us, have lifetime limits on our health coverage so that when we need it the most, we can run out of health insurance.

Now, I believe that qualifies as a crisis. I also know that everybody in this country who is still working for a living, who does not work for the Federal Government or a very big and completely secure corporation, can lose their health insurance even if they've got it. I also know that because of the cost of health care going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of the inflation, there are other plans in the Congress that seek to cut Medicare or cut Medicaid increases without doing one thing to try to help our senior citizens and without proposing a comprehensive plan that guarantees you that Medicare services will not be cut. I am here to tell you that we're not going to mess up what's right about American health care. Medicare works. Our doctors, our nurses, our hospitals, our medical research works, and we're going to keep them intact and improve our support for them. That's what we ought to do.

My fellow Americans, if we want everybody in this country to have health care, we've only got three choices: We can guarantee coverage through the workplace through private insurance; we can pass a tax and cover everyone; or we can decide what a lot of the special interest groups and the Congress, people in the Congress hope we'll decide, which is, one more time, we just can't figure out how to do it.

Every other advanced country with which we are competing for the future has figured out how to give all their people health care security. We have not been able to figure out how to do it. You know why? It's because the people who are making a killing on the financing of the system don't want us to figure it out. I say, give it to the people.

I want to tell you what I think we should do: We ought to have guaranteed private insurance; we ought to keep the choice of doctors and health care plans in the hands of consumers, people who are actually having to deal with the care, not their employers or the insurance companies; we ought to outlaw insurance abuses like charging older people more than younger people for their insurance or eliminating people with preexisting conditions; we ought to guarantee those health benefits at work; and we ought to protect Medicare and improve it.

First, I believe that guaranteed health coverage is important because if you don't do it, you're never going to bring costs under control, and all the rest of us will be suffering from medical inflation from now until Kingdom come. And a lot of you are going to deal with the fact that your children and grandchildren are facing bankruptcy because they don't have the kind of security you have under Medicare.

I also believe the benefits package has to be a good one. If it doesn't include primary and preventive care, you will have children who are sicker than they ought to be; you'll have women who ought to have access to mammographies and men who ought to have cholesterol tests and things of that kind that you won't have. This is very important. And people have got to know that this is going to be there and can never be taken away.

The second thing—I want to be very clear on this—the second thing that our plan does is to preserve, indeed, to expand the right of the American people to choose their doctor or their health care plan. Now, if you're on Medicare, you can choose your doctor. But slightly more than half the people in the country who are insured at work already today have lost their right to choose their health care plan and their doctor. They don't have it today. And if we don't do anything, the rising cost of medical care will force more and more and more employers to take from their employees the right to choose their doctor or their health care plan.

Under our system, every American in the work force will get three choices: They can choose their doctor individually; they can choose a given health care plan; or they can choose another plan. They'll have at least three choices. And if they don't like the choice they made, every year they get to make another one. That's the way we ought to do it. That will guarantee the highest quality. It will protect the interest of our doctors and nurses. It will be the right thing to do.

The third thing we've got to do is stop some of these insurance company abuses. We have got to stop people from dropping their insured people. We've got to stop people from cutting benefits to the bone. We can't have people with their rates going up just because they get sick. After all, you have insurance because you might get sick. So when you get sick, which is the reason you bought the insurance in the first place, should you have to have higher rates? Of course not. We shouldn't have lifetime limits. Insurance ought to mean what it used to mean back when it was started by Blue Cross during the Depression: Pay a fair price for security, and when you're sick, your health care benefits are there for you. That's what insurance used to mean, and it can mean that again.

Now, I think the easiest way to do this is just to expand coverage at the workplace. Why? Because 8 out of 10 Americans who have no insurance are working or are in working families. And 9 out of 10 Americans who have private insurance get it at the workplace. So the simplest way is to say that employers and employees who aren't covered should purchase insurance and to provide discounts for small businesses who can't afford it otherwise. That is the simplest way to do it.

The Government should provide the discounts for the small business and cover the unemployed. This approach builds on what works. It's easy, it's simple, it will make sure that everyone is covered.

Why are some people fighting it? They say it's bad for small business. Let me tell you something, folks, 70 percent of the small business people in this country cover their employees. What about them? They're at an unfair competitive disadvantage to those people in the same business they're in who don't cover their employees. And I'll tell you something else, I meet small business person after small business person who says, "I'm embarrassed that every year I have to raise the copay and the deductible because my rates are 35 or 40 percent more expensive than the people in the Government are paying or the people from big business are paying." We are going to change that. That's what Governor Chiles has tried to do here in Florida; that's what we're going to do for America.

And let me say finally that no health care reform can pass any true test unless it is good for older Americans. Dr. Arthur Flemming, a former U.S. Commissioner of Aging and a fighter for older Americans in the tradition of Claude Pepper, has called my proposal, and I quote, "the best thing for older Americans since Medicare." That's why so many senior groups have said that our approach is the best option for senior citizens and why I was so proud that Larry Smedley of the National Council of Senior Citizens would come here today to endorse our efforts and give you all those caps to keep you from expiring in this heat.

Under our approach, if you get Medicare, you keep it. Your choice of doctor is protected. I know that's important, because every older American deserves the security of quality health care. But under our approach you get more. I want to expand benefits.

We want to have coverage for prescription drugs, which costs older Americans more than

anything today. Since I started running for President, the number one complaint I have heard from people who are on Medicare is that they are not poor enough to be on Medicaid, they don't want to be that poor, but they are not rich enough to pay their outrageous drug bills. We want to do something about it, and that's why our plan covers prescription medicine for senior citizens.

We also begin to provide coverage for long-term care where you want it, at home or in your community. I want to thank the wonderful "We Care" volunteers for greeting us today and for walking Hillary and me in here. I understand they help many of you get medicine or get a little bit of help to stay at home. But not everybody is lucky enough to have a "We Care." Believe me, I know. I meet people who don't every week. That's why we need to make a start in helping people to afford care where they prefer it, in their homes or in communities like this one. It's not right to force people into nursing homes when they could do just fine at home if they had a little help from their friends.

Let me also say that I know we can strengthen Medicare and make some savings in the Medicare program, but only—listen to me—only if we cover everybody and if everyone has medical inflation go down. Under our plan we still expect Medicare spending to go up at twice the rate of inflation, not 3 times the rate of inflation which is what's going to happen if we don't do something to change. Medicare goes up at 3 times the rate of inflation, your premiums under Medicare go up more for the same health care. Under our plan, less inflation, and we use the savings for prescription drugs and for health care at home or in the community. It is a good deal for the senior citizens of America.

Let me make one other point. We must also invest more and more, not less and less, in medical research into all kinds of problems but especially one which I know concerns many of you in this audience today and that's Alzheimer's disease and the new drug therapies to treat Alzheimer's, into things which cause cancer, into the causes of osteoporosis, into what we can do to prevent heart disease. America leads the world in cutting-edge research, and under our plan we actually increase the funds going to medical research.

The opponents of our plan have tried to confuse the issue by making it seem complicated. They ignore the fact that the system we have today is the most complicated on the face of the Earth. The principles of our plan are simple: Guarantee private insurance to every American; let you choose your doctor and your health plan; outlaw insurance company abuses; guarantee health benefits at work for everyone who works; preserve and strengthen Medicare for older Americans by adding the prescription drug and long-term care benefits. That's our approach, and that's our opportunities.

But let me say this, there are a lot of people who are making money out of this system today who don't want it to change, even though we can change it and improve, not weaken, health care. One group of health insurers has already spent $14 million on health care ads to scare you about the cause of health care reform.

And what are the special interests saying? Led by the extreme right of the Republican Party, they are warning of a grim future. I say that because we do have some good Republicans who want health care reform, and we hope they'll be at least free to vote with us in the Congress as we work toward it. That's a message to their leaders, these guys that—no kidding, they're up there saying all over again, they say, "This is socialized medicine; this is rationing." This is private health insurance. This is what every other economy with an advanced standard of living in the world has done but the United States; that's what it is.

It's the same old thing they said when Roosevelt tried to do health care reform, when Kennedy fought for Medicare. Listen to this, when Kennedy fought for Medicare back in 1962, a movie actor in California who later became the Governor of his State and the leader of our country—listen to this—urged listeners to oppose Medicare. He said, "If you don't do this, one of these days you and I are going to spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in America when men were free."

Now, to his credit, by the time he became President, Mr. Reagan didn't try to totally dismantle the Medicare system. But they're using the same rhetoric today. Once we've put it in, they won't try to take it out. They'll try to take credit for it just like they do with Social Security and everything else.

Make no mistake about it, the guardians of gridlock, the people who liked our national politics when it was about distraction, division, and destruction, are doing everything they can to stop health care reform. If you will help me, it will be good for your health because we won't let them, if we stay together.

My fellow Americans, I cannot outspend the opponents of health care reform. They have more money than I can possibly raise, especially if I'm working for you every day. But I can fight, and you can fight with me. And we can keep working, and we can support Congressmen like your Congressman who believe that the time has long since passed when America should be able to continue making excuses for no prescription drugs, no long-term care in the home or in the community, and not even providing decent basic coverage to the working families of this country. We can do better, and with your help, we will.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, Hillary Clinton spoke about the personal dimensions of the health care reform battle and then invited questions.*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]—about the 28 million veterans in this—what about—can you hear me?

Hillary Clinton. Let me repeat this gentleman's question. His question is, what about the 28 million veterans?

Well, the President's still visiting. Let me say that the President's health care reform has been endorsed by all of the major veterans service organizations because it is the only one that tries to preserve and strengthen the veterans health system. And there's a very specific way we offer to do that. Those of you who are veterans, and I imagine there are many of you in this crowd—if you are like my father was, that was one of the most important parts of your life. And he never could understand as he got older why he could not take his Medicare and go to a VA hospital, as he chose to do so. And we've heard that from many veterans.

Under the President's health care reform plan, if you're a veteran with Medicare or Medigap or other insurance, you can use the VA system. You will no longer be locked out of the system that is there for veterans.

Now, veterans with service-connected disabilities and low-income veterans will always retain their preference, because we have to take care of them first. But there are many facilities around our country that can accommodate millions of our veterans who can bring their Medicare and insurance dollars. So we are going to take care of our veterans.

Thank you.

Q. Mrs. Clinton, if this program is put into effect, this reformed health plan, will the Congressmen and Senators assume the same payments as we do?

Mrs. Clinton. Yes, and the President, too. We are going to have one health care system for everybody, including Congress and the President.

Q. I'm president of the Florida Nurses Association. And you have made it clear that you will veto any health care reform bill that does not guarantee coverage for all Americans. Will you make a commitment to veto any bill that doesn't also include tough and effective cost controls? And could you comment on the role of advanced-practice nurses in the health care reform?

The President. She said that—this lady is from the nurses association here in Florida. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] And the American Nurses Association have been among the strongest supporters of our plan. I appreciate that. She said I said that I would veto any bill that didn't provide universal coverage; would I also veto a bill that didn't have cost controls? And would I comment on the role of advanced-practice nursing?

Let me answer the second question first. We have achieved so much support among nurses in part because our plan permits the widest possible use of nurses to do things that they are properly trained to do anywhere in the country.

And secondly, it's not as easy to say yes or no on that. I think there have to be cost controls in the plan. If there aren't some guarantees of controlling costs, we won't be able to prove to the Congressional Budget Office how much the plan costs, and we won't be able to pass it. So as a practical matter, no plan will pass and come to my desk unless there are clear, disciplined measures to make sure that costs are held down. It can't happen. But I don't want to get into a fight about what kinds of measures we'll accept or not accept.

Q. I want you to know that we love you. And the reason we love you is because you've

shown by words and, more important, by deeds that you love us, too.

The President. Thank you.

Q. I have two questions. Why do we need those parasites known as the insurance business? And I have one more question, and the other question is, can we end up with 50 alliances instead of say, 5,000? If you want real competition, why not one alliance or two for the more populous States? That should be the real competition, because we'll show the industry where we come from.

The President. Let me answer the insurance question, and I'll let Hillary answer the alliance question, okay? We'll split it up. Because a lot of you have single-payer signs up, and I want to talk abut that.

There are basically, obviously, two ways to get universal coverage. You can do it through a single-payer system, or you can do it through an employer-employee shared cost system for private insurance. Here is why I think our plan is better and why I wouldn't eliminate all the insurance companies. First of all, I feel compelled to tell you, sir, that there are some insurance companies, believe it or not, who have not contributed to that television ad campaign against our plan, because they do favor universal control—I mean, universal coverage for all Americans.

Now, here's why I think it's—our plan is better. First of all, I think that it's clear that some of the insurance companies, particularly bigger ones, do a good job of trying to manage the health care system and manage costs. And if you have enough people in a big insurance pool, they can get their administrative costs down almost as low as you have in the Medicare program, if the pools are big enough. That's the second question you asked. And they really have acquired quite a lot of expertise.

Secondly, as a practical matter, there are a lot of awfully good people who are working in this industry. And I don't think we should throw them all out of work. The problem is that in our system you've got 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies, so you have to hire all these people to figure out who's not covered. If we had a rational private insurance system, the insurance companies can make a valuable contribution without bankrupting the system.

I also believe, as a practical matter, based on—we have Members of Congress here who may have a different opinion, but my reading of the Congress is that we have a better chance to pass guaranteed private insurance than the single-payer system, because I think it's simpler, easier, and less disruptive. But I also think, on the merits, it's the right thing to do.

Now, let me let Hillary answer the question about the alliances.

Mrs. Clinton. Well, I think that if you have the States making the decisions, some States will only have one; some will only have two; some of the larger ones may need more than two. But it's not going to be thousands. It will only be probably 100 or 120 at the most, the way we look at the population. So I don't think that will be a problem.

And the other thing about single payer is in the President's plan, each State has the right to be a single-payer State if they so choose. And so that is something we want local people to make a decision about.

Q. Hillary and Mr. President, to quote you about "we'll watch it," that happened to my wife. She died because a doctor said, "We'll watch it."

Now, as a little aside, Mr. President, our honorable Governor will concur, we do have the best health care in the world right here in Florida. Our number two industry is citrus, oranges and grapefruit. That's the best health care for Florida at the moment. Thank you.

The President. Go ahead.

[*A participant asked about health care coverage for mental illness.*]

Mrs. Clinton. I wish that this gentleman had the microphone so you could have heard. He made the point that a third of the people who are homeless have mental health problems. Many people in our prisons have mental health problems. And many Americans have mental health and substance abuse problems. We want to begin covering mental health problems. And in the benefits package the President has proposed, that will begin, because it is not fair to turn our backs on mental illness like schizophrenia or clinical depression and not treat it like a disease. And in fact, if we began to treat it, it will actually help more people and save us all money. And so we're going to start doing that and beginning to treat mental health right.

Q. Mr. President, and to Hillary—Hillary, I know you've been pushing the primary physician. And even though I'm on a board with

a lot of hospitals and doctors, how are we going to get rid of all these specialists who charge millions and millions of dollars for—[*inaudible*]—MRI's, and scans? We need primary health care. Will you push that, please?

Mrs. Clinton. Yes, we do need more primary health care physicians, and we're going to try to create more and also advanced-practice nurses and physician assistants because we really need a team of doctors and nurses and other health care professionals to work together on primary care, so that our specialists then can get the good referrals that they need to take care of people.

The President. Don't let—let me just say this: Don't let anybody tell you, scare you into saying that we are for undermining the American people having enough specialists. That's a load of hooey. Right now we've got enough specialists for 30 years, but we don't have enough primary care physicians in most States in the country. So we'll take care of the specialists, but we have to have more primary physicians first.

Q. Mr. President, I realize that you're trying to redo the medical program. The problem that I'm facing, and I might be the youngest one in the crowd, is I have somebody at home who has applied for Medicare disability and should be eligible. And what is happening to this person is over a year ago or a year and half ago, this person was denied it twice. It has gone to Federal court. We have an honorable lawyer, and the judges are writing one thing and saying another. And what I'd like to do—and I made myself a promise I was going to do this today, I'll be glad to pass it on to you—I would like you to look at—may I come forward?

The President. I'll have somebody come get it.

Q. Well, I could come forward.

The President. Thank you.

Q. And I have to say to you, that while you are fixing or redoing a new prescription for medicine, I think you need to look at this documentation and talk to—I'm very disappointed, but I know Senator Graham, who I have been working with on this, has the whole file. And I think there are a lot of disabled people, I might be one of them next, that need help and need a system that's ethical and moral.

And I thank you for listening to me, and I wish you good luck because we need it.

The President. Thank you very much.

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to tell you what happened to my mother. She needed a operation and was told to go to a doctor to get this operation. The doctor said, "Yes, you need a gallstone operation, but my price is $5,000." My father says, "I can give you my life savings of $1,000, but I don't have $5,000." He said, "Mr. Segal, if you don't have money to go in a taxi, you ride in a subway." And he left.

The President. I think what you said speaks for itself. And thank you for having the courage to tell us. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, a lot of people here know me. I've been coordinating your health care plan for south Florida since the Inauguration. And I just want to comment that it's really a pleasure to do so. But I'd like to ask you what's asked of me when I give speeches around. They say, "Mr. Brodin, how does this lower or lessen the bureaucracy? If anything, you're going to create another level of bureaucracy." Could they hear it from your lips—that I prize your words greatly—and explain to them, as I have tried, how it will not only not multiply it but it will actually significantly lessen it. And by the way, it's a pleasure to work with you, too.

The President. Here's why it will lessen the bureaucracy. Look what—what runs the bureaucracy up today? Talk to any doctor or nurse. Talk to these nurses here. You have 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands and thousands of different policies, each of them with different coverages or different copays or different deductibles. Once you standardize the benefit package and standardize the coverage, then you make it possible for every person to fill out one form. The insured person can fill out one form, a simple form. The nurse at the hospital or the clinic can fill out one form. You will drastically cut the paperwork; the insurance people will be processing one form.

So I want to—the people—you will need fewer jobs in clerical work in hospitals, clinics, and insurance companies. You will need more jobs in providing home health care, community-based health care, and doing other things. But it will be, from a pure paperwork point of view, it will be much simpler because of the reform of the insurance packages.

Now, what that means is the little insurance companies will either have to resort to selling supplemental policies or go into cooperative arrangements so they can insure people in big

pools and make money the way grocery stores do, a little bit of money on a lot of people instead of a lot of money on a few people.

But that's why it will be much simpler. The central benefit package in the common system—and everybody carries a little card around like that card up there and just files for the health care.

Q. Thank you. That's my most frequently asked question——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—dedicated State employee. My name is—and I've been deprived of all my State benefits for the past 2 years. My dad in Cleveland has had to pay for my Blue Cross-Blue Shield for me. And I just—[*inaudible*]—grave injustice. And I'm just asking for help from you and also from the Governor, because I've been calling his office for the last 2 years to help me, and no one has helped me. And I was a devoted State employee and the only girl in my office in Broward County, and I don't deserve it—the division of hotels and restaurants.

Mrs. Clinton. Thank you. We will look into that. But your concern and your feeling obviously goes far beyond your own case because people lose their jobs, then they lose their health care benefits.

Q. But I was a loyal——

Mrs. Clinton. And they can be loyal, hard-working people. And you don't deserve it. And when I think about that——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—and they crucified me for no reason.

Mrs. Clinton. We'll look into that, thank you.

But what we are going to try to do is eliminate the problem. The problem should be eliminated so that when you lose your job, you still have insurance, you don't have to worry about it anymore.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Medical overbilling—there's a special provision in the plan that will enable us to do that.

Again, if you have everybody covered in a uniform system, it will be much easier to see whether there is overbilling than there is now.

Q. Your health care plan is great, great for people who have existing problems, also good for my grandma and her contemporaries. But what about my generation and my mom's? Will there still be enough money for these funds for our security?

The President. Absolutely. Here's the thing. If we don't do something now, then there may not be enough money for adequate health care because we can't have another 10 years when the cost of health care goes up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, so people pay more money for the same health care.

And also, keep in mind, our plan covers things for your generation that aren't covered now like medicine and preventive care and mental health coverage, things that aren't covered now. So the answer to your question is your generation has a lot better chance if you pass a plan and we slow the growth of health care cost.

We could stay here til tomorrow at dawn. You've been great being out here in all this hot weather.

Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:23 p.m. at Century Village East. In his remarks, he referred to Lawrence Smedley, executive director, National Council of Senior Citizens; Joanne Pepper, niece of late Congressman and senior citizen advocate Claude Pepper; Mark and Stacey Levy, son and daughter-in-law of the developer of Century Village; and Michael Dukakis, former Presidential candidate, and his wife, Kitty.

Remarks at a Presidential Dinner in Miami, Florida

March 21, 1994

Thank you, Governor, for your kind remarks. And thank you, my fellow Americans, for that wonderful, wonderful reception that you gave to Hillary and to me tonight, not only for the phenomenal amount of funds which you have given and raised but for the spirit in which you have done it and for the reasons for which you have done it.

I want to thank my good friend Bob Graham, for what he said and for the guidance that he used to give me when we were seatmates in the Governors' conference, Lieutenant Governor

Buddy MacKay, and all the Members of Congress who are here and the other officials. If I might say, one former Congressman who's here that I think the world of, Dante Fascell, I'm glad to see you, sir. I know you have the Speaker of the House here and many State legislators, but too many for me to mention, I suppose, and I'm glad to see all of you here. I have always loved coming to Florida and working with you. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Chuck Mangione for playing such wonderful music to us tonight. I want to thank all the dinner chairs, Bud and Marvin and Mitch Berger and Larry Hawkins and Jorge Perez and Monte Friedkin and Howard Glicken and everybody else that worked so hard on this.

This is an amazing dinner. It reminds me of why we got into this in the first place, what you have said to me and to Hillary tonight. I also want to thank those of you who saw us on television as Harry and Louise and thought we were better than the first ad. I thank David Wilhelm for the fine work that he has done. And I thank all of you for making this a wonderful, very brief stop for us.

And today, as Hillary said, I played a little golf with Bud Stack and Bob Farmer and Arnold Friedman and my brother-in-law, Hugh Rodham, and Raymond Floyd, who, needless to say, was slightly better than the rest of us. [*Laughter*] And I thought to myself—we played this one short par-four hole that had big bunkers in the front of it, and this is the kind of thing that keeps people doing things they shouldn't do, like trying to be good golfers when you know it's never going to happen. [*Laughter*] But at the end of one stroke, my brother-in-law, Hugh, and I and Raymond Floyd were on the green in one. So I thought to myself, I never get to putt for an eagle; I'll keep coming for years now. [*Laughter*]

I say that because the spark of hope is what keeps us all going. I say it because don't you ever forget that when our opponents have nothing else to offer—when they don't have a health care plan and they don't have an economic plan and they don't want to vote for any tough decisions to reduce the deficit and they are mad because the Democrats are now the engine of change on issues like welfare reform and crime—then they resort to the politics of division and distraction and destruction, almost like angry people that want to bring the house down instead of help to build it up. Well, my friends, we aim to keep on building it up, and you've helped us to do it tonight.

We've got a lot of help in Washington from Floridians, and starting with your wonderful Attorney General, Janet Reno, and our EPA Administrator, Carol Browner. But we also see the example of what we want to do in the work that is being done here by your leaders in Florida.

In 1992, when Al and Tipper Gore and Hillary and I campaigned all across this country, we did it because we really wanted to change this country. I was having as much fun as I had ever had in my life being Governor. I wasn't tired of doing it, even though I'd been doing it for 12 years. I was just sort of getting warmed up, about to get the hang of it. I got into the race for President for the reasons that Lawton Chiles mentioned. I believed our country was adrift, that we were coming apart when we ought to be coming together, that because it was painful politically, no one really wanted to face the hard issues and take the tough decisions that needed to be made to move the country forward.

I always thought that public life at best was about bringing people together and bringing out the best in people and actually getting things done, so that next year you could talk about a new set of problems—you wouldn't have to keep on talking about the same old thing over and over again—and people could have the sense that they were moving their lives forward and that together we were doing that. And yet, in Washington, we were treated to the sort of endless orgy of posturing and political rhetoric and obsession with who had power, not what was being done with power.

For in the end, in this country, the power belongs to you. It doesn't belong to the President; it doesn't belong to the Congress, even though they don't like to admit it sometimes; it doesn't even belong to our friends in the press. It belongs to you. The rest of us are all—[*applause*]—the rest of us in various ways are all your hired hands. And we serve for a little while to do our anointed tasks, and then our time is over.

So I say to you tonight, I want you to think about what it would take for you to get your money's worth out of this dinner. What is it that we would have to do to make it worth the investment of time and effort as well as money to move America forward?

You know, I really admire a lot of the things that my longtime friend Lawton and Buddy MacKay have done here in Florida, because they knew if they did some of the things that needed to be done, their popularity would go down. They proved that you can govern in an austere fiscal climate, that you could have diversity in government and still have excellence. They reformed workers' compensation and increased the technological capabilities of this State. They've been tough and smart on crime. And they passed a remarkable health reform plan. But if you look at the struggles that they went through and the beatings they took, and you look at what I've been through last year and what I'm facing this year in Congress, just to do the work I got hired to do, never mind the sideshows, it's like old Yogi Berra saying, "It's *deja vu* all over again."

Look at the health care plan. Florida adopted a fascinating health care plan. It may not be perfect, but it's a whole lot better than just letting things drift. And there is no such thing as a perfect plan. When we were putting together our national health program, we looked very closely at what Florida had done, especially the idea of bringing people together, small business people and self-employed people, school districts and others, in large purchasing co-ops called alliances so that they can get lower costs. Florida is on the frontline of this effort to reform health care. And as you have found in Florida, change is hard. If it were easy, the Republicans would have done it, and they'd still have the White House.

What I want to say to you is, I did not run for President to hold the office, to live in the White House, although it is a magnificent place and it still gives me chills every time I walk in the door and realize that every President since John Adams has lived there. I was perfectly happy in my family life and my work life doing what we were doing before. And I ran because I thought that we ought to change the country. In health care, I thought we ought to keep what's good about our system and change what's wrong, the crazy financing system, get rid of unfair insurance practices, and do it in a way that wouldn't make the insurance companies go broke.

That's why we need big buyers groups. If you want to say, "Don't discriminate against people because they're older; don't discriminate against people because they have had an illness in their family; don't discriminate against people because they're small business people or self-employed people," and you want to be fair and say, "How are you going to do that with insurance without bankrupting people?"—you have to have them in big pools.

I think we ought to keep the right to choose doctors. People are losing the right to choose their doctor rapidly today. Fewer than half the people insured in the work force have it. Our plan increases choice, not decreases choice. That's the ultimate mockery of a lot of these ads that are being run.

I think we ought to keep Medicare. It works. But we ought to strengthen it. We ought to cover prescription medicine, and we ought to cover long-term care in the home and in the community so that people aren't forced to go into a nursing home when it costs more money, if they can have some alternative care first.

And if we do it right, we'll improve the quality of care and moderate cost increases. How do I know that? Look at Florida's purchasing alliances. The bids are coming in for health care from 5 to 40 percent below current costs. Why? Because when you put people together in larger groups, you can afford to insure them at a lower cost per person without bankrupting the insurers.

The same thing is happening here in a number of other areas—in the crime area, where I perceive you're trying to be tough and smart. You know, it's easy when people are scared to death—and Lord knows they are all over the country today—to say things that excite crowds about crime. But let me tell you, the first job I ever had as a public servant was as the attorney general of my State. And I was very close to and very involved with law enforcement during my entire public career, before I ever became President. And one thing I know is, it's one thing to talk about crime in a way that gets a crowd to stand on their feet and shout and ventilate, and another thing to do something about it. And I think we, all of us, should be intent on doing something to make our streets and our schools and our homes safer places for our children to grow up in and our people to live in.

So, you saw the movie. That's what we did last year. That's what you hired me to do. Let's talk about this year. This year we need to pass health care reform. We don't need to do it next year or the year after or the year after

that. Every other advanced economy in the world has found a way to provide high quality health care to all its citizens. Only the United States has not done it. It is time for us to stop making excuses and start making progress. We can do it.

The Congress has before it today a crime bill which would put another 100,000 police officers on the street, well-trained, community policing, knowing the neighbors, knowing the folks on the block, not only catching criminals but preventing crime. I know it will work. I know it will work. I saw it happen in Houston, a city with a very high murder rate, where in a matter of 15 months, the crime rate went down over 20 percent, the murder rate went down over 20 percent, and the mayor got reelected with 91 percent of the vote—because lives changed. This will work. And our bill bans 28 kinds of semiautomatic assault weapons that are not necessary for sporting or hunting and are used to kill. And it's the right thing to do.

The bill is smart and tough. It gives drug treatment for people who need it. It provides for innovations like the drug court you have here in Miami that Janet Reno and my brother-in-law and so many other people worked to make very, very important and nationally recognized. It provides funds for our young people to have recreation in school, before and after school. It provides something to say yes to as well as to say no to. And yes, it's tougher. It says if you commit three violent crimes that threaten people's safety, you can never be paroled; "three strikes and you're out." Smart and tough; that's what we ought to do, and we have to pass it.

We're going to give the Congress a welfare reform bill that gives a genuine chance for people to escape the trap of welfare dependency, make it a second chance, not a way of life; say, "We'll give you education and training and child support, and then after 2 years, if you haven't found a job, you must go to work even if it's in a public service job." [*Applause*] But let me say—I'm glad you're clapping for it, but let me make the point. We can only do that if we also provide health care.

You know, I met a woman just this week, just this week, who said, "I got off welfare and I went to work. I didn't have a lot of education; I didn't get a great job, but I went to work because I wanted to work. I was proud. But do you know, I didn't have health care coverage at my job, but when I was on welfare I had health care through the Medicaid program. So by going to work, I gave up my child's health care so that I could pay taxes to pay for the health care for people on welfare."

Now, you don't have to be as bright as a tree full of owls to know that doesn't make a lot of sense. [*Laughter*] So don't listen to our adversaries. There will be, ultimately, no real welfare reform until there is health care reform, because people are not going to put their kids at risk in this country. You must do both.

We have a whole passel of education bills up there. Your education commissioner is here; he told me tonight that all the State education commissioners have endorsed our education reforms, world-class standards, grassroots reforms, innovative things we're encouraging that for too long the National Government has not encouraged local school systems to try, but still saying the ultimate test is, "What are the kids learning?" And we're going to say, "Here's what they should know by world-class standards"—judge every school, every district, see what the children are learning—but encourage people to try new and different and innovative things; if they're not working, try something else.

We're going to have a system which will provide an opportunity to move from school to work with further training for all people who don't go on to 4-year colleges. You know that the unemployment rate for high school dropouts in this country is 11.5 percent; for high school graduates, it's 7.2 percent; for people with 2 years of further training after high school, it's 5.4 percent; and people with 4 years of college, it's 3.5 percent. And the average annual earnings by category go up about $4,000 a category. We have got to find a way to give the young people who aren't going to finish 4-year colleges at least some sort of further training in school and on the job while they're working. We have to abolish this notion that there's a real difference between what's vocational and what's academic in education and move to the future. And we have to do it not just for those folks but for people in the work force, no matter what their age. The average person will change work eight times in a lifetime. I meet people in their fifties now all the time that lost their jobs, had to get retrained, had to get new jobs in different lines of work—all the time.

We've got an unemployment system—we've got a lot of employers here—you all are paying that unemployment tax into a system that's flat busted. It was established for a time that no longer exists, when people who were unemployed were called back to their jobs after what the economists called a cyclical recession passed. Today, most of the changes in this economy are structural. Most people who lose their jobs do not get called back to their old jobs. We don't need an unemployment system in which employers pay that unemployment tax for people to live on a lower wage until their benefits run out and they still don't have any place to go. We need to have a reemployment system where the day people lose their jobs, they are immediately eligible for retraining so that they can go back to work quicker, put less burden on the unemployment tax, and become productive, taxpaying citizens again. That's what we need in this country.

Now, this is what I thought public life was about, and this is what I think the Presidency is about, and this is what I think the Congress ought to be about and what I think the American people really care about: How are we going to get together; how are we going to get things done; how are we going to lift up the human potential of the American people? That's why I ran for President, and that's what's going to make this dinner worth your investment tonight, if we do what we're supposed to do.

Last year we passed the NAFTA treaty, and it was a good first step. But we knew we had to do more. The Vice President is in Latin America even as we speak, and we are going to have the Summit of the Americas here in Miami in December. And we're going to do it because we know that Latin America is the second fastest growing region of the world economically. They are our neighbors, and we are bound up together in a common future. We must share our democracy; we must share trade and investment; we must share a common commitment to building each other up. And we will win if we do it. Miami is the right place to do it because you are, I believe, committed to building the kind of multiracial, multiethnic, harmonious, successful democracy that the world will look to in the 21st century. And so we will work on that at the summit. Then I hope the next time we have a summit, we'll be joined by a democratically elected leader from a free Cuba.

Now, until that happens, this administration will support the act which Senator Graham sponsored, which requires us to maintain a strong economic embargo as leverage for democratic reform. We will also continue to make it clear that we want to reach out to the Cuban people, as is provided in the act, with private humanitarian aid and more information. We have no quarrel with the Cuban people. We want them to be part of our common destiny. We want them to go into the 21st century a free people in partnership with us.

Let me say this, we want the same thing for the people of Haiti, too, and they deserve it as well. As long as the dictators who have prevented President Aristide from returning and who continue to thwart democracy and continue to abuse human rights and continue to kill innocent people persist in trying to hold on to power, we will maintain the economic sanctions which are standing up against their clouding of international law and their own agreements. These are things we must do in our own backyard.

Now, let me say that Lawton Chiles described to you the Democratic Leadership Council group that he and I got together through, again, as a group that tried to go beyond the partisan politics that paralyzed us in the eighties. We tried to find new ideas and new solutions, and we have reached out to all people who wanted a change, without regard to their party label. We had Republicans for Clinton-Gore organizations in many States in this country, and they played a decisive role in our victory in some States. And I have done my best to reach out to Republicans in the Congress, and I will continue to do so. I have been, frankly, dismayed at the level of intense partisan opposition present on so many issues. And when that has dissipated, I have been hopeful, and the country has been better off for it.

The Republican Party has not always been against change or unity. It has not always been obsessed with personal power and just in a snit because they didn't have the White House. The Republican Party, after all, gave us Abraham Lincoln, without whom we would not be here tonight. The Republican Party gave us Theodore Roosevelt who taught us to save our natural resources and spoke out against the dangers of too much concentrated power in public or private life. Even President Nixon signed the Environmental Protection Agency bill and first pro-

posed that employers ought to contribute to their employees' health insurance so we could have universal health coverage for everybody.

Today, instead of that, they don't offer a lot of new ideas, and they often offer blatant, blind, partisan opposition. Last summer, we were fighting for a budget to cut the deficit, get the economy moving again, hold interest rates down. You know what they said? One Republican Senator said, "If this plan passes, we're buying a one-way ticket to a recession." Another one said, "This plan will cost American jobs, no doubt about it." In the entire House and Senate, there was not a single, solitary vote from the other party for the economic plan, not one.

What did they vote against? They voted against $500 billion in deficit reduction; tax cuts for almost 17 percent of the working families in this country who hover at the poverty line and who are raising their children, so that we could lift them beyond the poverty line and take away any incentive they would have to go on welfare and quit work; tax cuts for 90 percent of the small businesses in this country; increased capital gains for investment in new business and small business; a reform of the college loan system which cut the interest rates and strung out the repayment terms. That's what they voted against in that bill. Yes, and also raised most of your taxes in this room—1.2 percent of the American people—and every last red cent of that tax money will go to reduce the deficit, not a penny to any new program. Every cent of it goes to reduce the deficit.

And what did it produce? It produced low interest rates; low inflation; high investment; 2.1 million new jobs in 13 months, more than the entire previous 4 years; the fastest rate of growth in years; in the last quarter of last year, the fastest rate of growth in a decade. Over 5 million Americans have refinanced their homes. The budget is at the lowest percentage of our gross domestic product that it's been since 1979. The deficit is going to be a third lower than it was projected to be under my predecessor. And if Congress adopts this year's budget, we'll have 3 years of declining Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

In the House of Representatives, we had staunch opposition from the other party, not only to the budget but to the Brady bill, to the Family and Medical Leave Act—and I applaud the Republicans who voted for that; in the Senate, filibuster after filibuster, or threats of filibuster on family and medical leave, motor voter, the budget act which they couldn't filibuster but didn't vote for, the Brady bill which finally the public opinion of the country just shouted from the rafters of the Congress and they had to give up on the filibuster for. These are the kinds of things that we are facing.

Now we move to health care. In the Senate, there are some Republicans who genuinely want to provide health care to all Americans. And they have been forthcoming in talking to us. They have said they do not want to be part of just saying no. In the House, there are people who say, "We want to talk to you, but if we do, we won't have any influence in our party anymore. We haven't been given permission."

So we've got to decide, my fellow Americans, whether we are going to let partisan politics and obsession with destruction and division and distraction get in the way of why you made this investment and why Hillary and I ran, why Al Gore ran, why most of my Cabinet people left other lives and served.

And I say to you, this year we ought to say, look, let's just do something for America. Let's keep our eye on the ball. Let's not demean the political process anymore by being so intensely partisan and so obsessed with who's got power and so obsessed with hurting somebody who's got it instead of somebody who doesn't that we forget that it's all going to be gone before you know it. And all that really matters is what you do with the time you have when you have it. That's all that counts.

When it's all said and done, the people of this country are going to have health care, or they're not. We're going to reform this welfare system, or we're not. We're going to do something to make our kids safer on the streets and in their homes and the schools, or we're not. We either are, or we aren't. When it's all said and done, we're going to be closer together as an American family without regard to our race or our age or our gender or where we live or what our party is, or we're not. That is what this is about, not who's in but what we're doing while we're there. And I say to you, I will do everything I can, every day I have that job, to remember that your investment is for your children and your children's children.

Larry Hawkins gave me this picture of his granddaughter tonight at dinner, and he said, "I like you a lot, but I didn't raise all this

money because I like you. I raised all this money because this is my granddaughter, and I want her to have a better future." Praise God that he thinks that, and I hope we can do it.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 p.m. in the Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Bob Graham; attorneys Bud Stack, Marvin Rosen, and Mitch Berger; Larry Hawkins, Dade County commissioner; businessmen Jorge Perez, Monte Friedkin, and Howard Glicken; David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee; and investors Bob Farmer and Arnold Friedman.

Statement on Emergency Assistance to the Northeast Fishing Industry
March 21, 1994

New England's fisheries are experiencing a virtual collapse, threatening the livelihoods of thousands of New Englanders. The first step to recovery is to restore the supply of fish, and we are working to do that by restricting fishing. But we must address the economic impact that is being felt by individuals, businesses, and communities. These resources are targeted to specific programs that will help the industry, help people, and help communities get back on their feet.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing emergency supplemental appropriations to assist the Northeast fishing industry and communities affected by the collapse of Northeast commercial fisheries.

Remarks in a Health Care Roundtable With Small Business Leaders
March 22, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, first let me thank all of you for coming here. We have several Members of the United States Congress up here in the front. We're very glad to see all of them, and we thank them for their presence. And we have small business people here from all over America, and we thank you for your presence. We're here primarily to hear from the small business people who are here on the panel, and perhaps some others if time permits.

I just want to make a couple of comments. First of all, I very much appreciate the work that Erskine Bowles has done as Director of the Small Business Administration. I am proud of the fact that I was able to appoint someone to this job who was not just someone who had run unsuccessfully for office or was otherwise looking for a patronage appointment. This man has spent 20 years helping to finance small business creations and expansions. And therefore, he has a clearer understanding and grasp of what small businesses are really up against and the difference between the rhetoric of supporting small business and the reality of it than perhaps anyone who has held this job in a very long time. Secondly, I want to thank my good friend Congressman LaFalce for his leadership on small business issues.

Finally, let me say that everybody, I think, understands that one of the reasons that the United States has not succeeded in providing health security for all its people while every other advanced economy has done so is the difficulty posed by the greatest strength of our economy, which is that an inordinate percentage of our workers work for small business people, very small business, and increasingly, more and more of the new jobs are created by small businesses. So that presents us with a dilemma. However, we also know, if we look at the real facts, that almost all the job creators among

small business are making some effort to provide health insurance, and that those which do tend to have more stable work forces and higher productivity and greater success.

Just this week I had a good friend of mine up here with his family. He's a car dealer in my home State, and he was talking about how he'd always insured all of his employees and none of his competitors had. And in the last 20 years, three of them had come and gone, and he was still there. And one reason was, he never had any employee turnover because he always took care of his employees and their health care problems. But the struggle to get a bigger pool of insured people so that he could get his insurance cost down was a continuing one for him.

Anyway, that just brings me to this point: This administration could not in good conscience have advocated and I could not support a plan that I thought would be, on balance, bad for small business. I believe this plan is, on balance, good for small business. If I didn't, I wouldn't be supporting it. And I will not sign any bill passed by the Congress that I do not believe is good for the small business economy, because we have to create more jobs in this country.

Our plan builds on the system we have now, guaranteed private insurance. It provides more choices to employees than they now have under most health care plans, at least three a year, every year. It contains real insurance reforms that are very important to small businesses, no discrimination for preexisting conditions or based on the age of the work force. It protects Medicare. It does provide, both for Medicare people and for the work force and their families, a prescription medicine benefit and a phased-in, long-term care benefit for service at home, for example, for disabled people or elderly people as well as in institutional settings. And it does have an employer mandate, but with strong discounts for small businesses with modest payrolls and modest profit margins.

Now, there will be countless discussions about what the proper details of that should be, but it seems to me that that is the only approach that has a reasonable chance of being successful in this environment. And as I said, there are people who will propose variations on it, but that, it seems to me, is what we ought to be doing.

My purpose today is to show that there is a great difference in the rhetorical pronouncements of some organized groups and the real life experiences of a lot of business people. And we have here people who have been affected by the present health conditions. And I am frank to say that while most of the people who are on this panel who are providing health insurance today would actually pay less under our plan, some would pay more, and they know it. But they also know that for the first time their competitors would as well, putting them on a more even footing.

So let's get into the panelists, hear their stories, and give them a chance to comment.

I'd like to start with Mona Castillo, who founded Monarch Graphics, a trophy and plaque manufacturer in Chicago, and who was the Chamber of Commerce national minority entrepreneur of the year award winner in 1993. And I'd like to ask Mona to talk a little bit about her difficulties in providing coverage for her employees and finding an insurance company who will do it.

Mona.

[*At this point, Mona Castillo, chief executive officer, Monarch Graphics, Chicago, IL, discussed difficulties presented by having uninsurable employees; Betty Hall, owner, Hall Manufacturing Co., Inc., Brookline, NH, discussed loss of coverage by Blue Cross/Blue Shield, limiting her company's options for health care coverage; and Spence Putnam, chief operating officer, Vermont Teddy Bear Co., Shelburne, VT, discussed difficulties in providing coverage for employees.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Let me just try to emphasize a couple of the points that were made here, because they are different issues. Mr. Putnam wants to insure all of his employees, today can only insure about two-thirds of them. So he would actually pay more if our plan passed, but he'd get to insure all of his employees and they would also have more primary and preventive care than they have now and lower deductibles. But he would be, again, on an even scale with his competitors.

Betty Hall talked about—I wanted to make sure you understand what she meant when she talked about her situation in New Hampshire, because she doesn't have Blue Cross options for her business but does have the matching Thornton option. She has an HMO option. And the HMO has a very good reputation in New Hampshire and throughout New England; I think everybody would admit that. But the indi-

viduals who work for her now don't have the choice that, if our plan passed, every year her employees would get to choose either the HMO or one of two other options. And under our plan, she would pay the same no matter what. But if the employee wanted to pay a little more for fee-for-service medicine, the employee would have that right. So that's how that would work.

If you go back to what Mona said about two of her employees being uninsurable, it's important here, I think, to recognize a certain truth about the insurance business itself. While certainly I have been critical of insurance practices of which I do not approve, I think it is also important for us to understand that given the organization of the insurance business today, it is economically impossible for a lot of these health insurance companies to do other than they do because they are dealing with a very small pool of people.

So if you insure, let's say, an employee unit the size of her company and two of them are really sick or they have two kids who have been really sick, then that can double the cost of whatever your annual premiums are in a year, which is why we have worked so hard to find a mechanism—and I'll say more about this in a minute—to let insurance companies insure people the way grocery stores make money, a little bit of money on a lot of people. And that's what all this—and I'm going to say more about this toward the end of the hour because I don't want to interrupt the flow of the people talking, but that's the dilemma we face about whether there should or should not be a health alliance, a buyer's co-op or something.

You've got to have these folks able to go into big enough pools so that the insurance companies themselves do not go broke. They're in business, too. And the economics have to work out. And the only way the economics can work out is if the risks which all small businesses are subject to can be widely spread over a bigger pool. So we'll come back to that.

I want to introduce now Murray Horowitz, who currently covers his employees today but has had to take some pretty strong steps to keep covering them. Murray, would you like to speak about that?

Murray Horowitz. As a pawnbroker, I represent one of the most misunderstood industries in the country.

The President. Want to come to work up here? [*Laughter*]

[*Murray Horowitz, owner, City Pawn Shop, Baton Rouge, LA, discussed increasing costs, increasing deductibles, and employees who are uninsurable because of preexisting conditions.*]

The President. Same thing—81 million Americans have preexisting conditions of some kind or other. This is not a small problem; this is a big problem. Those who are in families that are insured through government or larger employers are okay now except that most of them couldn't change jobs and go to work for any of you or couldn't start their own business. You know, a lot of people, that's a lifetime dream to start their own business. It takes enough courage, as all of you know, to do that if you don't have to worry about this.

So you've got 81 million Americans, some in the situation of your employee who can't get insurance, others who pay very much higher rates, and millions and millions—no one knows exactly how many, but literally tens of millions who are locked in the jobs they are now in because they can't afford to give them up and lose in coverage. So it's a significant issue.

Congressman, would you like to say something about any of this? I haven't heard from you since the beginning.

[*Representative John J. LaFalce discussed town meetings in which constituents described dramatic cost increases, increasingly limited choice, and increases in deductibles and copayments.*]

The President. We have someone here from your home State, Elaine Stone, of American Aviation in New York, who has gone to extraordinary efforts to cover her employees at very high cost. I'd like to ask her to explain her situation and what the consequences have been.

[*Elaine Stone, owner, American Aviation International Corp., New York, NY, discussed her desire to provide coverage for all employees and described her current self-insured plan which splits funding between the corporation and the insurance company.*]

The President. Thank you very much.

Let me say because of the unique sort of semi-self-insured system that Elaine has, and because she's had some significant illnesses in her work force, she would actually, at least based on the last year or two's experience, pay consid-

erably less than she is paying because of the self-insurance schemes kicked in. It works, again, like everything else—it may work very well for large employers, but for someone with a couple of dozen employees, it is a very high-risk strategy that can work real well until it doesn't anymore.

I'd like to now talk about people who are kind of the other side of that equation, people who would like to cover all their employees but can't and therefore only cover a portion of them or have had to give up coverage. And I'd like to begin with Judith Wicks who owns the White Dog Cafe in Philadelphia. Because, as I'm sure all of you know, the people in the restaurant business have been among those most concerned about this health care plan because there are so many people who work for restaurants and delis and other eating establishments who are young, who are single, who don't have health insurance, and who are still willing workers there. But there are an awful lot of people who very much want to cover folks.

And the press will remember, we were in an establishment in Columbus, Ohio, just a couple of weeks ago, where by accident—we didn't plan to go there for health care—but where we had a whole health care seminar because only half the employees were covered and the person covering them wanted to cover them all.

So Judith, why don't you talk a little bit about your situation?

[*Judith Ann Wicks, owner, White Dog Cafe, Philadelphia, PA, said she was able to provide insurance coverage for only a small percentage of her employees and that the health care plan would provide full coverage for only a small increase in cost while placing all restaurants on an equal competitive footing. Representative LaFalce then discussed sources of opposition to the plan and reiterated that it would place all restaurants in the same competitive position.*]

The President. Do you think he feels strongly about that? [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

Erskine Bowles. Mr. President, we also have another restauranteur here, who runs the Burrito Brothers chain here. They're three Mexican fast food restaurants. Eric's also experienced some of these same problems that small businesses face in trying to provide health care coverage. And Eric, you might want to comment on how you would react if it was a level playing field and you could provide reasonable coverage at reasonable cost.

Eric Sklar. First let me say that, what Judy said notwithstanding, I hope jobs are lost to Mexican food. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, if I'm setting the pace, you've got a good chance of achieving that objective. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Sklar, owner, Burrito Brothers, Washington, DC, discussed the plan's benefits for the restaurant business, citing the advantage of having employees with health care coverage, and indicated his willingness to pay more to secure health care for employees.*]

The President. Thank you. I just want to say that Eric and Judy represent an interesting thing that we have seen basically around the country with people who really are trying to do the right thing by their employees. If you are in the restaurant business and you insure part of your employees, you are in the worst of all worlds. You're still at a competitive disadvantage to people who don't insure anybody, and you feel terrible that you can't insure everybody. That's basically what they face.

[*Administrator Bowles introduced Garth Sheriff, owner, Sheriff Associates, Los Angeles, CA, who discussed the dilemma of having to choose between keeping an employee or keeping health insurance for his firm and the difficulties presented by a group of aging workers in terms of insurance costs and then strongly endorsed the health care plan.*]

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I'd like to, first of all, thank you and thank your group and thank you for sharing your painful experience with us. I'd like to go on and sort of pursue this theme a little more and call on Brian McCarthy, who owns the McCarthy Flowers, a large florist in Scranton, and ask him to tell us a little about his situation.

Brian.

[*Brian McCarthy, owner, McCarthy Flowers, Scranton, PA, discussed the problem of attracting unskilled workers from welfare who would lose health care coverage from Medicaid for their families and also attracting skilled managers who would not take positions without adequate health care coverage.*]

The President. Thank you very much. I just want to emphasize one comment Brian made, and if I might go back to what our restauranteurs also said there. One of the arguments that the Restaurant Association makes against our doing this is they say, "Well, you know we have a lot of young single workers that are healthy, they're strapping. They don't want insurance, or if they do have it, they ought to be able to get it much more cheaply than older workers." Because young single workers will pay higher per person premiums under our plan. That's what community rating is all about. If you put people in large pools with older people and with families with a lot of kids and the kids have been sick, you average it out. So they will pay a modestly greater amount, and therefore, the employer contribution for them will be modestly greater.

I'd like to make two arguments in response to that. One is one Brian made. A lot of the young single people we want to be workers in this country are on welfare. They all have health insurance for themselves or their children through the Medicaid program which is as generous as most health insurance programs. And yet, we want them to move from welfare to work and take jobs in our small businesses and give up health insurance for their children so they can then start paying taxes to pay for the health care of people who made the other decision to stay on welfare. I mean, it's just a—we cannot reform this welfare system unless we fix this problem. So there are a lot of young single potential workers out there we cannot even get in the workplace unless we deal with this.

The second point that I'd like to make is that the fastest growing group of people in America are older Americans. And people are going to be working later and later and later in their lives. Indeed, the gradual phase-up of the Social Security retirement age starts in a couple of years as a result of the Social Security Reform Act of 1983, raising retirement age by a month a year over several years to go up to 67. And if you don't want discrimination, if we need older people, if we know they're very good employees and they're very reliable and you don't want discrimination against them in the workplace, one sure way to avoid it is to make sure that their health insurance premiums are not discriminatory.

I see a lot of older people who work in eating establishments, too. So this thing, I think, will balance out and is ultimately fair. I especially thank Brian for his statement because he does cover all his employees today. And it shows you, I think, he really is thinking towards the future.

Administrator Bowles. Mr. President, we also have here Chris Maas, who has experienced some of these same problems of trying to compete for labor with absolutely skyrocketing costs in health care.

Chris, do you want to talk about it a second?

Chris Maas. We're a small computer consulting firm here in Washington. We do most of our work with Washington area lawyers, and we need professional help. And the one competitive advantage that we have as a little firm—[*laughter*].

The President. Every one of you has a one-liner for that, don't you? [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Maas, owner, Potomac Consulting Group, Arlington, VA, discussed problems he confronted in hiring older employees due to health insurance issues and stated that health care should be viewed as a business issue rather than a political issue.*]

The President. Good for you. Believe you me, nothing would make me happier than to do exactly what you've said. It should not be a partisan political issue. And if you get beyond the fog of rhetoric to the hard facts of what people's actual individual circumstances are, it's very much easier for it not to be a political issue. Thank you very much. That was very impressive.

I want to talk a little bit, by giving these folks a chance to talk, about how we give small business people the ability to have competitive prices in the insurance market. And I'd like to start with Stephen Hightower of the Hi-Mark Corporation in Franklin, Ohio, and talk about how the absence of that has affected his business and his family.

Stephen.

[*Stephen Hightower, president, Hi-Mark Corp., discussed the difficulty of keeping employees without offering health care benefits and emphasized the link between welfare reform and health care reform.*]

The President. I'd like to now to go to a small family business, Kathleen Piper, who owns the Pied Piper Flower Shop in Yankton, South Dakota. I first met her a little over a year ago

when she represented small business at the economic conference we held in Little Rock shortly before I assumed the Presidency. I'd never met her before, and I didn't know anything about her, but I was deeply impressed by the comments she had to make, and we asked her to come back here today because of her own experience on health care.

Kathleen.

[*Ms. Piper discussed her inability to continue to provide health insurance for her employees and then thanked the Small Business Administration for its work in educating small business owners on the health care plan.*]

The President. Yesterday when I was in Miami, I met, as I often do when I'm traveling around the country, with some children and their families from these Make-A-Wish programs, where the kids are desperately ill and one of the things they want to do is meet the President. And I met with a family, a very impressive family of three children, two sons and a daughter, where both sons had a very rare and apparently genetically transmitted propensity to have a very rare form of cancer. And this family has a lifetime limit on their policy, as three out of four Americans do. Three out of four Americans have lifetime limits. And they're in a real pickle, because they are going to run up against the limit long before the second child—assuming that both the boys survive, and they've done pretty well so far, but if they do both survive their illness and they're plugging along, then they'll run up against their limit long before the second child is out of the house. And then they have a third, youngest child, and thank goodness the young child so far has not contracted the disease, and of course they hope she won't. But if she does, then you can just double whatever their problem is.

Again, I would say—I want to emphasize, though, the only way this works with the private health insurance business is that you have to find a way not to bankrupt private health insurance. And a lot of these things—I've had a lot of employers—I had a restaurant owner I mentioned in Columbus, Ohio, who was very complimentary of her personal health insurers. She said, "These people are doing the best they can for me under the circumstances, given the way their business is organized and the way the market is organized." That's why you have to reorganize the market and put people into larger units and insure people on a community basis.

One of the most controversial things—I just want to mention this—one of the most controversial aspects of our plan has been the provision for small and medium-sized businesses to be in these big buying alliances. People have treated it as if it were some big new Government bureaucracy. I have seen it, quite the contrary, as a way of enforcing community rating. That is, there are some States—New York State has a law mandating community rating. But if you don't have the system within which the little guys can buy together, the law itself won't guarantee community rating.

And yesterday—I just want to read you something—yesterday in the Los Angeles Times, there is this article, "State Alliance Gives Workers Health Clout. Forty thousand workers at small California businesses will get an extraordinary piece of good news on Tuesday." That's today. "At a time when health insurance costs in the country are climbing at 6 to 8 percent a year, their premiums will actually be reduced, starting July 1st. These fortunate few are members of the State's unheralded health alliance, a purchasing agency that gives companies with between 5 and 50 workers an opportunity to band together and achieve the same buying clout the health care market gives to giant corporations. Even as President Clinton's proposal for alliances is being denounced in Washington as a blueprint for a menacing new bureaucracy, a staff of just 13 State workers in Sacramento has put together a working alliance, the first in the Nation, and the customers seem delighted."

And in Florida they've got now buying pools of small businesses—Congressman Gibbons is here—and the Governor told me last night that most small businesses that joined these alliances had experienced declines in premium costs of between 5 and 40 percent.

So I say this not to be combative, but just to ask this question: As this bill moves through the Congress, if they don't like the way we structured the alliances, you've got to find some ways to give the little guys big buying power.

Administrator Bowles. Mr. President, all these buying groups do—and I wish to goodness we'd called them buying groups instead of alliances, but all these buying groups do——

The President. I do, too. They liked it when we called NATO an alliance. [*Laughter*]

Administrator Bowles. ——is, truly, they shift the power of the marketplace. They change that supply and demand equation from favoring the supplier of health care to favoring us, the consumer and the small business owner. It's just identical to what Mr. McCarthy was here saying about what happens in the flower business. It gives us, the small business owner, some market muscle so that we can cut a good deal for our employees. That's what it does.

Q. Could I ask a question? One of the big arguments that I have heard in talking to other businesses is that everybody is concerned about the quality of health care, what's going to happen. They're afraid. Right now they may have choices; they have certain choices. And that's sort of the unknown out there. How is the quality of health care going to change?

The President. I think there are two concerns about the quality of health care that I've heard. One is, are you going to cut down on how much you spend on health care so much that there won't be enough for medical research, for technology, for things to progress? The other is, if you deprive people of choices, isn't that a backdoor way of undermining quality?

I mean, in America I think people equate—we all like to make our own decisions. So people equate choice with quality. To that I would respond in two ways: Number one, if you don't do anything, if we just let this alone, if we walk away from here and don't do anything, you will see dramatic reductions in choice. And many of you in this room will contribute to that because you will have no choice.

That's what happened to our friend from New Hampshire here. She wished to give her employees the choice between being in the HMO or insuring with fee-for-service medicine through Blue Cross. Now she has only the HMO option. She is now in the majority of employers in America who cover their employees. Now, a slight majority does not provide any choice for the employee but, in fact, makes the choice for the employee because they have no choice. You know, Mr. Sheriff here, if he were able to get back into the health insurance market, probably would have to just make the best deal he could, and the employees would have to take it or leave it.

So on the question of quality in terms of choice, under our plan, again because of marketing power, we would give—your obligation as an employer would be constant. You would pay the same no matter what. But your employees every year, because of the cooperative buying power, would be able to choose from among at least three programs. And we estimate that in most places they would always have access to an HMO. And as I said, many of them are very good, but they'll be better if they have competitive pressure. Then probably there would be a PPO—that is a professional group where doctors get together and they organize health care delivery, and normally those have many more doctors and sometimes let people in who are willing to provide the service for an approved price, so you get even more choice—and the fee-for-service medicine. And that would come up every year. So that's my answer.

And the second thing is, if you do nothing, you will continue to see a squeeze on the quality of medicine in terms of what goes into the teaching hospitals and medical research. Why do I say that? I was in Boston last week, and I met with the heads of all the teaching hospitals, after which they came out and endorsed our plan. And they said, every one of them said, "If we don't do anything, we're going to get less and less money because the people who come into our hospitals are increasingly in managed care plans where they put the squeeze on us and they cut down on the money we get for patient care." So under our plan, we increase medical research, we increase support for teaching hospitals, and that's what we have to do.

So my argument is quality will suffer if we do nothing. Choice will be restricted if we do nothing. If we move, we can increase quality and choice in a fair and balanced way.

I know we've got to wrap up. We have one more person to hear from, and the Congressman wants to make a comment.

[*Representative LaFalce indicated that the health care plan offered better quality care with its emphasis on preventive medicine and pointed to the Hawaii system as a model of success.*]

The President. I'd like to hammer that home because a lot of people say, "Well, Bill, everybody goes to Hawaii on vacation. It's a rich State." Hawaii has a very, very large percentage of people in its health care system who are low income people, native islanders, people come in from surrounding islands, about a 20 percent load there, quite a high load. So the

health outcomes for Hawaii include a very large number of people who have to be paid for in traditional ways who aren't even in the employment system. So you just can't make that argument. I'm just trying to reinforce what he said.

Our last speaker is John Sorenson, from the WECO Supply Company, in Fresno, California. He wrote to me about one of his employees. And I thought it would be good to kind of let him close because of the concern that this employer had for his employee and how it affected his business.

[*John Sorenson, owner, WECO Supply Co., Fresno, CA, told the story of an employee who, because of job changes and changes in the company insurance plan, incurred the full cost for the births of two premature children and ultimately suffered bankruptcy, loss of credit rating, loss of his job, and separation from his wife. Mr. Sorenson concluded that the issue of coverage for preexisting conditions was the cause of the employee's problems.*]

The President. It was.

Q. And if you can accomplish that, you've got my vote for the next 20 times.

The President. Well, let me tell you, the votes that really matter here—first of all, let's give him a hand. I think that was quite a moving thing. [*Applause*] I wanted to end with that because I was so moved by the letter that he wrote to Hillary. And it seemed to sort of capture so many of these things that we talk about in kind of esoteric terms: preexisting conditions; people falling in between the gaps; why you can't change jobs; all that kind of stuff. And you hear a story and you realize that this is the business of America.

But the votes that really matter here are the votes of the Members of Congress. So before we leave, I'd like to ask the Members of Congress who sat through this entire panel to please stand and be recognized. I see Congresswoman DeLauro there and Congresswoman Eshoo there, who are standing, so they can't stand; and Congressman Serrano's in the back. Would all the Members of Congress who are here please stand so you can see them?

Thank you, Mr. Bowles. Thank you, Congressman. And thank you most of all to these fine members of our small business family in America.

Thank you. We're adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:46 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Nomination for Ambassador to the United Kingdom
March 22, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Admiral William Crowe, Jr., as Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

In announcing this nomination, the President said, "Admiral Crowe has distinguished himself throughout four decades of dedicated public service. I am very pleased that he will continue his service to this Nation and that I will be able to rely on his wise counsel in this very important position."

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

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
March 22, 1994

The President announced the nominations today of seven individuals to serve on the Federal bench. The President nominated Theodore A. McKee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He also announced six U.S. District Court nominees: Paul L. Friedman, Gladys Kessler, Emmet G. Sullivan and Ricardo M. Urbina for the District of Columbia; Vanessa

D. Gilmore for the Southern District of Texas; and Raymond L. Finch for the District of the Virgin Islands.

"These seven men and women have outstanding records of achievement in the legal profession and in public service," the President said today. "I am proud to nominate these distinguished individuals to serve as Federal judges."

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

Nomination for the Corporation for National and Community Service

March 22, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Larry Wilson to be Chief Financial Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

"Larry Wilson is an innovative and dynamic financial manager," the President said. "His leadership at USDA proves that he will be a strong addition to the National Service team. I look forward to working with him and the AmeriCorps participants on getting things done in communities throughout America this year."

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

Teleconference Announcing a Defense Diversification Grant for Charleston, South Carolina

March 23, 1994

The President. Mayor?

Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr. Mr. President.

The President. How are you doing, Mayor?

Mayor Riley. Well, I'm doing fine. How are you?

The President. I'm great. Nice to hear your voice.

Mayor Riley. Well, it's great to hear yours. And we're pulling for you, and just keep fighting and working hard. We're in your corner. And thanks for all the tremendous cooperation we've been getting from the administration with our reconversion efforts. It's been terrific.

The President. Well, thank you. As you know, I'm calling you with some good news today. The Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, is awarding $15 million in defense diversification program funds to the Charleston County Employment and Training Administration.

Mayor Riley. Well, that's wonderful.

The President. We hope it will help to retrain about 1,920 people who are being laid off from your naval complex there.

Mayor Riley. Well, Mr. President, that's great news, and it will be a huge help. We've got great workers with great skills. They will be making a career change, and to get the training to move from one career to another is essential. And this is terrific news for the Charleston community; it really is.

The President. Well, I just want to say again to you what you and I have already talked about so many times privately, and that is that I'm committed not just to training and preparing those folks for other careers but seeing to it that the base facilities themselves are successfully redeveloped. And I know that your BEST committee is aggressively moving forward with redevelopment planning. And I commend you for that, and I just want to tell you so you can tell them that I am, personally, and this whole administration is committed to working with them and making the best use of those enormously important facilities there.

Mayor Riley. Well, that's wonderful. Thank you, Mr. President. We have a great committee. They've done a terrific job and I want you to know, from the people in your White House, Secretary Perry on down, the response couldn't be better and more enthusiastic and supportive.

And as I told you in our private conversation, our goal—and told Secretary Perry—is to make Charleston a model that you can point to of where a major reconversion occurred and occurred successfully.

The President. Well, I know Secretary Perry and the Navy Secretary, John Dalton, have been down there, and I know that the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment has already provided about $2 million in planning grants. But we want to keep going, and we want to assist those workers as they begin their transition to new careers. And I think you've already got a transition assistance center open on the base.

Mayor Riley. We do, yes, sir, a very fine one.

The President. So we now will be able to provide with today's grant the full array of services through that one-stop career center there, including counseling and basic skills remediation and occupational skills training and other kinds of things that we believe will really help to get people new jobs, and hopefully as good or better than the ones they're losing. We're going to do the very best we can on that.

Mayor Riley. It's going to be a huge help, and we are going to make Charleston a model, one that you can proudly point to.

The President. You can do it. I know you can. We'll do whatever we can to work with you.

Mayor Riley. Well, thank you. Thanks for everything.

The President. Tell everybody in Charleston I said hello. I always love coming there, and I hope I get to come again soon.

Mayor Riley. Well, I will. Somebody just a couple of weeks ago gave me a picture of you and I talking on January 1st, 1992.

The President. It was the first stop I made in the new year, 1992.

Mayor Riley. That's right. Well, I've got a picture of us chatting. I was doing the talking, and they subtitled it, "Low country advice." [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, it was pretty high-brow advice from the low country, I'll tell you that.

Mayor Riley. Well, it was heartfelt, and we're very proud of you.

The President. Good luck to you.

Mayor Riley. Thanks for all your help.

The President. Thanks, bye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:44 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to the Building Economic Solutions Together (BEST) committee on redevelopment of the Charleston naval complex.

Teleconference With the California Medical Association
March 23, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Dr. Holley, for that kind introduction and for your good work and the good work of all the physicians whom you represent now in dealing with these very difficult and complex and profoundly important issues. I regret not being able to join you in person today, but I am glad that Ira Magaziner is able to be there with you. I'm glad I had a chance to visit with you, Dr. Holley, and your past president, Dr. Richard Corlin, in Washington recently, following another health care forum. And I'm grateful for many reasons for your continued good counsel and for this invitation to address you.

Each of you has, in the most personal way, been part of the excellence in American medicine simply by caring for the families in your communities. And I'm grateful that you understand that our health care system needs dramatic reform. You know costs are rising too fast, that paperwork is mounting too much, that every day more constraints are placed on your patients and your ability to practice medicine the way you know it should be practiced.

But unlike so many others in the debate who will only tell us what they don't want to change, long ago you left the sidelines and became advocates for responsible, comprehensive reforms. I appreciate the early and continued support you have shown for the objectives we are trying to achieve: providing Americans guaranteed private insurance, preserving the right of everyone to

choose his or her own doctor and their own health care plans, outlawing unfair insurance practices, protecting and strengthening Medicare, and linking these health benefits to the workplace, where most people get their insurance today.

These reforms are entirely consistent with many of the things that you have tried to do in California. Your health care providers have been innovators in improving quality and controlling costs. And judging from today's headlines, the new California purchasing pool is certainly a step in the right direction, offering consumers a wide choice of plans, a comprehensive benefit package, and lower rates. That kind of competition between insurers, combined with more choices for consumers, is what my plan is all about.

At a national level, I think the first step we must take is clear. The best way to preserve what's right about our health care system is to guarantee private insurance to every American. That's the foundation of our health reform plan. We'll provide every American with a health security card that will guarantee them a comprehensive package of benefits that can never be taken away. The benefits will include for the first time for many Americans prescription drugs and preventive care. All of you know that the best way to keep people healthy is to promote wellness in addition to treating sickness. Retaining choice of doctors and health plans is also critically important to Americans and to American medicine. And this, too, is central to our approach.

Today, only about half of American employers offer their employees more than two choices of insurance plans; 90 percent of the businesses that have 25 workers or less offer no choice at all. And even for those who have some choice today, there's no guarantee they'll have it tomorrow if they change jobs or lose their job or if their employer has difficulty meeting the costs. This is a tremendous restraint on most Americans.

My proposal will guarantee the great majority of Americans far more choice of both doctors and insurance plans than they have now. Under this approach, people will be able to join a traditional fee-for-service plan, a network plan, or a plan sponsored by a health maintenance organization. But in all cases it will be families, not employers or insurance companies, that make the health care choices.

The people who are telling you we don't offer enough choice, which is clearly not so on its face, are the same who for decades have been pushing you out of the way and limiting your choices. You don't believe their arguments and neither do we.

That's why, among other things, we're going to insist upon different insurance practices: no more preexisting conditions, no more lifetime limits, no more higher rates for those who have had someone in their family sick or those who are older, no more overcharging of small employers or dropping them because one person in the workplace has a medical problem, no more avoiding people who might cost some money.

The fact is, increasingly insurance companies set your fees. They second-guess your clinical decisions. More and more they make you get prior approval from someone who's thousands of miles away who's never seen your patient and doesn't have a clue about what really ought to be done. They all pay according to their own fee schedules, requiring different forms for different people under different circumstances. The forms are drowning the health care system in paper.

I have a doctor friend who calls me about every 3 months to tell me another horror story. Recently he told me, "We've got all these people doing paperwork. Now we've hired somebody who doesn't even fill out forms, just spends all day on the telephone beating up on the insurance companies about the forms we've already sent in." He's told me, he said, "I went to medical school to practice medicine, but I'm getting lost in the funhouse instead." Well, he's right, and I know a lot of you agree with him and identify with that story. But this year we can escape that funhouse.

The fourth element of our approach is to preserve and protect Medicare. Older Americans will continue to choose their doctor and their plan. And in addition, we want to cover prescription drugs under Medicare and provide new options for long-term care in the home and community, which most people prefer and which will become increasingly important as our population continues to age rapidly.

Finally, let me say again, we should guarantee these health benefits at work; that's how most people are insured now. And 8 of 10 uninsured Americans have a family member who works. This is the fairest and most efficient approach

to covering everyone. And so no one gets hurt by the needed reforms, we'll provide discounts for small businesses and breaks for self-employed people and their families.

This is the proposal; it's pretty straightforward. All Americans will get a card that guarantees with it the security of private insurance and comprehensive benefits; then they can pick the doctor they want. They'll know that they're always covered by what is said to be covered, and it won't be subject to change by anyone.

Before taking your questions now, let me again just express my deep thanks for your continued support and encouragement. After 60 years, I think this is the year we're going to provide every American health security that can't be taken away. I'm optimistic because of what's already been done. This Congress has been willing to act and to work with me to pass an economic plan that's helped to produce low interest rates and high [low] [1] inflation and more than 2 million new jobs. After 7 years, this Congress passed and I signed the Brady bill and the family and medical leave bill, things that people had given up on getting done. The point is not that we have been able to do so much but that that is evidence that we can still do what we have to do.

The American people have demanded that we make a great deal happen. They want their dreams back, and they want this problem fixed. A big part of the American dream has always been knowing that you can care for your children or your family if they become sick. That's what you do. You're a part of every American family's dream. I've seen the magic you perform all over the country. You care, and the American people know it. And our challenge now is to do everything possible to keep and protect the bond that you've worked a lifetime to establish. Our challenge is to provide every American health care that's always there. With your help, we can do that and we can make history.

I thank you for the leadership you've already shown. And if you have questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them. Thank you very much.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. I wonder if you have a contract with Coca-Cola. [*Laughter*]

The President. I forgot to put it in a cup. There goes my Pepsi voters. [*Laughter*]

Q. Well, Mr. President, as you acknowledged, the California Medical Association has been deeply involved working for health system reform. You know, I think you have to realize that we had Harry and Louise opposing us when they were only engaged. [*Laughter*]

The members of this house, representing 40,000 practicing California physicians, are vitally concerned about what is contained in any proposal for health system reform. We will, after all, be caring for our patients within whatever structure is created by those changes. We want to be as certain as possible that it's going to work. We have some questions for you that will address some of those physician concerns. And I'm going to take the opportunity to ask the first one.

Mr. President, in your State of the Union Address, you said that you would sign a health reform bill if it met the test of universal coverage. In addition to universal coverage, what other elements do you believe critical to a reform package, and what must be included to secure your signature?

The President. Well, I want to be very careful about how I answer that because I don't want to be throwing down gauntlets that may mean more than I wish to say. But let me say, to have a system that works, you not only have to have universal coverage but it seems to me that the benefits ought to include primary and preventive care. There ought to be a comprehensive set of benefits.

Then there ought to be a clear outlawing of insurance practices which have caused so much misery and caused so many Americans to fall between the cracks. I think there should be an end to lifetime limits. I think there should be an end to preexisting conditions. I think there ought to be an end to discriminatory rate-setting based on age.

In order to do this, I think we have to find some way of not only legislating community rating but actually having community rating. And we need a device that guarantees that small businesses and self-employed people will have access to insurance at competitive rates with people who are insured through big business and Government. I think that's very, very important. So these are the things that I think are critical.

Now, if you're going to cover everybody, you have to either do it through a tax or through some device by which people pay into an insurance pool. I think the employer mandate, so-called, is the best way to do it, by providing

[1] White House correction.

guaranteed private insurance at the workplace because that's the way most Americans get their insurance today.

I know there are some small businesses for whom this would create difficulties, so we developed a system of small business discounts paid for from tax proceeds. And the taxpayers would pay to cover those who are unemployed and uninsured. That's basically the way I think the system would have to work.

There are lots of other things I think ought to be in it, but I think it's very important for the President, in the middle of a congressional process that is just now getting its sea legs and getting underway, not to be too specific in talking about vetoes.

If we can begin with a good comprehensive system of universal coverage, we can go a long way to dealing with a lot of the other problems. As you know, my plan does deal with a number of your concerns, and I know you have more questions on that, so maybe we should get to the other questions.

Q. Well, thank you very much, Mr. President. You're now going to have an opportunity to field questions from a group of pretty nervous California physicians.

Q. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. President. I'm a family physician in San Bernardino. I have a unique opportunity here to ask you a question, particularly because I was a graduate from the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

The President. Good for you.

Q. Thank you very much. And I had an opportunity to campaign for you in 1982 when you made your comeback election for the governorship. So what I would like to ask you, Mr. President, is that physicians are concerned that in the current marketplace and under your proposed model, insurers and businesses are encouraged to collectively purchase health care services. However, antitrust laws prohibit physicians from collectively selling their services. It's like requiring individual autoworkers to negotiate their salaries separately with General Motors.

In light of the strong opposition of the Federal Trade Commission to any changes in antitrust laws, what would you propose to provide a more balanced and fair environment in which these negotiations can occur between physicians and insurers?

The President. I think we have to change the antitrust laws to allow you to organize to provide your services in more comprehensive professional groups. And let me say that one of the things that has concerned me most about this is that there is a development in American health care which I like, which has a consequence that I don't like. I like the fact that people are getting together in competitive buying groups and trying to get a better deal and trying to squeeze some of the excess cost out of our system. I think we all agree there are some there. I don't like the fact that an inevitable consequence of that has been that so many Americans have lost the right to choose their own doctor. We try to address this in two ways, one of which directly addresses your question. But let me try to put the two ways together so they'll fit.

Under our plan, each American consumer, once a year, would have the right to choose from at least three plans, including a fee-for-service plan, an HMO, and hopefully some sort of provider plan that will be provided by providers who get together and who may allow all doctors in a State, for example, to participate if they agree to observe the fee schedule that the plan bargains for. So, I think you ought to be able to do that. We also think that the HMO's should have to have a fee-for-service option that would allow people who are covered under the HMO the option to choose another doctor if it seemed appropriate. And if the fee-for-service option were elected at the beginning of the year, the HMO would have to contribute to that.

So I think that this will help. But I agree that there must be some changes in the antitrust laws so that you can clearly get together without fear of legal repercussions. Otherwise, you are consigned to dealing with a middleman that will only add to the cost of your providing your services and undermine the choice that the consumer gets.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I'm an oncologist practicing in Redwood City in northern California. My question is about budgets and living within our means for health care. We recognize the need for controlling health care costs; there's no debate about that. However, we are concerned that your proposal and others may limit the rise of the health care budget to the cost of living or other artificial indexes that may have little to do with actual health care costs. Rising health care costs may

be more related to human factors such as our aging population, tobacco consumption, new technologies, new diseases such as AIDS. How can these factors be taken into account when arriving at or when developing a health care budget?

The President. Well, first let me say that I basically agree with you on that. I have tried, not with complete success, but I've really tried hard since I started thinking about this issue seriously 4 or 5 years ago, when I was still a Governor, to identify the elements of disparity between, let's say, the 14.5 percent of their GDP that Americans spend on health care, the 10 percent that Canadians spend, the 9 percent or less that the Germans and the Japanese spend. There's no question that a lot of it is due to good factors like we invest more in medical research and technology, and that's good. And there's no question that some of it is due to bad factors that you can't do anything about, at least in your role as a doctor, which is higher AIDS rates, higher rates of violence which lead to enormous medical costs.

What we believe is that in the beginning, at least, there are many, many savings which can accrue from a rational system, far, far lower administrative and bureaucratic paperwork costs, significant reductions in unnecessary costs that are in the system; that after that, in the years ahead when we measure how much costs can increase, we're not only going to have to consider population growth and inflation, we will also have to consider the burdens of the American system if the rate of AIDS, for example, continues to go up instead of going down, if the rate of violence goes up instead of going down, if the aging population imposes greater burdens rather than fewer because we don't succeed in doing a lot of the preventive things that we're going to do.

Those things will all have to be calculated in the rate at which medical costs go up. We can't ignore real-world factors that make the CPI in health care different from the overall rate of inflation. And I think those things should be taken into account.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, sir.

Q. I'm a pediatrician from San Luis Obispo. My question to you this morning relates to the power of insurance companies. Yourself, Mrs. Clinton, and Mr. Magaziner have repeatedly stated that one of your goals is to return the control of medical practice back to physicians and hospitals. We obviously agree with that. Unfortunately, however, many of the current managed care plans in California are moving away from that goal. Mr. President, does your plan contain features which would achieve that goal?

The President. It does. I think there are some that would help indirectly and one or two that would help directly. Let me just mention them.

First, giving every consumer three choices will make a big difference, saying that every consumer has to have at least three choices and that one of those choices must always be fee-for-service. We'll put all these plans in competition with one another, and that will make a difference.

Secondly, making it easier for physicians to provide these services directly will dramatically minimize the ability of the insurance companies to add to the cost and delay and undermine the quality of health care by second-guessing everything the doctors want to do in the HMO's that they're promoting—[*inaudible*]—in our plan that the insurance companies disclose what's in their utilization review protocol in advance so people can evaluate that and know what's going on and argue against it. And competing plans, including competing physicians groups, can say, here's why this is a bad deal for you and why you shouldn't take it and why it is going to add to the cost and undermine the quality of health care.

Now, all these are things, I think, that will really make a difference. Most doctors I know recognize that from time to time there are certain things that ought to be subject to some kind of review. But basically, it's gone crazy now. It's become an instrument of denying service when it's needed. So what we've tried to do is strike the right balance here, and I hope we have.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. I must say that "Bravo" is a wonderful name for a pediatrician to have. A lot of times you can just say that to your kids, and they'll get better. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, I think the medical profession really believes that that issue is so important that if we win everything else but lose on that one, none of the other matters.

The President. It's absolutely clear to me that the whole HMO movement has taken the utilization review to an extreme and that it has

to be backed off of. Forget about the HMO, just the whole insurance—it's the insurance companies that are driving this. And I think the more we can put doctors into the management decisions of the HMO and the more choice we can give to the people who themselves will be patients, who have personal contact with their doctors—keep in mind, this is a huge deal. Letting the employees themselves make this choice, instead of their employers, means that somebody will be choosing, every plan will be chosen by someone who has had a personal relationship with a physician who has doubtless discussed this with him or her. I mean, that's going to make a big difference in this. And I agree with you, it's a very important issue.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I am a trauma surgeon in San Bernardino, California. Medical malpractice concerns and the practice of defensive medicine are serious issues associated with the delivery of care to the trauma patient. Mr. President, we are really pleased that you believe that the tort reform should be an essential part of the health care reform and have adopted some of MICRA provisions in your plan. But sir, would you be willing to add to your plan the most essential part of the MICRA, that is, a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages? And sir, if you just say yes, I would be happy.

The President. As you might imagine, we debated that thing for a long time before we presented our plan to the Congress, because we didn't want the whole health care plan to come a cropper on a debate over tort reform. We thought there had to be some. We knew that the States were taking up this issue to some extent, but we thought we ought to do something nationally, even though tort law historically has been completely within the purview of State government, not the National Government. So we agreed that there ought to be a limitation on lawyer fees, contingency fees. And we did some other things that were recommended by you and were in the model work that was done in California.

Something else we did that I think has been insufficiently noticed is we agreed to include medical practice guidelines developed by professional groups as raising a presumption that there was no negligence on the part of doctors. This offers an enormous opportunity to dramatically reduce the number of medical malpractice suits, the number of recoveries, and therefore the malpractice rates.

My own view is that based on the research I've seen in a couple of places where this has been tried on a limited basis, is it may offer the best hope of all of protecting doctors from frivolous lawsuits by simply raising a presumption that the doctor was not negligent if the practice guidelines developed by the professional groups themselves were in fact followed. So I think that that has been not sufficiently noticed. That is a very, very big step, in addition to the other things I mentioned.

My own judgment is that we will not include the national cap because there will be so much difference among the various congressional delegations from different States about what the cap should be and whether it should change with inflation over time. And in fact, you might wind up in California with a situation different from the one you have now if it were to be done. For example, if there were a debate on the national cap, then the immediate thing would be, what should the cap be, and if States have a lower one, should it be required to be raised? Because all those things were involved, we decided that we would leave the cap issue itself to State law and deal with these other matters.

I urge you to look at what we have done, because I think we've taken a long step toward trying to relieve doctors of the burden of frivolous lawsuits and trying to control the cost of malpractice insurance.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Q. Good morning, Mr. President. I'm a practicing family physician in Modesto, California. I'm also the current California Academy of Family Physicians president and past president of the Stanislaus County Medical Society.

Mr. President, when I entered medical school, I was led to believe that I would spend my career practicing health care. I find that an enormous part of my day is spent battling with health insurance clerks to get authorization for my patients to have some of the even most basic of health care. Obviously, it would be better for me to spend that time seeing patients. What will your plan do to prevent or to limit the use of these managed health care organizations from providing these—or throwing up these artificial barriers in the name of managed care, but in reality these things prevent us from providing that care?

The President. Let me try to restate what I said before. I believe that the micromanagement of medicine by insurance companies has reached an excessive point. And what we have tried to do to reduce it, since we can't—you don't want the Federal Government exactly passing laws saying what decisions can or cannot be made by physicians and others working with them. What we've tried to do is to change the whole system so that it would be much less likely.

And I will mention two things again. Number one, we make it easier for people like you to join with like-minded physicians in providing services directly or to join together and to tell people if you're going to work with them, you don't want those kinds of utilization reviews. And we require the insurance companies to disclose their utilization review protocols in advance. And they will be under much more pressure than they are now because now they won't have the same shot at business X, Y, or Z's employees because the employees themselves will be deciding whether they want an HMO, do they want a PPO, do they want some other kind of organization, or do they want to have fee-for-service medicine. Under each case the employer's responsibility is the same. So I think that we are changing the environment in ways that will really permit you to cut down, working with your fellow physicians and your patients, to cut down dramatically on the number of these abuses.

I also want to point out that if there is a single card, which we envision, which entitles a person to health care and which enables them to hook into a computer which says that they are covered and all of that, and if there is a single form related to the comprehensive benefit package which can be filled out in every doctor's office and hospital in the country and then processed by every insurance company in the country, then that is going to dramatically reduce the paperwork burden, too. I have many, many doctors complain to me that the time they have to spend and the money they have to spend in their clinics on post facto paperwork has exploded in recent years. And I think that is also very important, cutting down on that burden, not only the time but the money, is critically important. So I believe that we will make it better.

If you have further suggestions, I'd be glad to hear them. But this is an area in which it is difficult to legislate directly and in which many physicians are reluctant to have us legislate directly. It seems to me if you change the economics and change the distribution of the power of decisionmaking in this whole process, giving more to the doctors and to patients through the workplace and less to the insurance companies, that those practices will inevitably change because the shift of decisionmaking has occurred.

Q. Thank you very much. Mr. President, we know that your time is very tight. If you could spare us a few minutes, we have some other questions that we would hope to be able to put before you.

The President. Please do, because I know we've got one or two other issues that I think should be dealt with.

Q. Thank you, sir.

Q. Mr. President, I practice anesthesiology in San Diego. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to ask you a question today. Two years ago, right here in California, in this State, with the support of this organization, we passed a law that created voluntary health insurance purchasing cooperatives. In fact, you just alluded to them a few moments ago. And as you said, they so far have been enormously successful, both in extending access and in eliminating costs.

My concern is that there are some reform proposals that would cause these purchasing pools or alliances to become so large and thus so inflexible that they would in fact limit rather than enhance the competition that you yourself state, and I agree with you, that we want to see in the marketplace. So to make these entities work the way I think we both wish them to, the alliances and the purchasing pools, I believe that we need to limit their size. So my question for you this morning is, what would you propose to control the size of the purchasing pools and alliances so that they would fulfill their primary purpose of providing affordable, accessible care and not become a large, inflexible bureaucracy?

The President. Well, let me first say that I agree that we shouldn't have them become large, inflexible bureaucracies. Under our plan, the alliances would be much larger and the membership would be mandatory. But that's because we're trying to achieve something with our plan that is beyond what the alliances do.

I think it will all be debated in the Congress, and I'm certainly flexible on it.

But let me explain why we recommended larger alliances and offer you, not just you individually, sir, but your group there the opportunity to suggest to me—either to Ira Magaziner who's there or to us through a letter later—how we could achieve the same objective. Because I know a lot of people say, "Well, these alliances are too big, or the work units—you don't need people with several thousand employees in them." And at one level I think that's right, but at another level I'm not sure, and let me explain why.

The purchasing co-op that you have in California, which has worked real well, is designed primarily to give small businesses bargaining power so that they can, in effect, have the same access to health care at the same cost that people in large units like big corporations and Government do. You can do that with smaller alliances, let's say with people with a few hundred employees or 100 or whatever it is in California, 50 and down, you can do that. The same thing is now happening in Florida where they're seeing these results.

What we wanted to do with the alliances were three other things that it still seems have to be done somehow under the plan. First of all, through the alliances, we were going to distribute the small business discounts. We can find another way to do that, but that was going to be done.

Secondly, we were going to provide certain handling services basically to bring together and reduce the paperwork burdens of the physicians, the employers, and the insurance companies. We were going to do a lot of the paperwork there. That can probably be done some other place.

The other thing, though, which I think is very important and which all of you clapped when I mentioned earlier, is the alliances as large units were going to be used to make it financially possible for the insurance companies to observe community ratings. And I'd like to talk about that a minute.

There are two issues here on discriminatory rates. One is, how do you get small businesses and self-employed people access to the same rate structure presently available to big business and Government? The other is, how do you, as a practical matter, eliminate unfair billing practices without bankrupting the insurance companies that are still in the market? That is, how do you eliminate preexisting conditions? How can you afford to do away with lifetime limits? How can you eliminate rate discrimination against people with preexisting conditions in their families or against workers who are older at a time when older workers are having to change jobs a lot in their life, too?

Now, you can pass a law and say we'll have community rating. But New York did that, and yet they still don't have it. And the reason is, they don't have any mechanism within which community rating can be practically made to work in a State where you have a lot of different insurance companies. And the insurance companies simply cannot solvently—can't stay solvent and do that unless people are insured in very large pools where insurance companies can make money the way grocery stores do, a little bit of money on a lot of people.

So the fundamental difference in what California has done, which is very good, and what we are seeking to achieve is that I'm not sure that unless we have everybody below a certain substantial size in one of these alliances, we can achieve community rating. We can get better breaks within the present system for small businesses, but I am not sure we can get community rating. That's the rub. If we can solve that, I'm very flexible on the rest of this. I mean, I'm just trying to achieve an objective that we all agree is necessary.

Q. Mr. President, I practice emergency medicine in inner-city Los Angeles. Every day I see the impact of undocumented immigrants on our health care system. Mr. President, I'm grateful to you for making health system reform a top national priority. Your proposal provides health security for all citizens and $1 billion to cover noncitizens. However, in some of California's largest counties, up to 25 percent of the population are noncitizens, both legal and undocumented. Currently, Federal law and our own ethics as physicians require that we provide care. But the reality is that these costs are putting an enormous strain on our State's health care delivery system and the entire California economy. We are spending close to $1 billion in Los Angeles County alone to deliver health care to undocumented immigrants. How do you feel we can better address this problem?

The President. It's a difficult one, as you know. Let me make a couple of observations, and then say where I think we are practically.

Obviously, no State or local government should be required to shoulder the cost of immigration or the lack of an immigration policy or the inability to enforce the policy we have now at the national levels. But as a practical matter, as we all know, it happens all the time. Now, in my last two budgets, I have tried to provide more funds to California, especially in the areas of health and education, for dealing with the extra costs of immigration because I think it's not your fault.

Now, in this health care plan, we provide a billion dollars in extra money. Is it enough? Of course it's not, but it's a good step in the right direction. Let me say that if you look at the States with the big immigrant health care burden, California, Florida, Texas, New York, although there are five or six others with substantial burdens as well, our plan will save the States enormous amounts of money that they would have paid otherwise in out-of-pocket Medicaid match costs, long-term care costs, and other health-related costs, related to running public health facilities, for example. In other words, our plan—we estimate that California will save, if our plan goes into effect in 1996 or we begin to put it into effect in 1996, phasing it in, we estimate California will save about $6 billion or more between that year and the end of the decade, new money that would not have been there otherwise in this budget. That will also allow the State to divert some of those resources to health care as well as to dealing with some of your long-deferred education and other problems out there.

So I believe that, between the savings that will occur from the State of California and the funds that we can put into immigrant health care—migrant health care—directly, I think that will make a big difference. Now, let me say, this fund will start at a billion dollars, but obviously, based on the evidence and based on our ability to secure savings in other aspects of the system, Congress will be free to supplement this fund every year from now on. That's where we're going to start.

I realize it doesn't solve the whole problem. I think it's frankly all we can afford to do at the moment. And I think the savings which will flow to the State from passing this plan will be so great that they in turn will be able to do more and still have money left over to address other needs of Californians. So I hope they'll stick with it, because I think it's the best we can do right now.

Q. Mr. President, you really need to know that over half the hospitals in California are currently operating in the red. It is an urgent problem, and I hope that the solution to the problem would not be tied to the whole health system reform.

Thank you.

The President. I certainly agree with that. Let me just say one other thing. I agree that we cannot hold this problem hostage to health care. We're just trying to use the health care reform which will free up billions of dollars to put more into medical research, more into undocumented alien health care, and other things. But I agree that we have to deal with it.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Do you have time for one last question?

The President. Sure.

Q. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I practice internal medicine in Los Angeles. I also drink Diet Coke. And I'm delighted to be here this morning as president of the California Hispanic-American Medical Association. Mr. President, in California, our managed care system has evolved from what started as a not-for-profit market into one which today is dominated by large for-profit publicly traded HMO's. This evolution has also caused the profits and administrative costs of these HMO's to soar, while health care services to patients has plummeted. While the CEO's of these corporations make millions, I have to argue with these same companies who insure my patients to approve immunizations, pap smears, and mammograms. The CMA is sponsoring legislation in California to limit the administrative costs and profits of these companies. How do you feel about this situation, and how would your plan protect other States from this trend?

The President. In two or three ways. First of all, under our plan those plans will have to offer pap smears, mammograms, and other preventive and primary services. They won't be able to cut them out. Secondly, these companies will be under much more pressure to provide quality service and to siphon less money off to bureaucracy and profits than they are now because they won't be able to make a deal with employers which can then be enforced on employees. Every employee—that is, every patient you see will be able to make a new choice of plan every year. So if they get abused in year one, then

in year two, the next year, they'll be able to make the same choice they made last year all over again and choose a different plan or fee-for-service medicine or a group of physicians who are providing health care.

So this will fundamentally change the whole incentives of the system. They simply will not be able to use the fact that they have a pre-existing relationship with an employer to undermine the delivery of quality of care between the doctor and the patient, because the patient will be making a decision and every year can make another decision. And that will have a profound impact on it. And they will not be able to eliminate primary and preventive services from their package. That has to be involved. So that's going to change it. Then we will make—when we make some of the changes in the antitrust laws, which will make it even easier for physicians to get together and deliver health care directly. So these HMO's are going to be under a whole different kind of competition. It won't be competition from somebody else providing less service at lower costs, it will be competition from somebody else providing more services at higher quality with more choices for the same costs or sometimes less.

So I think this will really change things and put you and your patients much more in the driver's seat than you are now. That's perhaps the most critical element of my plan that has not been really noted. We are not restricting choice, we're expanding it. And we're putting the decision—we're moving the decision from the employer to the employee about who makes the choice, which means you're moving it to the patient. And that should be, I think, something that will make a profound difference, particularly after you all get through talking to all of them.

Q. Mr. President, everyone in this room and all the people we represent would like to thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to meet with us today. We want you to know that we're with you in this fight and we'll join with you in working with Congress in a joint effort to guarantee all Americans private health insurance that can never be taken away.

The President. Thank you. And let me just say in closing, if I could ask you one thing, it would be to impress upon the Congress the importance of acting and acting this year. This is a very complex issue. No one has all the answers. We'll be improving on what we do from now until kingdom come. But you know, more uniquely than most people do, what the consequences of not doing anything are, and that's more restricted managed care, more people without any insurance at all, more of the headaches that you have already complained about today. So you are in a unique position to embrace the fundamental principles here, work with me on the details, and impress upon your very large congressional delegation that the time to act is now, not next year, not 5 years from now but now.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:47 a.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building to the association meeting in Anaheim, CA. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. David Holley, president of the association. A participant referred to the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act (MICRA), a California State law.

Remarks to Health Care Providers
March 23, 1994

Thank you very much. It's a great honor for the Vice President and Mrs. Gore and for Hillary and me to have all of you here today. I want to especially thank Dr. Haggerty for his moving account, and Marva Wade for having the courage not only to tell us the story of her work but the story of her family, and Sister Bernice Coreil for her stout-hearted defense of our continuing efforts. I was sitting there thinking when she was speaking, I wonder how many nuns have ever given a speech and quoted Machiavelli? Well, I suppose he was a Catholic. [*Laughter*] And he certainly was right about a lot of things.

I want to say to all of you how important it is for us to have you here to validate our

common efforts because of your work, your life, and your experience. We've been seeking out a lot of that lately. Hillary and I went to Florida the first of the week and met with thousands of senior citizens, some of whom had been frightened by claims that we were trying to do something to Medicare instead of to protect Medicare and to extend its benefits to prescription medicine and to long-term care options in the home and in the community.

I met yesterday with a very, very moving group of a couple of hundred small business people, and 12 or 13 of them talked. About half of them, by the way, in endorsing our program, acknowledged that they would pay more if our plan passed, but for the first time they'd be able to insure all their employees instead of just a few of them and insure them with good benefits. And for a change their competitors would be on an even field with them because they would have to do the same thing, and they'd all make out all right.

This morning I met by teleconference with the California Medical Association, the biggest affiliate of the AMA in the country, and they were extremely supportive of this plan and what we are trying to do. And of course, now I'm meeting with you. And along the way, I have had encounters with people that we didn't plan that have made the same points all of you have made.

I was in Florida, and as I often do when I'm traveling, I agree to meet with children who are part of the Make-A-Wish network around the country, desperately ill children. And I met a family with two boys with a rare form of cancer which they believe must be genetically related because both their sons have it. And they have a daughter who is the youngest child and who has not yet been diagnosed, and we all hope she won't be. But this family was living in mortal terror because they had a lifetime limit on their insurance policy, and they thought, well, maybe one of their sons would become an adult. They're both surviving and maintaining it, but if they have good success with the treatment and both the boys are able to live and go on and do well, they'll certainly outrun their lifetime limits while the younger son is still at home and needing care.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day campaigning for our crime bill, and I stopped in a delicatessen where the owner of the delicatessen, who wound up being one of our small business people here yesterday by the way, came to me and said, "I am in the worst of all worlds. I have 20 employees that are full-time, 20 that are part-time. I had cancer 5 years ago. I'm about to be declared cancer free. Because of my preexisting conditions, our deductibles went up, our copay went up, our premium went up. But I still cover my 20 employees. I'm proud of that because it's the right thing to do, but I'm at a competitive disadvantage to everybody who doesn't, and I feel guilty that I don't cover my part-time employees."

So I hear these stories always. And those of you who are on the frontlines of medical care must wonder from time to time when you hear people make these speeches or you see these television ads, what planet they came from—[*laughter*]—because it's so inconsistent with the personal experience you've had.

Hillary and I have gone to extraordinary lengths to try to get people to look at this anew. We even made our own Harry and Louise ad for the national press the other day. Someone said after it was over, "Have you no shame left?" And I said, "Not very much after the last year." [*Laughter*]

The purpose of all of this to me is to give the American people who are looking at this from their own perspective, as every person should, a sense of how the real world operates, how incredibly complex and counterproductive the present financing system is, how it encourages people like you to spend more time on paperwork instead of patient care, and how it leaves millions of our fellow citizens rife with insecurity that they either are going to lose their health insurance or have it priced out of their reach, or that the policy they have doesn't cover something they need.

What we are genuinely trying to do, in good faith and with the consultation of thousands of people like you all across the country, is to fix what's wrong with this system and keep what's right. We believe we have to have guaranteed insurance for all Americans. Otherwise we'll never have security for all Americans; we'll never be able to have a rational system; we'll never stop all the cost-shifting; but most important of all, we'll never do the right thing.

And we think that guaranteed insurance should cover comprehensive benefits that include primary and preventive care, that include prescription medicine, that builds in mental health coverage. And we think over the long

run these things will give us a more cost-efficient system and a much healthier and happier and more secure country and a more productive American work force.

We believe in order to have the kind of system we need, we have to find a way to capitalize on the managed competition and those competitive forces that we've seen taking root in health care over the last couple of years, but to do it in a way that preserves rather than undermines people's choices of providers and therefore the quality of our health care system.

Fewer and fewer Americans have choice in their health care system today. I was glad to hear somebody mention that earlier. I hear all these things, saying, well, if you vote for the President's plan, you will lose your choices. The truth is that more than half of the employers who are carrying insurance for their employees today provide less than two or more choices. In other words, fewer than half of them say to their employees, here's two choices, here's three, here's more choices, you make a decision. Under our plan, people would be able to choose not just once but every year a fee-for-service approach, a network plan, or a network plan that has a point-of-service option so they could always decide that they wanted to go outside the plan and get other health care. And if they chose that option, the employer would still be obliged to pay his or her portion of the cost of care.

In other words, we'll have more competition, we'll have more managed care, but we'll have more choice. And the choice will be made by the patients, the people who are going to get the care, based on an informed set of information. And they'll be able to make the choice anew every year. I think that is very, very important.

The next thing we want to do is to have real insurance reform. That means that we're going to have to have an end to the preexisting condition problems that you all know very well. People cannot be denied coverage or have their rates raised just because someone in their family has been sick. We should have an end to the lifetime limits policy. And we should not charge older people more than younger people for their health insurance.

Let me say there are sound economic reasons quite apart from health care to do this. The average American 18-year-old's going to change work eight times in a lifetime. We are now regularly seeing people in their sixties lose their old job and have to find a new job. We are up here this year, this administration is, trying to redesign the entire unemployment system of the country to make it a continuous reemployment system. What good is that if for reasons having nothing to do with your family's health condition or your own age, you lose your job, and then you can't get another one with health insurance because your child's been sick or because you happen to be over 60 years old? This is a very serious issue.

We also have to find ways for small business people and self-employed people to buy the kind of good insurance that people like me who work for the Government have or people who work for big companies have, at the same competitive prices. So you want a break for small business and the self-employed to get what the rest of us take for granted.

And we have to have broadbased community rating. I will say this, you cannot expect the insurance industry under the present circumstance to provide these services, because a lot of the smaller companies will absolutely go broke. They cannot afford community rating. They cannot disregard these things because we're all insured in tiny little groups where a lot of those folks have to make money, a lot of money on a few people. The only way we can do this in a way that is fair and humane and practical is to have each other insured in ways that permit the insurance folks to make money the way grocery stores do, a little bit of money on a lot of people where you spread the risk. And that is what we are trying to do. It is what we must do.

And we have to change the system. It is no good just railing against something that will not work economically. We can change it and make it work economically. I simply refuse to believe, by the way, that we are the only advanced country in the world that can't figure out how to do this. It's like being told—every time I see one of these ads saying, "We can't do this; we can't do this; we don't need to do this," I feel like someone telling me right now, not as President but as an American citizen, that there is some inherent defect in my country and we're all just consumed with the dummies and we can't figure out how to do this. That's not true. If we have the will to do it, we can do it. And people who really care about the quality of care, like you, know we can do it. We can

do it, and we can still preserve Medicare. We can preserve the things that work, and we can do it.

I think we ought to do it at work. I think that people ought to be insured at work who are working. Eighty percent of the uninsured people in America today have someone in their family with a job. So the simplest, clearest, least bureaucratically, least threatening way to do this is to extend the requirement that employers should pay for a portion of their employees' insurance; the employee should pay for a portion of that as well. Yes, we have a very vital small business job market. Interestingly enough, most of the job-creating small businesses in this country provide insurance for their employees right now.

Just this week, to give you another personal story, Hillary and I had a family staying with us here from our home State, where the man is in the car business, has been for 20 years. He said, "You know, I've always thought about what a competitive disadvantage I face because I've always covered all my employees in my automobile place and none of my competitors ever had. And I just moaned about it all the time. And then I realized, I'm in business after 20 years and doing better than I ever have, and three of my competitors have gone broke even though they didn't cover their employees and I did. And it's because I've still got the same people working for me that started with me 20 years ago, taking care of our customers, doing a good job, providing quality service and a good product."

There is a real lesson there. We cannot let people who always tell us about the problems beat this thing and make it worse. Yes, there are problems. You name me a problem that's not going to get worse if we do nothing. If we do nothing, next year we'll have more uninsured people than we had this year. If we do nothing, next year we'll have more cost-shifting than we do this year. If we do nothing, next year we'll have more families with Marva stories than we do this year. If we do nothing, you as doctors and nurses will face more restrictions on your practice than you have this year. Isn't that right? If we do nothing, the patients that you deal with will have fewer choices than they do this year. If we do nothing, all the competitive forces will allow some bigger businesses and government to get a better deal next year, but the consequence of that will be, there will be more financial trouble for hospitals than there are this year.

Everything we're complaining about this year will get worse if the people who tell us that we can't do anything because there are problems with anything we want to do prevail. The only certainty is the problems will be aggravated if we put this off another year.

So if you believe in these principles, let me say this: We need to take it out to the American people and tell them what we're trying to do. Let me tell you—this is the most interesting thing I've read recently—that wouldn't be too hard. A couple of weeks ago, the Wall Street Journal, which is hardly the house organ of the Clinton administration, conducted a little forum, and they explained our health care program to some citizens of York, Pennsylvania, without telling them anything about our plan. It turned out that the great majority of the group thought everything about our plan was great. But they didn't like our plan very much because of what they had heard on the paid ads, and they'd heard organized groups were against it. Then when they told them what was in it, they thought it was peachy.

What does that mean? Well, it means that we need people like you to go out and talk about the basic principles. Of course there's a congressional process; of course there have to be amendments made; of course we have to work through this the way all laws are made. But it is very, very important that the Congress understands that you, as people who have put your lives, your heart and soul into health care, are for this, and that the people with whom you work, the people who are the patients of America, want it to be done.

Congress will go on recess soon, but democracy won't go on recess. It will pick up because the people will go out and talk to their Congressmen and Senators. So I implore you, as we look at this Easter recess, go tell your patients, your colleagues, your friends, your neighbors, and most important, your Senators and Representatives that the time to do this is now, that delaying it will make it just like a hangnail or an ingrown toenail; it's just going to get worse.

And one of the things—it's almost like sometimes when a country has to face these big problems—it's like when you're trying to raise your kids, sooner or later you have to get across to people that when you've got a big problem, you

might as well deal with it, because if you delay it, it will just get worse.

We have this momentous opportunity. Machiavelli was right, there is nothing so difficult as to change the established order of things. But remember this, if it hadn't happened over and over and over again since he wrote that, there would be no civilized society, and America would not be the oldest democracy on the face of the Earth. We can do this, and with your help, we will.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:14 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jesse C. Haggerty III, M.D., chairman and program director of a family medicine residency program, Topeka, KS; Marva Wade, R.N., president-elect, New York State Nurses Association, New York, NY; Sister Bernice Coreil, D.C., senior vice president, system integration, Daughters of Charity National Health System, St. Louis, MO.

Statement Announcing a Meeting With Native American Leaders

March 23, 1994

I look forward to this historic meeting and to affirming our commitment to strengthening the nation-to-nation relationship we have with tribal governments.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing a meeting with American Indian and Alaska Native tribal leaders at the White House on April 29.

Statement on the Air Collision at Pope Air Force Base

March 23, 1994

I am deeply saddened to learn of the tragic air collision at Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina and the resultant loss of life and injuries. Hillary and I join all Americans in expressing our condolences to the families and friends of those killed and wish a speedy recovery to those injured. This tragedy is a reminder that all those who serve in the military at home and abroad put their lives at risk in the service of their Nation and deserve the thanks of all Americans for doing so.

Statement on Denying Executive Clemency to Jonathan Pollard

March 23, 1994

After personally reviewing the Jonathan Pollard matter, I have decided to deny his application for executive clemency. I make this decision taking into account the recommendation of the Attorney General and the unanimous views of the law enforcement and national security agencies. My decision is based upon the grave nature of his offense and the considerable damage that his actions caused our Nation.

Mr. Pollard's crime is one of the most serious crimes against our country, placing national security secrets of the United States in the hands of another country. I have considered Mr. Pollard's argument that he is deserving of a shorter prison sentence because he spied for a friendly nation. I nevertheless believe that the enormity of Mr. Pollard's crime, the harm his actions caused to our country, and the need to deter every person who might even consider such actions, warrant his continued incarceration.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters
March 24, 1994

Air Collision at Pope Air Force Base

The President. Hello. I just wanted to make a brief statement. This morning, I called General Shelton at Fort Bragg and General Floyd at Pope Air Force Base to personally express my sorrow and condolences because of the tragedy yesterday, and to thank them, and through them, the members of our armed services who do the work that they do.

As I said in my statement yesterday, it's sometimes easy for those of us who enjoy the protection of the United States military to forget that it is a dangerous business, even in peace time, because of the training which must be carried out. And I think the hearts and thoughts and prayers of all Americans go out to the families of those who were killed yesterday, those who were injured, and all of those who were involved in this tragedy. We wish them only the best, and we are all thinking of them.

Assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio

I'd also like to say a brief word about the tragic murder of Mr. Colosio in Mexico yesterday. As you know, I called President Salinas last night, and we had a conversation about it which was entirely personal. And again, the United States, all of us, particularly the Vice President and I and Secretary Cisneros and others who had met Mr. Colosio, feel a great sense of loss and feel the pain of the Mexican people and the pain of his family.

The United States has done what we could do today to try to support the people of Mexico and the Government by making it clear that we think that the country's institutions are fundamentally strong. There was a brief delay in the trading of Mexican securities today to give the investors the opportunity to find out the facts in the hope that we would avoid any undue movement there. That delay lasted somewhere around 30 minutes or an hour. And I think it did have a good, salutary effect to make, just to make sure that the investors have all the facts and were not under any misapprehension about what had occurred. And it appears that things are proceeding normally there. So our best wishes go out to the Mexican people and our grief and our condolences and our prayers to them in this terrible time of loss.

Mexico

Q. Mr. President, are there steps the United States Government can or should take to try to make sure that there's stability in Mexico?

The President. Well, what we can do and what I think we should have done, first of all, is to take the steps we took on the trading. Secondly, I did talk to Secretary Bentsen last night to make sure that if there was serious trading in Mexican currencies, that we could try to help to stabilize that.

But, as you know, their financial institutions were all closed down today. So they took that step, and we'll just have to see whether anything else happens on that regard tomorrow. But I think things will settle down here. And I think fundamentally they are in sound shape. And I hope that will be the case. We'll have to wait and see what happens tomorrow.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, what did you tell the American Jewish leaders today about the status of a united Jerusalem?

The President. I told them that the position—I told them what I've always told you in public. I'll tell you the exact words I used. I said, "My position has not changed on that issue. But my position is also that the United States and other countries should refrain from intervening in these peace talks between the parties themselves. And part of the Declaration of Principles between Israel and the PLO was that the disposition of that issue would be a so-called final status issue to be resolved at the end of the talks. And I have respected that process." So I have made it clear that the United States has not changed it's position. The way we handled the resolution on the Hebron massacre in the U.N. gave us the opportunity to make that clear again. But we are trying to get these peace talks going, and we are going to let the parties make their decisions for the future of the Mid-

dle East on their own, and we are going to do everything we can to facilitate it.

News Conference

Q. What do you hope to accomplish in your press conference tonight?

The President. Basically, I'm going to make a report to the American people about what we're trying to do up here, about the work we're doing on the crime bill, on health care, on a number of other important issues. And if I don't get to the Hill now, I'll be behind the curve on health care. So I've got to go.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:06 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Capitol Hill. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Henry H. Shelton, USA, Commanding General, 18th Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg; and Brig. Gen. Bobby O. Floyd, USAF, 23d Wing Commander, Pope Air Force Base.

The President's News Conference
March 24, 1994

The President. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Yesterday we were reminded that protecting our democracy and expanding its promise around the world can be costly and dangerous. Here at home we mourn the loss of the servicemen in the tragic aircraft accident at Pope Air Force Base, and we pray for a speedy recovery for those who were injured. This tragedy reminds us that the men and women who serve in the military put their lives at risk in the service of our Nation.

In Mexico, an assassin killed Luis Donaldo Colosio, the Presidential candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party. We send our condolences and our prayers to his family. And I urge the Mexican people at this difficult time to continue their strides toward economic and political reform and progress.

With the Congress beginning its Easter recess tomorrow, this is a good time to assess the real work we are getting done on behalf of the American people. We're moving forward on our economic plan. The budget now moving through Congress, when passed, will give us 3 consecutive years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President. In 1995, we'll have the lowest budget deficit as a percentage of our annual income of any of the major industrialized countries. A recovering economy produced 2 million jobs last year, and we're on track to create 2 million more in '94.

Around the world, America's efforts have helped to bring much needed calm to Sarajevo and led to an important political accord between the Bosnian Muslims and Croats. Our call for restraint has helped to start talks again the Middle East. We will continue our efforts to stop North Korea's nuclear program and to seek progress on human rights in China, working to build a more positive relationship with that very important nation. This Friday, a week ahead of schedule, our troops will return home from Somalia. Because of their courageous efforts, Somalia can now build its own future, a step it made in the right direction today with the accord between the leaders of the two largest factions in that country.

Since we came here, our country has been moving in the right direction. Just today, the House of Representatives passed our legislation to limit the influence of lobbyists. Our administration is completing work on a comprehensive welfare reform proposal. We have presented to the Congress our very important reemployment proposal, to change the unemployment system to provide immediate retraining to those who lose their jobs. In a few days, with bipartisan support, the country will have an education reform law that sets national standards for our public schools. In a few weeks, Congress will pass a crime bill and put more police on the street, tougher gun laws on the books, and make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. Speaker Foley assured me last night that the crime bill will be item number one on the agenda of the House when it returns to work.

And in a few months we will succeed in passing health care reform. Just yesterday the House Subcommittee on Health passed legislation to provide health security for every American. And while there will be lots of twists and turns in the legislative process, this year Congress will

pass and I will sign a health reform which guarantees health care security to every American that can never be taken away, with the right to choose a doctor, with a plan that outlaws insurance abuses: no more dropping coverage or cutting benefits, no more lifetime limits, no more raising rates just because someone in your family has been sick or some are older than others. We want to preserve and strengthen Medicare. And we believe in this administration that those health benefits should be guaranteed through the workplace, building on what works today.

I know that many people around America must believe that Washington is overwhelmingly preoccupied with the Whitewater matter. But our administration is preoccupied with the business we were sent here to do for the American people. The investigation of Whitewater is being handled by an independent Special Counsel whose appointment I supported. Our cooperation with that counsel has been total. We have supplied over 14,000 documents, my tax returns dating back to 1978, and made available every administration witness he has sought.

I support the actions of the House and the Senate clearing the way for hearings at an appropriate time that does not interfere with Mr. Fiske's responsibilities. And I will fully cooperate with their work as well. Tomorrow I will make available my tax returns dating back to 1977 when I first held public office. Cooperation, disclosure, and doing the people's business are the order of the day.

This is the best moment we have had in decades to do the hard work on so many issues that affect not only our own progress and prosperity but the very way we think about ourselves as a nation. The American people should know that I and my administration will not be distracted. We are committed to taking advantage of this rare moment and achieving these important goals.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Whitewater

Q. Mr. President, you just said that you would release your tax returns back to 1977. Questions also have been raised about whether you made money or lost money in your Whitewater investment. Do you still believe that you lost about $70,000? And do you have any reason to believe that you owe any back taxes?

The President. I am certain that we lost money. I do not believe we owe any back taxes. If it is determined that we do, of course, we will pay. I am now sure that we lost something less than $70,000, based on an interview I heard on television, or I heard about on television, with Jim McDougal with one of the networks, where he said that he felt that one of the loans I had taken from a bank where we also borrowed money for the land development corporation, he said he thought one of those was a personal loan.

And so I started racking my brain to try to remember what that might have been, and by coincidence, I was also rereading the galleys of my mother's autobiography, just fact checking it, and I noticed that she mentioned there something that I had genuinely forgotten, which is that I helped her to purchase the property and what was then a cabin on the place that she and her husband, Dick Kelley, lived back in 1981, and that I was a co-owner of that property with her for just a few months. After they married, he bought my interest out.

So that's where that—I borrowed the money to go into that investment. I paid the money back with interest. That was unrelated to Whitewater. All the other losses that we have documented to date we believe clearly are tied to the investment Hillary and I made in Whitewater. So we, in fact, lost some $20,700 less than the Lyons report indicated because that loan came from a different place or came for different purposes. And there was another $1,500 payment I made on it. So whatever the total in the Lyons report was, you should subtract from that $20,700 and another $1,500. And we believe we can document that clearly.

Tomorrow, my counsel, David Kendall, will brief the press on the evidence that we have, what's in the tax returns. You will see when you see the tax returns that those losses were clearly there. And he will be glad to support it with other information as well.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, do you know of any funds, any money—Whitewater seems to be about money—having gone into any of your gubernatorial campaigns or into Whitewater, particularly federally insured money? Do you know of any money that could have gone in?

The President. No. I have no knowledge of that. I have absolutely no knowledge of that.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. President Clinton, you just mentioned James McDougal, your former business partner. A lot of questions have been raised about his business practices. Can you tell us what drew you to him to begin with and whether or not you still have faith now that he was—that he is an honest businessman?

The President. Well, I can tell you that when I entered my relationship with him—let's go back to then and not now—I knew Mr. McDougal and had known him for many years. I met him in the late sixties when he was running Senator Fulbright's office in Arkansas. I knew that sometime around that time, perhaps later, he got into the real estate business. When I entered into this investment, it was with a person I had known many years who was in the real estate business who had never been in the S&L business or the banking business. That all happened at a later time. He had done quite well.

The reason we lost money on Whitewater is not surprising; a lot of people did at that time. Interest rates, as you'll remember, went through the roof in the early eighties. People stopped immigrating to my State to retire, at least in the numbers they had all during the seventies, and the market simply changed. So we didn't sell as many lots, and the venture was not successful. So we lost the money. Principally, the money I lost was on the interest payments I had to make on the loans, which were never reimbursed because the venture never turned a profit.

Q. Do you still believe in his honesty now and do you think that he——

The President. All I can tell you, to the best of my knowledge, he was honest in his dealings with me. And that's all I can comment on. As I said, when I heard about his comments on television, since he had—he's always told you that I had nothing to do with the management of Whitewater, that Hillary had nothing to do with it; we didn't keep the books or the records; that this investment was made, as you know, back in 1978 and that we were essentially passive investors; that none of our money was borrowed from savings and loans and we had nothing to do with the savings and loan. So that's what he has always said. So when he said he didn't think this note, where I borrowed money from a bank, not an S&L, in 1981 had anything to do with Whitewater, I started thinking about it. We talked about it. We couldn't remember what else it could have been until I literally just happened to cross that in reading my mother's autobiography.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Leach made some very dramatic charges today. He said that Whitewater is really about the arrogance of power, and he didn't just mean back in Arkansas. He said that Federal regulators tried to stop investigators for the Resolution Trust Corporation in Kansas City from putting Whitewater into their criminal referrals. That would amount to a coverup and possibly obstruction of justice. Do you have any knowledge of that?

The President. Absolutely not. And it is my understanding——

Q. And are you looking into it?

The President. Let me just say this, it's my understanding that Mr. Leach was rather careful in the words that he used, and apparently he didn't even charge that any political appointee of our administration had any knowledge of this. So he may be talking about an internal dispute within the RTC from career Republican appointees, for all I know. Keep in mind, until I came here, all the appointees of the RTC were hired under previous Republican administrations. There has never been a Democratic President since there's been an RTC. And I can tell you categorically I had no knowledge of this and was not involved in it in any way, shape, or form.

Q. Well, in light of all that's happened so far, Mr. President, do you think you made any mistakes in the initial investment and in the way the White House has handled this?

The President. I certainly don't think I made a mistake in the initial investment. It was a perfectly honorable thing to do, and it was a perfectly legal thing to do. And I didn't make any money, I lost money. I paid my debts. And then later on, as you know, Hillary and I tried to make sure that the corporation was closed down in an appropriate way and paid any obligations that it owed after we were asked to get involved at a very late stage and after Mr. McDougal had left the S&L. So I don't think that we did anything wrong in that at all. And I think we handled it in an appropriate way. We were like a lot of people; we invested money, and we lost.

I'd be the last person in the world to be able to defend everything we've done here in

the sense that whatever we did or didn't do has sparked an inordinate amount of interest in a 16-year-old business venture that lost money. But to suggest—let me just say again, I have had absolutely nothing to do, and would have nothing to do, with any attempt to influence an RTC regulatory matter. And I think if you look at the actions of the RTC just since I've been President and you examine the facts that everybody that works there was appointed by a previous Republican administration, the evidence is clear that I have not done that.

Yes.

Q. Mr. President, you've been kind of tough at times on people you felt made out during the eighties and didn't pay their fair share. Can you tell us, sir, tonight that you have abided by the very high ethical standards——

The President. Absolutely.

Q. ——to which you've sought to hold others? And also, sir, if it turns out that you do owe something in back taxes, will you be prepared perhaps to revise some of those judgments you've made about others?

The President. No, not at all. I ask you to tell the American people what percentage of my income I paid in taxes in every year where I reported my tax returns. And let me tell you what my wife and I spent the eighties doing: I was the lowest paid Governor of any State in the country. I don't complain about it. I was proud of that. I didn't do it for the money. I worked on creating jobs and improving education for the children of my State. Every year I was Governor, my wife worked in a law firm that had always done business with the State. She never took any money for any work she did for the State. And indeed, she gave up her portion of partnership income that otherwise came to the firm, and instead every year gave an enormous percentage of her time to public service work, helping children and helping education and doing a lot of other things, giving up a lot of income.

Now, we did that because we wanted to. The fact that we made investments, some of which we lost money on, some of which we made money on, has nothing to do whatever with the indictment that I made about the excesses of the eighties. And we always made every effort to pay our taxes. I would remind you that we, like most middle class folks, we turned our records over to an accountant. I always told the accountant to resolve all doubts in favor of the Government. I never wanted any question raised about our taxes.

When it turned out in our own investigation of this Whitewater business that one year we had inadvertently taken a tax deduction for interest payments when, in fact, it was principal payment, even though the statute of limitations had run, we went back and voluntarily paid what we owed to the Federal Government. And if it turns out we've made some mistake inadvertently, we will do that again. But I have always tried to pay my taxes. And you will see when you look at all the returns that we've always paid quite a considerable percentage of our income in taxes.

Yes.

White House Staff

Q. Mr. President, during the campaign you said your administration would set a higher standard. Yet in the travel office case last year, your own Chief of Staff found some of your aides used their official position to advance their personal interests, while recently we've seen a senior White House official delinquent in Social Security taxes that disqualified others from serving in your administration, and others in the White House neglecting until recently to undergo a security clearance required of other Government officials handling classified information. Why, sir, do you think it's so difficult for members of your staff to live up to your campaign promise?

The President. First of all, let's deal with those things, each in turn. Now, the finding was not that anybody who worked for me sought to advance themselves personally, financially in the travel office issue. That was not the finding. We found that the issue had not been well handled. And I might say, unlike other White Houses that stonewalled, denied, or delayed, we did our own internal investigation and admitted what mistakes we made and made some changes there. I'm proud of that.

Secondly, no one was barred from serving in our administration because they hadn't paid Social Security taxes, but people were barred from serving in Presidential-appointed positions that required Senate confirmation unless they complied with administration policy. Mr. Kennedy did not do that entirely, and he has been reassigned. He has had a difficult time, and I am convinced that he has done a lot of work that's been very valuable for us. But I think

that he should not have done what he did, and I think he should fully pay. He has done that. I think that's what he should have done.

Now, on the White House passes thing, let's just talk about what the facts are. About 90 percent of the people who work here have been through all the clearances. The others are going through the clearances. I learned when I read about this that apparently previous administrations had had some of the same problems, that is, they'd been lax because of the cumbersome nature of the process. So we've now basically put in rules that say that anybody who comes to work here now has to get all this done in 30 days or is immediately on leave without pay. They can't get paid unless they do it. I asked Mr. McLarty and Mr. Cutler to fix this and make sure it never happens again. So I feel confident that we have.

But since you raised the issue, let me also ask you to report to the American people that we have and we have enforced higher standards against ethical conflicts than any previous administration. When people leave the White House, they can't lobby the White House. If they're in certain positions, they can't lobby the White House for a long time. If they're in certain positions now, they can never lobby on behalf of a foreign government.

I have supported a campaign finance reform bill that I am hoping the Congress will pass, and I believe they will, which will change the nature of financing political campaigns. I have supported a very tough lobby reform bill which will require more disclosure and more restraint on the part of lobbyists and public officials than ever before. And we will comply with those laws.

So I think our record, on balance, is quite good here. And when we make mistakes, we try to admit them, something that has not been the order of the day in the past.

Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

Whitewater

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. So many things have happened since this Whitewater story broke or resurfaced, depending on your point of view: Your Counsel has resigned; a number of your top aides have been subpoenaed because of their contacts with Treasury officials in on the investigation. I'm curious, who do you blame more than anything else for the Whitewater mess that the administration in is now?

The President. Well, I don't think it's useful to get into blame. I think what's important is that I answer the questions that you have that are legitimate questions, that I fully cooperate with the Special Counsel, which was requested widely by the press and by the members of the Republican Party—and who is himself a Republican—that we fully cooperate. And we've done that. Senator Inouye from Hawaii pointed out today, he said, "I've been experienced in these investigations." He said, "You folks have claimed no executive privilege. You've fully cooperated. No one can quarrel with that." And then I get back to the work of getting unemployment down, jobs up, passing a health care bill, passing the crime bill, moving this country forward. I think the worst thing that can happen is for me to sort of labor over who should be blamed for this. There will probably be enough blame to go around. I'm just not concerned about it.

Q. To follow up, sir, do you feel ill served in any way by your staff?

The President. I think on the—I've told you what I think about these meetings. Now, let's go back to the facts of the meetings. We now know that Mr. Altman's counsel checked with the ethics officer in Treasury before he came over and gave the briefings to the White House. But I have said—so it appears at least that the counsel thought that Mr. Altman had an ethical clearance to come and do this briefing. We certainly know that no one in the White House, at least to the best of my knowledge, has tried to use any information to in any way improperly influence the RTC or any Federal agency.

Would it have been better if those had not occurred? Yes, I think it would have been. Do we have people here who wouldn't do anything wrong but perhaps weren't sensitive enough to how something could look in retrospect by people who are used to having problems in a Presidency or used to having people not telling the truth? I think that we weren't as sensitive as we should have been. And I've said before, it would have been better if that hadn't occurred.

But I think the one thing you have to say is, you learn things as you go along in this business. None of this, in the light of history, will be as remotely important as the fact that by common consensus we had the most productive first year of a Presidency last year of anyone in a generation. That's what matters, that we're

changing people's lives. That's what counts. And I'm just going to keep working on it.

Yes.

Q. Mr. President, you and your wife have both used the phrase, "bewildered, confused about why all the interest in Whitewater." Yet, in the Arkansas savings and loan business, your wife represented Madison Savings and Loan before the Arkansas Savings and Loan Board, whose head was a former lawyer who had done work for Madison Savings and Loan. Do you not see any conflicts of interest in your action, or your wife's actions, which would appear to contradict what you just said about her not doing any work before the State, that would cause people to question your actions?

The President. No, that's not what I said. I did not say—I said that when my wife did business, when her law firm represented some State agency itself—State agencies all over America use private lawyers—if she did any work for the State, she never took any pay for it. And when the firm got income from State work, she didn't take her partnership share of that income. She gave that up because she wanted to bend over backwards to avoid the appearance of conflict.

Was there anything wrong with her representing a client before a State agency? And if you go back and look at the facts, basically the firm wrote the securities commissioner a letter saying, is it permissible under Arkansas law to raise money for this S&L in this way? And it showed that she was one of the contacts on it, and the securities commissioner wrote her back and said it's not against the law. That was basically the extent of her representation.

Now, all I can do is tell you that she believed there was nothing unethical about it. And today, in an interview, Professor Steven Geller of New York University, who is a widely respected national expert on legal ethics, once again said there was nothing at all unethical in doing this. These kinds of things happen when you have married couples who have professions. And the most important thing there is disclosure. There was no sneaking around about this. This was full disclosure. Professor Geller—I brought the quote here—said, "I think this is a bum rap on Mrs. Clinton, and I'm amazed that it keeps getting recirculated." Now, there's a person who doesn't work for us whose job it is to know what the code of professional responsibility requires.

Yes.

Q. Mr. President, one thing that puzzled a lot of people is why, if you did nothing wrong, did you act for so long as if you had something to hide. And now that you're about to release these documents to the public, your tax records and other things, do you think it would have helped if you had released these documents to the public earlier? Would it have stopped this issue from reaching the proportions that it has?

The President. I don't have any idea. But I don't think I acted as if I had anything to hide. After all, I did volunteer—I had already given out my tax returns going back to 1980. And then keep in mind, when the furor arose at the request for the Special Counsel—even though everybody at the time said, "Well, we don't think he's done anything wrong; there's no evidence that either he or the First Lady have done anything wrong; we still think there ought to be a special counsel"—I said we would give all this over to the Special Counsel. It was only after the Special Counsel had all the information that the people who first wanted the Special Counsel then decided they wanted the documents as well. So we're making them available.

Perhaps I should have done it earlier, but you will see essentially what I've told you and things that you basically already know.

Yes, Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

Q. Mr. President, you said a few minutes ago that the people in the RTC who are involved in Congressman Leach's allegations are all career Republican officials. But aren't they members of your administration? And do you plan to take any action in speaking to either Mr. Bentsen or Mr. Altman about taking action and investigation of Mr. Leach's charges?

The President. I think the last thing in the world I should do is talk to the Treasury Department about the RTC. [*Laughter*] You all have told me that that creates the appearance of impropriety. I don't think we can have a—it's not just a one-way street; it's a two-way street. Mr. Leach will see that whatever should be done is done. But I can tell you, I have had no contact with the RTC. I've made no attempt to influence them. And you can see by some of the decisions that they have made that that is the furthest thing, it seems to me, that ought to be on your mind.

Q. Do you abandon all responsibility for a department, a Cabinet department in your Government?

The President. I haven't abandoned all responsibility. You can't have it both ways. Either we can talk to them or we can't. I just think this is a matter of public record now. And Mr. Leach will certainly see to it that it's looked into. He's already said that that's his job, and I'm sure he will see that it is.

Yes.

Q. With so many questions swirling around Whitewater and the Rose law firm, there's some concern that the moral authority of the First Lady is eroding as well. Are you reconsidering her role as the point person for health care reform?

The President. Absolutely not. Absolutely not. People should not be able to raise questions and erode people's moral authority in this country. There ought to have to be evidence and proof. We live in a time when there is a great deal of question-raising. It seems to be the order of the day. But I know what the facts are, and I'm giving you the facts on this.

Here we just had—all these questions were raised about whether she was properly or improperly representing a client before a State agency—to do something, I might add, that the Federal Government had asked savings and loans to do, that is, go out and raise more capital to become more solvent. So that's what she was doing in the full light of day, in full disclosure.

Now we have, even in retrospect, an eminent national expert saying that she is getting a bum rap. When people ask questions that don't have any basis—I think you should ask whatever questions you want to ask, and I think that we should do our best to answer them. But I think that the 20-year record she made as a lawyer, never before having her ethics questioned, never before having her ability questioned, when everybody who knew her knew that every year she was giving up a whole lot of income to do public business, to advance the cause of children and to advance the cause of our State—no, I don't think so. I think in the end when all these questions get asked and answered, her moral authority will be stronger than it has ever been, because we will have gone through this process and been very forthcoming, as we are, to the Special Counsel. And then in the end, people will compare how we did this with how previous administrations under fire handled their business. And I think it will come out quite well.

Mexico

Q. Mr. President, the assassination of Mr. Colosio today has shaken the financial markets in this country, created doubt about the stability of Mexico. Mexico opens its stock market and banks tomorrow. You said you would help Mexico in this. What can the United States do to help Mexico in these trying times?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say, Mexico is a very great country that has made enormous progress economically and politically. There is a lot of ferment and change going on there that is inevitable and that can be very positive. What I think the United States can do, first of all, is to tell the rest of the world that we know this about Mexico. They're our neighbors, and we think they have a great future. And we don't expect any long-term damage to come from this terrible personal tragedy and political setback.

Secondly, the only business I did last night on this—and I called President Salinas as a friend, as well as the President of the United States, to express my sorrow—the only business I did was to talk to the Secretary of the Treasury about what we might be able to do in the event there was some sort of unusual trading against the Mexican currency. And there may be something we can do to step in and stabilize that. As you know, there have been times in the past when our friends have had to come to our aid. The Germans, the Japanese, and others have come to our aid when there was unusual trading against the dollar. And we are prepared to try to help the Mexicans if that is necessary. But we hope it won't be.

Today we did just a little bit on Mexican securities when we suspended trading here in the United States for a very short time so that the American people who would be interested in this would at least be able to verify what the facts were and what they were not about the terrible incident last night. And I think that helped a bit. I certainly hope that it did.

Whitewater

Q. Increasingly polls are showing that more and more Americans are unsure whether you acted properly in Whitewater, that maybe you did something wrong. Does that concern you? And when do you think it would be proper

for the First Lady to answer questions about Whitewater?

The President. Well, first of all, does it concern me? Only a little bit. The truth is, I am amazed. When I read in the New York Times or someplace today that there had been 3 times as much coverage of Whitewater as there had been of health care, I'm amazed that there hasn't been more change in the polls. I think what the American people are really upset about is the thought that this investment that we made 16 years ago that lost money, that did not involve savings and loans, might somehow divert any of us from doing the work of the country, getting the economy going and dealing with health care and crime and the other issues.

So, in that sense, I think people are right to be concerned. And they want to know that I'm going to answer the questions. A lot of people don't even know, I don't think, that there is a Special Counsel, that we have fully cooperated, that he has said we have; that the Watergate prosecutor, Sam Dash, contrasted our conduct with previous Presidents and said we'd been highly ethical. And we're moving forward.

Now, the First Lady has done several interviews. She was out in three different places last week answering questions exhaustively from the press. I think she will continue to do that. And if you have questions you want to ask her about this, I think you ought to ask the questions.

Deb [Deborah Mathis, Gannett News Service].

Q. Mr. President, you and the First Lady have several times said that you've been amazed and dismayed by the intensity of both the opposition and the scrutiny surrounding Whitewater in particular. Has any of this been instructive for you? Have you taken any lessons from this ordeal, whether it's about the Presidency, about the process, about the city, or anything?

The President. Oh, I think I've learned a lot about it. I think one of the things I've learned about it is that it's very important to try to decide what the legitimate responsibility of the President is, to be as forthcoming as possible, and to do it.

It's important for me to understand that there is a level here—and this is not a blame, this is just an observation—because of the experiences of the last several decades of which I was not a part in this city, I think there is a level of suspicion here that is greater than that which I have been used to in the past—and I don't complain about it, but I've learned a lot about it—and that my job is to try to answer whatever questions are out there so I can get on with the business of the country.

And I think I've learned a lot about how to handle that. I've also learned here that there may or may not be a different standard than I had seen in the past, not of right and wrong, that doesn't change, but of what may appear to be right or wrong. And I think that you'll see that, like everything else, this administration learns and goes on. We always learn from our mistakes, and we have proven that.

Yes, sir, in the back.

North Korea, South Africa, and Russia

Q. I wonder if you realize the situation that is developing in Korea, what is expected? What will be the situation in South Africa next month? And do you believe that the former Soviet Union, Russia, has—[*inaudible*]—that will contribute to peace in the world? How do you respond?

The President. That's the quickest anybody ever asked me three questions at once. [*Laughter*] First of all, the situation in Korea is serious, and we have responded in a serious way. The North Koreans themselves have said they are committed to a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. We want that. We want a good, normal relationship with them. They have terminated the IAEA inspections. We are examining what we can do. We are talking to our South Korean partners as well as to the Chinese, the Japanese, the Russians, and others.

We still hope that this can be resolved, and we believe it can be. But the choice is really up to North Korea. Will they be isolated from the world community, or will they be a full partner? They could have a very bright future indeed. They have many contributions to make, indeed, to a united Korea. And we hope that it will work out. But I did decide to deploy the Patriots on the recommendation of General Luck as a purely defensive measure in the wake of the difficulties we've had, and we'll make further decisions as we go along.

With regard to South Africa, I am immensely hopeful. I have tried once to encourage Chief Buthelezi to join in the political process. And I still have some hope that he will. It is not too late, and they have made real efforts to try to accommodate the conflicts between national and local interests. But I think we will

be celebrating in late April a great triumph of democracy of the first nonracial or multiracial democratic process in South Africa.

With regard to Russia, I think that on balance, our relationship is still sound. It is based on our perception and their perception of our shared interests, and when we disagree, we will say so. And we will act accordingly. But I do think that the Russians have made a constructive contribution to our efforts in Bosnia which have had a lot of success. We've got a long way to go, but we've had some real success. And I'm hopeful that they will elsewhere. I know they made a suggestion on Korea today, and we'll see what happens there.

Press Secretary Myers. Last question.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Stark's health care bill doesn't do everything that you have proposed. Would you veto it if it reaches your desk?

The President. No, because it does what I ask. It doesn't solve all the problems. But it does provide universal coverage. It emphasizes the workplace. That is, there is no tax on people unless they elect not to take out insurance. And it provides comprehensive benefits, which I think are very important. And it leaves Medicare alone with the integrity of Medicare.

There are things that it doesn't do that I wish it did. I don't think it's as successful or would be as successful in holding down costs and expanding opportunity as our plan, but certainly if it were to be enacted by the United States Congress I would sign it, because it meets the fundamental criteria I set out of covering all Americans with health care.

One more, then I guess we've got to go. Everybody wants to be watching these ball games, I think. [*Laughter*] You know, I'm going to make—nobody's asked me if we're going to tax gambling or anything. [*Laughter*] Go ahead.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. This is a set-up; it's my joke. Only people who bet against my team in the NCAA. [*Laughter*]

Whitewater

Q. Mr. President, I take it that the tax returns you're putting out tomorrow are the ones that have already gone to the Special Counsel. If the Special Counsel wanted to question you about that, would you answer a subpoena? Would Mrs. Clinton? And what about congressional hearings, what would be the protocol on going before Congress to explain it to them?

The President. Let me answer the first question first. We decided in addition to putting out the '78 and '79 returns, we should go ahead and put out the '77 returns, that that would be an appropriate starting point, because that's the year I first entered public life. I know there's—it's kind of a moving bar here. None of us are quite sure how far back anybody should go anymore about anything. But we thought that we would do that. And at least you would then have a complete record of the money we earned and the taxes we paid, Hillary and I together did, as long as I've been in public life.

In terms of the information, I expect that the Special Counsel will want to question me and will want to question the First Lady. It's my understanding that typically in the past it's been done in a different way. I mean, I will cooperate with him in whatever way he decides is appropriate.

Similarly, if Congress wants any information direct from us, we will, of course, provide it to them in whatever way seems most appropriate. Again, I understand there are certain protocols which have been followed in the past which I would expect would be followed here. But I intend to be fully cooperative so that I can go back to work doing what I was hired to do.

Thank you very much.

Welfare Reform

Q. [*Inaudible*]—welfare reform?

The President. What did you say about——

Q. What about welfare reform?

The President. What about it?

Q. Are you going to tax gambling?

The President. No. What I said, I made a joke about that. I said I was going to try to tax anybody who bet against my team in the basketball finals.

But I have made no decision on the financing of welfare reform. I can tell you this, it's a tough issue because we have to pay for anything we do. And there are all kinds of proposals out there. I know that the Republican welfare reform proposal has a lot of things in it that I like. But I think it's way too hard on financing things from savings from immigrants. I think

it goes too far there. So there are no real easy answers.

But I can say categorically that I have been briefed on a very wide range of options and that nobody in this administration has made any decision, and no one will make a decision except me, about how to fund it. That decision has not been made. We will come forward with that plan. We do think it offers the real promise of ending welfare as we know it, of moving people from welfare to work if we can also guarantee these welfare parents that when they go to work their children will not lose the health care that they have on welfare, so they won't be punished for going to work. That's the key issue.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 54th news conference began at 7:30 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Gary E. Luck, USA, commander, U.S. forces, Korea, and Mangosuthu Buthelezi, South African Inkatha Freedom Party leader.

Statement on the Assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio
March 24, 1994

I am profoundly saddened to learn of the brutal assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio, the Presidential candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) in Mexico. I deeply deplore this senseless act of violence and have conveyed my deepest sympathies to the Mexican people and to the family of Mr. Colosio, his wife, and two young children.

Mr. Colosio dedicated his life to public service and to the betterment of his nation. It is particularly tragic when an assassin's bullet slays a man who still had so much to contribute to history. It is a great loss not only for Mexico but for all of North America.

I telephoned President Carlos Salinas de Gortari shortly after midnight last night to express my sorrow and that of the American people and to offer my condolences to the Colosio family. I told President Salinas that the United States stands ready to assist Mexico in the coming days in any way we can.

Exchange With Reporters
March 25, 1994

Air Collision at Pope Air Force Base

Q. Mr. President, why are you going to Fort Bragg?

The President. I'm going down there because it was a very, very serious accident. A lot of our service people lost their lives; many, many others were quite seriously injured. And I just want to go down there and visit the hospital and express my concerns to the people who are still hospitalized and to their families and all the people at Fort Bragg for the losses they suffered. I think it's an appropriate thing to do.

Whitewater

Q. How do you feel about last night, Mr. President? Do you think you put some of this Whitewater business behind you?

The President. I just tried to answer the questions, and I felt good about it. I did my best to answer the questions. I feel good about it.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Mr. President, how you could have forgotten about a $20,000 loan and check to your mother to buy a——

The President. Well, I think what happened was—keep in mind, all this happened in the heat of the '92 campaign. And they just said, "Is there any way any of these checks from Madison could have come from some—been about something else?" I said, "I don't think

so." And what happened was, when I read my mother's autobiography, I said, "You know, that's right, I did help her buy that place." So then—and Hillary and I were talking, so we asked for the checks. And when I saw the check, then I realized that that's where it had come from.

But when Jim McDougal said that, that he was sure that it didn't have anything to do with Madison, that's what got me to thinking about it. Then I saw it in the book. Then we asked for the check stub. That's how we verified it. So it just happened that way.

You know, keep in mind, keep in mind, when I was first asked about this back in '92, just off the top of my head, I said, "We lost money, but I don't think it was a great deal." I thought—I think I'm quoted in '92 saying I thought we'd lost about $25,000, just from memory. So apparently, we lost quite a bit more than that.

Q. Are you positive the tax returns that are being released today will clear the air on this matter?

The President. Well, they certainly ought to. Like I said, I always did what I think most Americans do, I gave all my records every year to my accountant. They were normally very simple returns. I didn't have a lot of complicated things on them. And we've given them out, all the way back to '77 now. So you guys have got them. You can do what you want to with them.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:30 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to the President's departure for Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, NC.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters at Fort Bragg, North Carolina
March 25, 1994

Air Collision at Pope Air Force Base

The President. First of all, I'd like to thank General Shelton and General Steele and General Davis for welcoming me here and for giving me an opportunity not only to review the site of the crash but also to go into this hospital and to see not only a good number of the soldiers who were injured but also the people who have been up virtually nonstop for the last 2 days caring for them.

I found it deeply moving. In the first place, the morale of the people who have been burned and injured is high. Their pride in their work and in their country is very strong. And what everybody said about the quality of care they've gotten and the outpouring of effort that has been made to help them deal with their problem has been very moving. Person after person after person said, "You know, I just can't wait to get back to my work. I'm ready to serve again."

It was a deeply moving thing. I'm very grateful to them for their service and to all of those who have cared so well for them.

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what you talked about or what you said to some of those who you saw today?

Mr. President. A lot of times we just made small talk. I asked them where they were from, how long they had been in the Army, what happened. They talked about it a little bit.

I was especially moved—I met a man and his wife who were both in the incident, both in the service, both injured. The man was injured because he was putting the fire out on his wife. And a lot of these young people were injured because they, instead of taking themselves to safety, were trying to help others who were being burned.

It was a very—I wish everyone in America could have seen the faces, the eyes, the spirit of these people. They would realize how fortunate we are to be served by men and women like this who are both brave and selfless and with no concern other than just to get back to their lives and to their duty. I mean, it is very, very moving. I'm very glad I came. I'm glad I had the opportunity to see this and, again, profoundly grateful to the people in this fine hospital who are taking such good care of them.

Q. Is this one of the worst incidents you've seen?

Mr. President. It was a serious problem, but they've handled it magnificently, I think.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:36 p.m. at Womack Army Medical Center. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. William M. Steele, USA, commanding general, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg; Maj. Gen. Richard E. Davis, USA, deputy commander, 18th Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Message on the Observance of Passover
March 25, 1994

Heartfelt greetings to all who are gathered to celebrate Passover.

This joyous festival of liberation reminds all of us of the importance of freedom. The Passover seder, filled with its symbols of confinement and liberty, of pain and joy, has served as a means of teaching each new generation the story of the Jews' liberation from slavery in Egypt. As children learn the ancient account, they understand that freedom is something for which we must continuously struggle and that we must always cherish.

Human history is filled with chronicles of peoples throwing off the shackles of their oppressors to embrace the causes of justice and equality. As new nations begin their journeys to a "promised land," the lessons of Passover echo in every corner of the Earth. They teach us that while we must be thankful for the freedom we have, we must also remember all those in the world who still yearn to know its many gifts. This year, let us rededicate ourselves to extending the blessings of liberty to all who seek it.

During this historic season of renewal and peace, Hillary and I extend warm wishes for a memorable and meaningful Passover.

BILL CLINTON

Nomination for United States District Court Judges
March 25, 1994

The President has nominated three individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court. They are: R. Samuel Paz for the Central District of California; Paul D. Borman for the Eastern District of Michigan; and Denny Chin for the Southern District of New York.

"I am pleased to nominate these distinguished individuals to serve on the Federal bench," the President said. "Each has demonstrated a strong commitment to equal justice for all Americans."

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

Exchange With Reporters in Dallas, Texas
March 26, 1994

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, what's the message from this part of the visit?

The President. Did you see the people we saw outside?

Q. Yes.

The President. The people we saw outside either don't have coverage or they're afraid of losing it. These children got this care because this hospital is open to all children and gives all children great care, without regard to their income. But not all children have access to hospitals like this. So the message is that all families

with children should have some insurance coverage so they can get health care and so they can be well like this. It was great.

Roger Clinton's Wedding

Q. How are the wedding preparations going?

The President. Fine. We're excited.

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:22 a.m. at the Scottish Rite Hospital for Children. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's Radio Address
March 26, 1994

Good morning. This morning I'm speaking to you from Dallas, Texas, courtesy of station KRLD in Dallas, and from the Scottish Rite Hospital for Children, one of the finest pediatric medical centers in America. Today in the audience we have parents and children who have been patients here. I want to thank the president of the hospital, J.C. Montgomery, and Dr. Tony Herring and all the others who gave Hillary and me such a wonderful tour today.

Places like Scottish Rite don't ask children with severe disabilities or serious illnesses, "Can you pay?" They just ask, "How can I help?" The wonderful team of doctors, nurses, and other hospital workers here take all children in need. That's what we want for all of America.

Last Wednesday at the White House, Sister Bernice Coreil, a member of the Sisters of Charity, the religious order which runs the largest nonprofit hospital system in America, spoke about health care in a way seldom heard in the Nation's Capital. She pushed all the politics and complex arguments aside and said health care is about basic human values, about honoring the intrinsic value of every person.

She knows, as so many health professionals do, that if we don't do something now, the future of health care is in trouble in America, because more Americans are losing their health coverage or can't get it because someone in their family has been sick, because more people with coverage are losing the right to choose their doctors or their health plans, because more of our hospitals are in trouble.

Without change, the future of health care will include less choice and bigger bills and maybe lower quality, too. Instead of health care being available to all Americans, more Americans are losing their health coverage every month.

How can we change? How can we keep what's best about our system, our wonderful caregivers, our wonderful medical research system, and fix what's wrong, the fact that there aren't enough places like this Scottish Rite Hospital, that too many people are losing their coverage, that the financing system is a bureaucratic nightmare full of unfairness? I think we can do better simply by building on what works in the current system, using the workplace to guarantee private insurance for every American. It is the foundation of our plan.

Just a few days ago, the first of many committees considering health care reform in Congress approved a plan like ours, covering every American. In spite of all the special interest and TV ads, the committee made an important statement. After 60 years of gridlock, the American people are being heard. They want us to take care of their important business, like health care reform, and now we're beginning to do that.

The administration's approach to health care reform is straightforward: guaranteed private insurance for every American that can never be taken away. And we want to be careful to base our approach on the best of American values. Guaranteed private insurance, making sure everyone has good health care, not only those who can pay whatever it costs, is the ticket to opportunity.

When our plan passes and your health care can never be taken away, that means you'll be able to change jobs, move, start a small business without worrying that your health care or your family's health will be threatened. Just this morning I met a fine couple here with twin boys. The boys have some undiagnosed medical difficulties, but they cannot get any health insurance because of that. The father and the mother have been under great stress and great difficulty.

If it weren't for this hospital and others like it, I don't know what families like that would do. We can do better.

In addition to guaranteed private insurance, we want the freedom for all Americans to make choices in the American tradition, guaranteeing the right to choose a doctor and an insurance plan. We trust the American people with the freedom to choose every year rather than leaving that choice to an employer or an insurance company.

Third, health reform in our plan is about fairness, correcting abuses in the insurance practices today. No more denying people insurance because they are sick, no more lifetime limits that cut off coverage when you need it the most, no more higher rates for the elderly or for small employers or self-employed people and farmers. These things aren't fair, and Americans deserve fairness.

Fourth, health care reform is about keeping faith with those who came before us. We preserve and protect Medicare without reservation or exception. Older Americans simply must be able to continue to rely on Medicare and to choose their own doctor. We do want to cover prescription drugs under Medicare for the first time and provide the elderly and chronically ill children or disabled Americans of all ages the chance to get some long-term care in their home or in their community if they need it.

Finally, health care is about responsibility, about rewarding those who work. Under our approach, you get your insurance through work. Most jobs already have health care; why shouldn't all of them? Eight out of ten Americans without insurance belong to working families. We should always reward work in America, and the right to health care should be part of that reward. Opportunity, freedom, and fairness, honoring the senior citizens and those who take responsibility, these are the values that have helped to build America, and they are at the heart of our health care proposal.

This weekend marks the arrival of Palm Sunday and Passover. It's a special week of reflection for everyone of the Jewish and Christian faiths, a time when we step back from the concerns of daily life and think more deeply about our religious traditions and the values they teach us.

Sitting in this wonderful hospital for children, I'm reminded that providing health care and the peace of mind that comes with it is also a practical expression of our deepest faith and ideals. The wonderful doctors and nurses and volunteers here at Scottish Rite Hospital for Children take in every child. No family has been charged. They live our best values. But they'd be the first to tell you that more than 9 million American children have no health insurance and most don't have access to a hospital like this.

That's not right, and health care reform is about doing what's right, about having compassion and bestowing dignity on each of us as God's children. These are enduring values, the source of the moral authority that has made our Nation great. And they are the lessons each of us, in our own way, can take from Easter and Passover. With these values to guide us, I know we'll succeed.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. at the Scottish Rite Hospital for Children in Dallas. In his address, he referred to Dr. Tony Herring, chief of staff, Scottish Rite Hospital for Children.

Interview With Jim Nantz of CBS Sports in Dallas
March 27, 1994

NCAA Basketball Tournament

Mr. Nantz. We're here with President Bill Clinton. It looks like you're having a great time. What do you think of the game so far?

The President. Great game, and our kids are playing well. But Michigan is playing a terrific game. They've done a great job defensing our big guys in the middle. And we've had the 3-point shot, so we're a little ahead. But this is a good game.

Mr. Nantz. We saw you really excited after some Arkansas baskets, but we also want to show you a couple of other times where it didn't

go so well for the Hogs, and here's how you reacted. Tell us about it.

The President. They were missing layups. We missed about five layups there, four in the beginning.

Mr. Nantz. We need a little more coaching here, Mr. President.

The President. We missed another layup.

Mr. Nantz. Well, Chelsea's been calling the Hogs a few times. I haven't seen you up doing that quite yet.

The President. I haven't done it. I'll get into it as we go along. I really get into the game. I'm impressed, though. It's a good, good basketball game.

Mr. Nantz. You're going to talk to both teams after the game, I understand.

The President. I'd like to do that if we——

Mr. Nantz. What are you going to tell them?

The President. That they've got a lot to be proud of. Both these teams have got a lot to be proud of. And this Michigan team—of course, they have these four guys that have been to the last game twice—without an enormous amount of depth, they are playing incredible defense, and they're doing very well. So we'll just see. I hope we win, but it's going to be a tight game.

Mr. Nantz. How much have you been able to watch the Razorbacks so far in the tournament, up until today?

The President. I've watched all the games. I watch them all. And I've watched a lot of the other games, too.

Mr. Nantz. Do you have any words for Nolan Richardson? Have you had a chance to send a little tip in to the team? He doesn't need it, though, right?

The President. I'm trying to learn about basketball from him, not the other way around. I just sit and watch and learn.

Mr. Nantz. If Arkansas holds on and wins this game, are you going to Charlotte? Are you going to go with them?

The President. Oh, yes, I'll go.

Mr. Nantz. Both semifinals and possibly championship game, too?

The President. We've tried to work it out so that I can go to both games. I'm going to try.

NOTE: The interview began at 4 p.m. in Reunion Arena. Nolan Richardson was the University of Arkansas Razorbacks basketball coach. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Statement on Tornado Destruction in the South

March 28, 1994

I was deeply saddened to learn of the severe losses incurred by people and communities across the South as a result of the tornadoes which swept the region this weekend. Hillary and I want to express our sympathy and offer our prayers for all of those affected by the storm's devastating power, particularly those families who have lost someone to the destruction.

I spoke to James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, yesterday to get an update on the situation. I instructed him to report back to me after working with the affected States to assess the damage and evaluate appropriate actions.

Statement on the Violence in South Africa

March 28, 1994

We condemn the violence that took place in the streets of Johannesburg and elsewhere in South Africa in recent days. The United States calls on all South African parties to reject violence and intimidation and to work towards a peaceful transition to a nonracial democracy.

Those who are responsible for brutal acts of terror must not be allowed to impede South Africa's historic transformation. We urge an aggressive investigation into these violent actions so that the culprits can be brought to justice.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
March 28, 1994

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

I am pleased to transmit the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) Annual Report for 1993.

As a national security agency, ACDA works in collaboration with the Department of State and with other agencies of the U.S. Government. This report addresses ACDA's part in national security policy development and implementation.

On July 3, 1993, after a comprehensive review, I decided to strengthen and revitalize ACDA in order for it to play an active role in meeting the arms control and nonproliferation challenges of the post-Cold War era.

This report, although mandated by current law, reflects new priorities for ACDA in pending legislation. This legislation was initially developed under the leadership of the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Claiborne Pell, has received wide bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress, and has now been approved by the Senate.

The ACDA's revitalization reaffirms and strengthens the agency's key function in developing and implementing arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament policies. A specialized, technically competent, and independent arms control institution remains important to the Nation.

The ACDA's responsibilities include:

—Providing advice:
  —the ACDA Director acts as principal adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament;
  —the ACDA provides legal advisers to arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament negotiations.

—Negotiating:
  —leading the U.S. Comprehensive Test Ban negotiating team at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva;
  —leading the U.S. negotiating team at the 1995 Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Conference;
  —chairing the Washington backstopping (policy support) group for the Conference on Disarmament;
  —participating in the Safety, Security, and Dismantlement Talks.

—Implementing and verifying:
  —leading the U.S. delegation to the Chemical Weapons Convention Preparatory Commission, and to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons that will succeed it;
  —leading the U.S. delegations to all meetings and conferences on the Biological Weapons Convention;
  —leading the U.S. delegations to the Joint Compliance and Inspection Commission of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty;
  —leading the U.S. delegation to the Special Verification Commission of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty;
  —leading the U.S. component of the Standing Consultative Commission of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty;
  —leading the U.S. delegation to the Bilateral Consultative Commission of the Threshold Nuclear Test Ban Treaty;
  —drafting, with interagency coordination, the Annual Report to Congress on *Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control Agreements*;
  —providing the Principal Deputy Director of the On-Site Inspection Agency;
  —participating in the U.S. delegation to the Joint Consultative Group of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty;

—participating in the U.S. delegation to the Open Skies Consultative Commission of the Open Skies Treaty.

—Controlling exports:

—participating in meetings of the Zangger Committee and the Nuclear Suppliers Group on nuclear weapons related exports;

—participating in meetings of the Australia Group on chemical and biological weapons related exports;

—participating in the meetings of the Missile Technology Control Regime.

—Coordinating and reporting on research on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament.

—Informing and educating the public:

—leading the Interagency Working Group on Public Diplomacy for Arms Control and Nonproliferation;

—publishing extensively on arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament.

My decision to strengthen and revitalize ACDA, combined with continued congressional support, will help the U.S. Government move vigorously to eliminate the overarmament of the Cold War, stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and apply arms control solutions to regional problems.

The report offers a summary of the broad range of complex issues that ACDA deals with each day; I commend it to your attention.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in San Diego, California
March 30, 1994

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, we understand you talked to the Korean President. What did you tell him?

The President. First of all, I'd like to make a statement about the Middle East, and then I'll answer the Korean question.

The announcement today that Israel and the PLO have reached accord on security measures in Hebron is very, very important. It opens the way to now resume the Israel-PLO dialog on Gaza and Jericho and to complete it successfully. And this, plus the announcement that the negotiations with regard to Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon will all resume in April, means that the Middle East peace process is back on track. It's very encouraging to me, and I hope it would be to all the American people.

North Korea

Now, I just completed—literally, just a few minutes ago, 10, 15 minutes ago—a conversation with President Kim of South Korea about the whole Korean situation and about his recent trip to Japan and to China. He and I reaffirmed our common intention to continue to work together for a peaceful but firm resolution of this problem with North Korea.

The North Koreans themselves have committed to a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. They have committed to the IAEA inspection process. All we want is for them to keep that commitment as well as their commitment to resume their dialog with South Korea. And we're going to work very closely together in the U.N. and in other ways to try to pursue this. We hope that we will be able to do it in strong cooperation with the Japanese, who have helped us every step of the way, and with the Chinese, who have played a very constructive role in this. And I would also hope that Russia will be able to help in this process. I first raised this whole issue, Korean issue, with President Yeltsin some time ago.

And so we and the South Koreans are working to try to get the cooperation of all these parties and others. But in the end, the North Koreans will have to decide whether they wish to be completely isolated or not or whether they will just keep their commitments and, in return for simply keeping commitments they've already made, have the opportunity to integrate their

nation into a broader and far more prosperous world.

Q. They use very hostile language sometimes. They've implied that sanctions might be, in their mind, a declaration of war. How do you respond to that?

The President. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have done nothing offensive to North Korea. All of our military moves, indeed, the Patriot missile, has been entirely defensive. And any actions that we would support in that regard would be actions to which we have been forced by the North Koreans simply because they have declined to keep commitments that they themselves have made.

If we're going to do business in this world, people have got to be able to rely on the commitments that countries freely undertake. And again, I would say the way is still open to North Korea simply to follow the commitments they've already made. There are ways they can do that. We are going to work very closely with the South Koreans, but I think we have to be firm and persistent and just keep working at it, and we intend to do that.

Q. How optimistic are you about a U.N. resolution, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I don't want to characterize it in that way. I'll just say that we and the South Koreans are exploring, with all the relevant parties, what our options are, and we'll see what develops over the next few days.

Q. Sir, how big of an impediment is the Chinese to try to reach an international agreement on this issue? Tonight the nonaligned nations said they would support China. Is this hurting the chances for an international agreement because of China's problem?

The President. Well, we'll have to see where China comes down on it in the end. The Chinese have always been somewhat more cautious because of their longstanding relationship with North Korea. And also they have—I think they are genuine in not wanting to do anything which provokes some sort of crisis.

On the other hand, I would remind you that the Chinese certainly don't want North Korea to become a clear nuclear power because of the consequences that might have for them as well as for Japan. And the Chinese are now doing 8 or 10 times as much business with South Korea as with North Korea. So, their long-term economic interests clearly are in pursuing a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula in which North and South Korea are ultimately partners and both trading with a more prosperous China.

So I think their long-term objectives, security and economic, are consistent with what our long-term objectives are. So I hope that we can work through this crisis. But in the end, I will say again, the Chinese, no different from any other country, should want all nations who give their word to keep it.

Q. Sir, is this in retaliation against the U.S. because of our trade problems, our trade differences?

The President. No, I really don't think so. I don't think that has anything to do with this whatever.

Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Are you going to—[*inaudible*]—about the Middle East—[*inaudible*]—Mr. Arafat or anyone?

The President. Well, I'm in contact with the Middle East parties all the time. To date, this has required quite a lot of effort and personal time, and believe me, from here on in, it will require much more, time on the part of the Secretary of State, the President, and all of our resources. So, I think you can say, over the next couple of months, this will require a significant commitment and investment on the part of the United States, and we intend to do that. It's worth it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:55 p.m. at a private residence in San Diego. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on Signing the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994
March 30, 1994

I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 3345, the "Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994." This Act's incentives will help to accomplish the reduction of Federal employment by about 273,000 by the close of fiscal year 1999.

When the Administration released the report of the National Performance Review last September, we promised the American people that we would create a Government that works better and costs less. We are committed to bringing meaningful change in the way this Government does business and to renewing the faith of citizens around this country in their Government. Enactment of this legislation is an important milestone toward achieving these goals.

This Administration is committed to streamlining Government with as few voluntary incentives as possible. New caps on agency budgets will force agencies to cut employment. Agencies need the cost-effective incentives provided in this bill in order to avoid excessive reductions-in-force that are costly, disruptive, and disproportionately strike younger workers, many of whom are recently hired women and minorities. With the "buyout" authority granted by this legislation, agencies can target employees in unnecessary high level jobs and maximize savings.

Consistent with the clear intent of the Act, I will interpret the term "full-time equivalent positions," used in the legislation to define annual employment ceilings, to mean "full-time equivalent employment."

This Act also will modernize the law governing Federal employee training. It will permit new flexibility in choosing the best and most cost-effective training and place new emphasis on retraining our employees to move into new career fields where their talents are most needed.

After all the rhetoric about cutting the size and cost of Government, our Administration has done the hard work and made the tough choices. I believe the economy will be stronger, and the lives of middle class people will be better, as we drive down the deficit with legislation like this. We can maintain and expand our recovery so long as we keep faith with deficit reduction and sensible, fair policies like this.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
March 30, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 3345, approved March 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–226. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Message on the Observance of Easter, 1994
March 30, 1994

Warmest greetings to all who are observing Easter Sunday. Easter is a time of hope and great joy for Christians the world over. It is a time to reflect on the blessings of rebirth, as the seasons transform and the cycle of life renews itself once again. This celebration holds the promise of new beginnings, fresh approaches to old problems, and the exciting prospect of a brighter future.

On this day when families gather together and worshipers attend church services, we hope for a stronger sense of community in this great nation. As we welcome the return of spring, let us rededicate ourselves to a season of renewed hope and faith, a season of peace and regeneration.

Hillary and I extend our best wishes for a happy Easter.

BILL CLINTON

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

Statement on the Death of Representative William H. Natcher
March 30, 1994

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Congressman William Natcher. We want to extend our deepest sympathy to his family, friends, and staff for their great loss. For the past 40 years, Bill Natcher has served the people of Kentucky's Second District with distinction and uncommon dedication.

Earlier this month, I visited Bill Natcher at Bethesda Naval Hospital where I presented the Presidential Citizens' Medal to him. The citation for that medal offers a fitting remembrance of Congressman Natcher's career: "Few legislators in our history have honored their responsibilities with greater fealty or shunned the temptations of power with greater certainty than William Huston Natcher."

Bill Natcher governed and campaigned the hard way. He never missed a rollcall vote or a quorum call in the House for 40 years. He never took a campaign contribution. He never made a political commercial. He never hired a press secretary. He read and answered his own constituent mail. He drove through the small towns and farms of central Kentucky visiting the people he represented at county courthouses and general stores. He paid his campaign expenses out of his own pocket and never had to spend much money. In an era of soundbites and high-tech media campaigns, Bill Natcher was a rarity.

Some may think that Bill Natcher's death marks the end of an era in politics. I hope not. I hope that Congressman Natcher's devotion to public service serves as an inspiration to the young men and women of America for as long as his voting record stands. Bill Natcher once said he wanted his tombstone to read, "He tried to do it right." Let us all carry those words forward in his honor and memory.

Nomination for Ambassador to Algeria
March 30, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Ronald E. Neumann, of California, as Ambassador to Algeria.

"Ronald Neumann has exhibited dedication and diplomacy throughout his career," the President said. "His experience in the Middle East makes him uniquely qualified for this important position."

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

Nomination for Chief Financial Officer at the Department of Energy
March 30, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Joseph F. Vivona as the Chief Financial Officer at the Department of Energy.

"Joseph Vivona's experience and expertise in the area of fiscal responsibility will be a great asset to the Department," the President said.

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

Teleconference Remarks on the Goals 2000 Education Reform Legislation in San Diego, California

March 31, 1994

The President. Hello.

Representative William Ford. Hello, Mr. President.

The President. How are you?

Representative Ford. Just fine.

The President. Senator Mitchell?

Senator George Mitchell. Yes, sir.

The President. Senator Kennedy, are you there?

Senator Edward Kennedy. Yes, sir.

The President. At the Mary Cunningham Elementary School in Milton, Massachusetts?

Senator Kennedy. That's exactly right.

The President. Chairman Ford?

Representative Ford. Yes, I'm here.

The President. Senator Jeffords?

Senator James Jeffords. Yes, I'm here.

The President. Congressman Kildee?

Representative Dale Kildee. Yes, I'm here, Mr. President.

The President. Congressman Goodling?

Representative William Goodling. I'm here in York.

The President. In York?

Representative Goodling. York, Pennsylvania.

The President. I've been there many times.

Representative Goodling. Yes, you have.

The President. It's nice to hear your voice. I just wanted to call you today. I'm here with Secretary Riley and with Congressman Filner, Congresswoman Schenk and a lot of other people who, like you, worked so hard on this Goals 2000 bill. I'm about to go out and sign the bill. I didn't want to do it without having the opportunity to call and thank you so much for all your hard work in getting this bipartisan, terrific education reform legislation through the Congress.

Speaker Thomas Foley. This is Tom Foley in Washington, Mr. President. Mr. President?

The President. Yes, sir, I'm listening.

Speaker Foley. The committees did a great job on this, and the Secretary did a great job. I think it's going to be great legislation for everyone.

The President. I'm elated. And of course, it passed the House by a vote of 307 to 120.

Speaker Foley. Right, a bipartisan vote.

The President. That's right. We need more of that.

Senator Kennedy. Yeah, we had a little tougher time in the Senate, Mr. President, as you know. But thanks to Jim Jeffords and a few of our other Republican friends who were able to break the filibuster early last Saturday morning and get it passed. And I think it's a tremendous tribute to you and Secretary Riley and all those who worked so hard for this bill.

Representative Kildee. Mr. President, this is Dale Kildee. And Bill Goodling and Mr. Gunderson just did a tremendous job on this bill and really made it bipartisan. We really appreciate their leadership.

The President. Yeah, I do want to thank Congressman Gunderson, too. I know he's not on the call today, but he worked hard and I thank him for that.

Representative Goodling. Yeah, his father's pretty critical right now.

The President. Mr. Goodling?

Representative Goodling. Yes, this is Congressman Goodling. We worked a long time and hard work, but I'm sure it's going to be very beneficial to excellence in education in the future, and that's what it's all about.

Senator Kennedy. Mr. President, Ted Kennedy. We came into the Cunningham School up here and had some of the first graders, and they said, "This is the most important day because Senator Clinton's coming." [*Laughter*] We're working—we're up with the fifth grade now, and they have—they're doing a lot of advanced mathematics. And there's the total immersion program up here, where the children in the first four grades, half the school, is totally immersed in French. And there's a lot of very exciting people here, teachers, parents, students. Ninety percent of them said they all love school. And I think that's what this bill is really all about. And I think all of us here are obviously grateful to all the great leadership in education and the priority placed on it—[*inaudible*]—Secretary Riley and all of our bipartisan friends. They really appreciate it out here in the Cunningham School.

Senator Jeffords. Mr. President, this is Jim Jeffords speaking.

The President. Yes, Jim.

Senator Jeffords. I certainly want to thank the Secretary also. And certainly this Goals 2000—it's beginning. It's unfortunate it's taken us a decade too long just to start the planning. And also, it won't be possible to reach the goals without additional resources, and the Federal Government, I think, must become an equal partner in financing education to reach these goals. And I think we've got to make that commitment pretty soon so that the States and local agencies can plan appropriately next year. And I just look forward to working with you and the Secretary, as I know you've made a significant effort to improving funding for education this year, and we've just got to keep on doing that.

The President. That's right. You know, in our 1995 budget, even though there's an overall reduction in Federal spending for discretionary programs, we have a $1.7 billion increase in education funding. And I'm proud of that, and it's a good beginning. And I want to thank you again, Senator Jeffords, for helping us to break that filibuster by a vote of 62 to 23. And then the bill ultimately passed, I think, 63 to 22. You were a real moving force, and we're grateful to you.

Senator Jeffords. Thank you, Mr. President. I look forward to working with you to do better even next year.

Senator Kennedy. Mr. President, Ted Kennedy. I think some of the students have a quick word just to say to you if you have one more minute.

The President. Okay.

The Students. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Well, thank you. You all just do a good job in school, learn a lot, make the most of it. You were great.

Representative Ford. Mr. President, this is truly a bipartisan moment when we have people of the stature of Jim Jeffords speaking for the Republican Party about spending more money for education. I think we ought to get to work with him right away and get all we can get. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thanks, Bill.

Representative Kildee. Mr. President, I think this ranks historically with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 under Lyndon Johnson. And Bill Ford was there at that time, passing that bill, too. And we're really grateful to Bill for it; we're going to miss him in the Congress.

The President. I'm certainly——

Speaker Foley. That's certainly true, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you so much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you Senator Mitchell, and thank all of you for everything you've done. Secretary Riley and I are going to go out here and try not to mess up this bill signing, and we'll be really celebrating what we said we'd do.

I also want to say that, as you know, we had to sign this bill before April 1st, and we're delighted to have the opportunity to sign it here in this wonderful school district, at this fine school. But we do want to have a very large celebration when we come back to Washington for all the people from all over the country and all the Members who worked so hard to get it passed. So we will do that and have an appropriate opportunity to have everyone thanked in person. But I thank you for being——

Speaker Foley. We'll look forward to it, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 9:20 a.m. The President spoke from the Zamorano Fine Arts Academy.

Remarks on Signing the Goals 2000: Educate America Act in San Diego
March 31, 1994

Thank you. Thank you so much. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, and to the boys and girls here. Let me say first of all, I've got a lot of people I want to recognize, but first I think we ought to give the students a big hand for being so well-behaved and so

quiet and so receptive. [*Applause*] I know that a lot of you may not understand everything that's being said here today, but it's all being said for your future, and the people who came here today came because they care about your future.

I want to recognize, in addition to Congresswoman Lynn Schenk and Congressman Bob Filner who are here with me today—and I thank them for coming; they're up here. They voted for the bill. If they hadn't, it wouldn't have passed. I want to thank your Mayor, Susan Golding, for being here; your superintendent of schools, Dr. Bertha Pendleton; John de Beck, the president of the San Diego School Board; Mary Bergen, representing the California Federation of Teachers; Dr. Lois Tinson, representing the California Teachers Association; Ken Melley, the associate director of the National Education Association; Sandy McBrayer, who's the Teacher of the Year in California—I think you're here somewhere. Stand up. Give her a hand. [*Applause*] Bless you, ma'am.

I also want you to know that there are a lot of people who are leaders in the business community all over America who work for this program, and some of them have come from a long way away. I saw two; I think three are here all the way from Atlanta. The president of Bell South, one of our country's biggest telephone companies, John Clendenin came. And I saw the chief executive officer of the Boeing Corporation, our Nation's biggest exporter, Mr. Frank Shrontz, is here. And I was told that Joe Gorman is here, the chairman of TRW, but I didn't see him back there.

Anyway, all these people have come here because they care about you and your future. I want to especially thank my good friend Dick Riley, who just spoke, for the work he did on this legislation, and many of his staff members, but especially Mike Cohen, who worked on this whole issue with me as a Governor, with Secretary Riley, and Bill Galston in the White House. I want to thank the Governors and the State legislators who worked with us, as well as the fine Members of Congress of both parties. We have so much partisan wrangling in Congress, but this bill passed with over 300 votes in the House of Representatives, and only 120 voted no; 63 votes in the United States Senate, only 22 voting no.

I want to say, too, that it is very appropriate for me to be here with all of you to sign this bill. The San Diego School District is well known for being on the leading edge of school reform and giving our children a better future. Your former superintendent, Tom Payzant, now serves as our Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education. Give him a hand there. [*Applause*] And I know Bertha Pendleton is continuing her outstanding work. I also want to say a special word of thanks to your principal, Dr. Jeannie Steeg.

I have been told that your school is one of the very best schools in this whole school district and in this State. And I want to thank you for striving to achieve excellence in every area with a student body that is very diverse, racially and ethnically and economically. You look like America will look in the 21st century, and we have to win with you.

I also want to thank you for what you put up on the basketball goal; that was very nice. [*Laughter*] And I'd like to thank the students here who are wearing their D.A.R.E. T-shirts, all of you. I love the D.A.R.E. program, and I'm glad you're active in it and support it.

Let me tell you why this bill is important to the future of the young people here today and those like you all across America. You know you're growing up into a world that is increasingly smaller, where people are connected financially and by communications networks that were unheard of when I was your age. The average young person will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime. The only real ticket to these kids' future is good jobs that come from good skills, learning a lot in school, and being able to learn for a lifetime.

What this Goals 2000 bill does, believe it or not, for the first time in the entire history of the United States of America, is to set world-class education standards for what every child in every American school should know in order to win when he or she becomes an adult. We have never done it before; we are going to do it now because of this bill.

Why do we do that? Because we believe every child can and must learn at world-class standards of excellence. And those of us who are older believe we have a practical and a moral obligation to see that you have the chance to do it. This Goals 2000 legislation sets into law the national education goals that, as Secretary Riley said, I worked very hard to write back in 1989. It says that every student, every student, should enter school ready and able to learn. It says

that 90 percent of our young people should graduate from high school on time, just the way our competitors do. It says that we must meet world-class standards in reading and writing, math and science, history, geography, foreign language, civics and economics, and the arts. It says that we have to take care of our teachers better. We have to prepare them better, enable them to continue to learn. It says that in a world in which families are under increasing stress, we can't succeed in our schools unless parents are more involved, and we have to find ways to help them do it. It acknowledges that most of the problems in American education have been solved somewhere by somebody, and we need more research and innovation to make available the successes everywhere to people who don't have them yet. There is no reason in the world that if somebody is doing something in Alaska that works, people in San Diego shouldn't know about it and have access to it immediately. And finally, it says that our schools have to be safe and disciplined and free of drugs and crime, and we have to work to make them so.

Besides these academic standards, this bill will set national skill standards to ensure that our workers are better trained for the high-skill, high-wage jobs we want for America and better able to compete in the world.

This bill provides funds—modest amounts this year, much more in the years to come—funds to make our schools safer and freer of crime and drugs, funds for those who need the most. It provides funds to support the innovations of local communities. I am proud of the fact that this bill contains not one single mandate or order to any State or any local school district. Instead, it sets standards. It says we know you want to meet them, and we are prepared to help you if you will be innovative and try some new things and make them work.

I guess I've spent more time in schools than any person who was ever elected President—that makes it sound like I didn't pass from grade to grade—[*laughter*]—but what I mean by that is I've spent a lot of time visiting schools and listening to teachers and watching teaching take place. And I know that learning does not occur in Washington, DC, it does not occur in Sacramento, or even here at the local school board office. The magic of education occurs in the classroom, supported by whatever happens in the home. That's where it happens.

So, in addition to providing funds to try to help make schools safer, this bill says we're going to try something new. We're going to have world-class standards implemented with grassroots reforms. We're going to give more waivers and cut the redtape to districts who want to try new and different and innovative things. We're going to support schools that let the teachers and the principals try things that innovate, that do things to involve parents, that are succeeding. We're going to encourage people to experiment with new and different things all across this country. People are trying things that work, that are different, that have never been tried before, different ways of managing schools, different people organizing schools in different ways.

But we know in the end what has to happen is that the children have to learn. So we want world-class standards. We want a way of measuring whether the children learn them or not, and then we want to say to people all across the country, "Here are the standards. Here's how we'll know whether you'll make it or not. Now, you figure out how to do it. Use your mind, use your energy, and we will support you. We'll try to make your schools safe havens if you will take the leadership to do it, and we'll try to encourage all your best ideas, all your energy."

This is a new and different approach for the National Government, but it's how learning really happens in the schools. You know it, and it's time now that your country recognizes it. This is a remarkable departure. First, there have never been any national standards. Second, there's never been any way to measure them. Third, there's never been any national skills standards for our workers. But fourth, we never thought we could do it with grassroots reforms. We're telling you we know you have the answers. You go find them, and we'll tell you how you're doing along the way, and we'll support you when you win for our children.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is just the beginning of this process. It will only work if, year-in and year-out, the Congress continues to support the effort; only work if we continue to provide good preschool opportunities until every child is in a good Head Start program or another program like it. It will only work when we provide an opportunity for every child who doesn't go to college to get the kind of skills training they need. Every child who wants

to go to college will never have to worry about how to pay for it again. And every adult will have the opportunity to get lifetime training. That's what we have to do.

But this is the beginning; it is the foundation. And as the Secretary said, today we can say America is serious about education, America cares about the future of every child, and America will lead the world in the 21st century because we're going to make sure you will be there on the frontlines, living up to the fullest of your God-given capacities.

Thank you all very much, and bless you all.

Now, I'm going to sign this little bill here. And then when I sign the real little bill, I'm going to sign this copy of the big bill. And all of them are going to help me since it's really their bill and their ticket to the future, all the students who are up here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 a.m. at the Zamorano Fine Arts Academy. H.R. 1804, approved March 31, was assigned Public Law No. 103–227.

Exchange With Reporters in San Diego
March 31, 1994

Stock Market

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what's happening on the stock market?

The President. Well, I've talked to Mr. Rubin this morning at some length, and he's obviously been making calls around the country.

I'd just like to make two observations. One is that we have conducted, since the stock market began to fall, another exhaustive review of all the evidence we have and the opinions of everybody we can talk to around the country. No one believes that there is any serious reason to doubt, that there is any inflation in this economy, or that we won't have good growth this year. In other words, there is no underlying economic justification for any cause of concern or any increase in long-term interest rates.

There are a lot of people who have believed for some time—and it's been in the press a lot—that the stock market had a very rapid runup last year. It might have been a little bit too high, and maybe a lot of this is people just kind of working that out. But again, I say, I think it's very important that the American people remain confident that there's no inflation in the economy, that there's no reason that the economy shouldn't grow, that there's no reason we shouldn't have 2 million more jobs.

The stock market, like any kind of market, is subject to movements which may sometimes be a little more than is warranted by the economic circumstances one way or the other. We saw that often in the 1980's, when the stock market tripled in years when unemployment went up, when wages were stagnant, when the underlying economy didn't seem to justify it.

So we've had a very good market; I'm very grateful for it. I hope that we'll rebound quickly, but the underlying economy is in good shape. And no one should make decisions based on a worry about some inflation factor they don't know about or some impending problem in some sector of the economy. Things, according to every single report I have, are still very solid for a solid economic growth.

Q. Does that skittishness bother you, though, I mean whether it's warranted or not?

The President. Let me just say this. I remember when it happened in 1987, when there was more than skittishness, when there was a big drop there. No one could figure out exactly why it happened, and then after it happened the market began a steady rebuilding. What I'm trying to do is to reassure people so that we don't go beyond skittishness, because no one believes that there's a serious problem with an underlying American economy. It is healthy, and it is sound. Some of these corrective things will happen from time to time, but there's no reason for people to overreact to it. The real issue is, is our fundamental economy sound?

Americans will be making these investment decisions all the time: Should they be in the stock market or should they be in CD's or should they be in something in between, you know? Should they change their stock portfolios? And there are a lot of things that have happened in the last few years which have increased the

volume and intensity of trading in the stock market. Low interest rates put more people in the stock market because they couldn't earn big interest rates on fixed investments. So, a lot of these things just happen and change. I just think it's important that we not overreact to it.

Japanese Students

Q. Mr. President, on the murders of those two Japanese students. Have you had a chance—they caught the two—they have two suspects in the murders of those two Japanese students. Have you had a chance to talk with the parents or with anyone involved in that? What do you think?

The President. I called Prime Minister Hosokawa, and we talked about a number of things, but I—or excuse me, I sent him word and he called me, and we talked about a number of things. And I personally told him how regretful I was, and I apologized on behalf of our people that anyone would lose their lives here. And I have written to both the young men's parents personally, and I saw Chief Williams on television last night. I'm gratified that an arrest has been made. That's a real compliment to the law enforcement agents in Los Angeles. And I appreciate the effort that they've made.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:03 a.m. at the Zamorano Fine Arts Academy. During the exchange, the President referred to Takuma Eto and Go Matsura, Japanese students living in California who were murdered in a carjacking on March 25. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's Radio Address
April 2, 1994

Good morning. For my family, and I hope for yours as well, this is a time for reflection, renewal, and rededication. At the start of springtime, nature reminds us of new beginnings and forgotten beauty, and most Americans celebrate holy days of redemption and renewal, from the Christian Easter to the Jewish Passover to the Muslim Ramadan.

Tomorrow on Easter Sunday, those of us who are Christians celebrate God's redemptive love as manifested in the life, the teachings, and the sacrificial death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. Easter symbolizes for us the ultimate victory of good over evil, hope over despair, and life over death.

At this season, we're reminded that Americans are a people of many faiths. But most of all, we are a people of faith. The Bible I carry to church on Sunday says, "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen." America is a special nation because it is the product of that kind of faith in the future to which so many have held fast in spite of fearsome obstacles and great hardships. Always we have believed that we could do better, conquer injustice, climb new mountains, build a better life for ourselves and a future of infinite possibility for our children. Always we have believed we can keep the promise we call America.

Last Thursday I visited the Zamorano Fine Arts Academy, an outstanding public school in San Diego, to sign Goals 2000, the new education law which challenges all our schools and all our students to meet the highest standards of educational achievement by setting world-class educational standards and promoting grassroots reforms to achieve them in every school for every student. That school reflects the marvelous diversity that is now America. The students there come from at least six different racial and ethnic groups. Like our Nation, they can trace their heritage to every continent, every country, every culture.

As I thought of the parents, the students, and the teachers at that school, I couldn't help but believe that the things that make them different from each other are ultimately far less important than the things that bring them together: their love of learning, the joy they share in arts and athletics and family and friends, and their dreams of the future in which they can make the most of the gifts that God has give them.

The greatness and glory of America is that we define ourselves not by where our families came from but by our common values, our common goals, our common sense, and our common decency. Two days from now, we'll honor the memory of a man of faith who stood for and struggled for what is best about America. On April 4th, 1968, Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life for every American's right to live and work in dignity. In his last Sunday morning sermon, one week before Easter, speaking in the National Cathedral in Washington, DC, 26 years ago, Dr. King reminded us that time is neutral; it can be used constructively or destructively. Dr. King used his time on Earth as well as anyone. He was only 39 when he died. He never held public office, but no one ever did more to redeem the promise or stir the soul of our Nation. In spite of unearned suffering, unreasoning hatred, and unprovoked violence, he never lost faith that he and we would overcome the frustrations and difficulties of the moment.

A quarter century later, each of us faces the challenge to use our time creatively and constructively. For this is a time of historic, sometimes wrenching, social and economic and technological change. The fabric of our society has been strained by the hopelessness caused by the flight of jobs from too many of our communities and the fear and suspicion resulting from the epidemic of crime and violence, especially among our young people.

And at this time of uncertainty, there are demagogs of division who would set us against one another. Too many powerful forces today seek to make money or even more power from our common misery, when what we most desperately need is to work together to solve the problems that plague us all and to build a stronger American community.

There's much that we can do as a nation to prepare our people for these changes and to do better. We can, we must create more jobs, finally provide health care security for all our people, improve our education and training so that we can compete and win in this global economy, and make our people safer in their homes, their streets, and their schools. But we must also, each and every one of us, accept greater personal responsibility for ourselves and our families and extend a hand of friendship to our neighbors.

We must raise our own children with responsibility and faith. We must reject those who would divide us by race or religion. We must always remember that, as Dr. King declared the night before he died, "Either we go up together, or we go down together." Essentially, all human condition can only be transformed by faith, faith in ourselves, faith in each other, faith that we can do better if we hold firm to the ultimate moral purpose in life, keep our eyes on the prize, and refuse to be dragged down.

I have issued a proclamation asking Americans to observe this Monday, the anniversary of Dr. King's tragic assassination, as a day of reconciliation, a day when we look beyond hatred and division and commit ourselves anew to reducing crime and violence and bringing out the best in each other. Some Americans may use that day to teach their children about the meaning of the life and death of Dr. King and his legacy and lessons for our time. Others may answer the call of the organization he founded, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and turn on their automobile lights as part of a national day of witness against violence. Still others may make a commitment to work with their neighbors to keep their communities free from crime and drugs and guns.

In our own lives, in our own way, this Monday and on every day of this year, let us rededicate ourselves to the spirit of Easter, of Passover, of Ramadan; to the mission of Martin Luther King; and to the common values that must make America a land of limitless hope and opportunity for all of our people for all time to come.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 2:15 p.m. on April 1 at a private residence in San Diego, CA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 2. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address. The National Day of Reconciliation proclamation of April 3 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at the White House Easter Egg Roll
April 4, 1994

The President. Good morning.

Audience members. Good morning.

The President. I am so glad to see all of you here. I woke up before dawn this morning, and when I got out just at dawn I already saw the Easter Bunnies out here walking around, plotting their strategies for the day and getting ready.

I want to thank everyone who has worked so hard on this and all the people who helped to sponsor it. But mostly, I just want to welcome all the boys and girls here, all the families here, and to thank all of you for being a part of this wonderful American tradition. I hope you have a terrific time today. I assure you that we're having a terrific time having you here. And I think we ought to start. Are you ready to start?

Audience members. Yes!

The President. Now we've got to get everybody lined up. Line them up for the first roll. Now everybody, let me just say, everybody who is here, all the children who are here, not every adult, all the children who are here will get a souvenir egg. Okay? And some of them were signed not just by the First Lady and me, some were signed by Socks. They're more valuable.

Are we ready?

Audience members. Yes!

The President. All right, when I blow the whistle, we're all going to start. Okay? So when I blow the whistle, all of you cheer the kids on who are over there in the roll. Have we got a deal?

Audience members. Yes!

The President. All right, let's go. One, two, three, go!

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. He was introduced by Hillary Clinton.

Exchange With Reporters in Cleveland, Ohio
April 4, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Do the Serbs have a green light in——

The President. I don't think they have a green light. We're looking at what our options are there. But it really depends upon in part what the U.N. mission wants to do there. We are committed to provide air support to troops if they go in. And whether we can recreate the conditions of Sarajevo anywhere else depends in part on the facts of each specific case.

I would discourage any of them for doing anything just for negotiating purposes. They ought to go ahead and negotiate a peace and get it over with, is what I hope they will. It's not going to change their options——

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 1 p.m. at Jacobs Field. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters in Cleveland
April 4, 1994

Stock Market

Q. Mr. President, does this roller coaster stock market have you worried, sir?

The President. No. I mean, people have been predicting for months that there would be some sort of correction in the stock market, that it got too high, too quick. And I think when the

Federal Reserve decided to raise the interest rates a little bit short-term, that happened. When people take their money out of the stock market, if they put their money in Government securities, that would raise interest rates, long-term interest rates in those securities. On the other hand, there's no inflation in the economy. We had 458,000 new jobs last month. That's the most in over 6 years. So that could have something to do, too, with a little increase in the interest rates.

Fundamentally, I still would just point people to the fact that we're creating jobs at a very rapid pace and without inflation, which means there's good growth. And I think the most important thing is that—we listened to the experts. The experts are telling us that there's some institutional investors and when they move around, that could aggravate trends both up and down in the stock market. But fundamentally it's a solid stock market and a very solid economy. And I think that's what should guide people in their long-term investment decisions. We have a solid economy, growth on the horizon. And none of us should do anything which would derail that. We should keep steadily moving forward.

Q. But can the market talk the economy into a slowdown?

The President. Well, I don't think so. No one expects that we can continue to grow at 7 percent a year. That's what we had in the last quarter of last year. That was the most we had in a decade. And you can't sustain that. But I think we can sustain very good and steady growth, and that's my goal. My goal is to have a steadily growing economy, where we're creating jobs and we're doing it in a way that doesn't run the risk of a big spurt and then going back into a deep recession. So that's why I'm hoping that no one will overreact to this. After all, if we have no inflation and we have job growth, those are the two most important things to ordinary Americans: no inflation and job growth.

So we'll get through this if everybody will just remain calm and let the market work itself out.

Q. Is this a situation where good news is bad news?

The President. No—well, it's a situation where good news can maybe reinforce some of the things which are going already. If you have real good news, you know you're going to have interest rates go up a little bit because the economy's very robust. But these other things are happening. I think we'll work through it, and I think it'll be just fine. We're just going to have to ride through it a little bit. But I think it's going to be fine.

NCAA Basketball Championship

Q. Are you worried about tonight's game?

The President. Of course. [*Laughter*] Of course. I mean, it'll be a great game. And you have to respect the fact that Duke has been there 3 of the last 4 years—extraordinary talent, more seasoned, more experience in the players, a fabulous coach, good program, playing at home with lots of folks from Carolina. It's a——

Q. You're low-balling—sounds like you're low-balling here. [*Laughter*]

The President. You guys taught me I had to do that. [*Laughter*] I learned it, it's one of the many lessons I've learned from you.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—that's a political hedge.

The President. No, it's a real hedge. I expect a very, very vigorous and an extremely close game.

Q. You're going to have to switch ties. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:57 p.m. at the Sheraton City Centre. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks in a Health Care Roundtable and an Exchange With Reporters in Troy, North Carolina

April 5, 1994

The President. We just completed kind of a brief tour of the hospital, and I met some of the nurses and patients and people who work here. We talked a little bit about the physician shortage in this county, a little about the problems with delivery of babies and the high rate

of teen pregnancies, low-birth-weight babies, relatively low number of prenatal visits. We talked about some of the reimbursement problems of Medicare and Medicaid and the problem that this hospital has at the emergency room because they take everybody whether they have insurance or not. And I think that's a fair summary—and I met the wonderful, dedicated people. So why don't you lead off.

Harold Scott. Thank you, sir. I want to let Mr. Bernstein give us an overview of Montgomery County medicine and how it relates to the rural problems overall.

The President. I think it would help for the press that are here, just the first time you speak, if you would say your name and why you're here.

[*At this point, Jim Bernstein, director, North Carolina Office of Rural Health, and president-elect, National Rural Health Association, discussed the development of a community corporation within Montgomery County to provide rural health care and stressed that health care reform must address the urban-rural discrepancy.*]

The President. Thank you very much. I also think—I was reminded on the tour that North Carolina actually has a program to provide subsidies for the malpractice premiums of practitioners who deliver babies and do things in rural areas that they normally wouldn't do in urban areas. Is that right?

Jim Bernstein. Yes. We have a lot of incentives in place in the State; one is that one. Another one—State hasn't done which is really good—Arkansas might do it, I understand—is that we pay our residents more money if they'll go into rural areas and give them higher salaries. And then we do the usual things like loan repayments, things like that. And we have, also, a statewide area health education center program trying to bring continuing education to keep people current in Troy and places like that.

The President. That's very important. In this plan—I just wanted to mention this, because I think it's important—as the Congress debates this whole health care issue, the things which get the largest amount of attention, as they would expect, are how to provide universal coverage and whether you can maintain choice and quality with universal coverage, and a lot of these big questions. But what a lot of people don't know is that in rural America, even if you cover everybody, a lot of folks still don't have adequate access to health care, and there's a real doctor shortage out there. And no matter what happens, I hope the Congress will leave in the provisions of our plan, which have—one, would expand the National Health Service Corps by 7,000 doctors over the next 8 years; two, would give physicians who go into underserved rural areas tax credits of $1,000 a month, 5 years, which is a huge incentive; and three, would allow a much bigger, faster writeoff of equipment, medical equipment that doctors might bring into rural areas. So I think those three things will really help to reinforce what you're doing.

Mr. Scott. Mr. President, Dr. McRoberts is one of our three practicing family physicians in the county. Our ratio of family practice physicians to population is almost one to 8,000.

The President. One to 8,000, and what's the recommended ratio?

Dr. Deborah McRoberts. Well, to qualify as a health profession shortage area, it would have to be about one to 3,000, correct?

Mr. Bernstein. But you want to be at one to 2,000.

The President. One to 2,000 is what you should have, right?

Dr. Hugh Craft. Yes.

Dr. McRoberts. What we should have. And I have 8,000 active patients in my practice right now.

The President. Eight thousand?

Dr. McRoberts. I have over 8,000.

The President. When was the last time you slept?

[*Dr. McRoberts described working an average of 100 to 110 hours a week during flu season and 80 hours a week normally while always facing unfinished paperwork, but affirmed her dedication to practicing rural medicine.*]

The President. What's the most important thing that could be done to make your life easier? More doctors?

Dr. McRoberts. More doctors. I mean, definitely. We are at such a critical shortage of doctors right now, with only three family practitioners. And our draw area, the population that we draw from, is about 28,000 people.

The President. And what would be more likely than anything else to generate more doctors in this area? What could be done by the county or by——

Dr. McRoberts. I don't know. That's the big question mark. What will it take to get doctors to come here? I think you have to look for things like loan forgiveness, certainly, or low repayment programs for the residents that are coming out, because that way you can get fresh, young blood, you know, people that aren't tired yet.

The President. It doesn't take long to get that way.

Mr. Bernstein. This sounds a little trite, because it's a big question. But for 30 years we've rewarded high-tech people and health professional people and basically didn't pay primary care people. And I know money is not the single most important thing, but it is important. And so, if the reform plan could move to reverse that, somehow the incentives would be not only loan repayment and stuff like that, but somebody who worked here could make as much money as somebody who worked—even if it had to be paid more to get to that level than in Charlotte—we would be in a better position, because our physicians get paid a whole lot less out here, a whole lot less, than they do in Charlotte.

The President. Well I think, for one thing, you know, let me just mention, if you start in medical school, under our plan we would shift the allocation of internships and slots more toward primary care physicians, so you'll have more people in that business, and they don't have to go where the market is.

Secondly, I think, we know the National Health Service works; it just got cut way back. So if you put another 7,000 doctors out there, it will make a difference, because that's a way to pay your medical school. And then the way the tax credit works is that it will, in effect, increase the income of every doctor in the underserved areas by $12,000 a year. That's what a $1,000-a-month tax credit is. And even though—you know, if people just come in here in 5-year cycles, that's a significant amount; that's a big commitment of your professional life. You can keep going that way.

[*Mr. Scott described the Montgomery County not-for-profit corporation designed to recruit six to eight family physicians to reduce the workload of county physicians. He then introduced Beth Howell, director of nursing, Montgomery Memorial Hospital, who discussed recruitment and retention of nurses in rural areas.*]

The President. How many more nurses do you need? I mean, just for example.

Beth Howell. I would like to have five additional registered nurses.

The President. And where are most of them trained, most of the RN's you get here?

Ms. Howell. In the local community colleges.

The President. And is there one—where's the nearest one?

Ms. Howell. We actually have two that are within 20 miles and another one that's within 40 miles.

The President. So that's not a real problem—[*inaudible*].

Ms. Howell. Right.

Dr. McRoberts. Retention is the problem. The nursing staff turns over a lot, just like she was saying.

The President. I'd be interested in your feedback on this. The only thing that I know of that's in our bill that would help is there's also—as I say, we felt that the quickest way we could deal with the income disparity—I mean, we can't go in and sort of change the economics of every community in the country, but you could give a Federal tax credit. And a credit is not like a deduction; it's a dollar-for-dollar deal. And so there's a $500-a-month tax credit for 5 years for nurses, too. And I think that will almost close most of the gaps. I mean, that's $6,000 a year. That's probably about what the gap is early on.

Dr. McRoberts. Is that just for health profession shortage areas?

The President. Yes. For shortage areas. But you could qualify.

Dr. McRoberts. Thanks. [*Laughter*]

The President. I mean, nobody can work 80 hours or 100 hours a week forever. You burn out. You can't do it.

Dr. McRoberts. That's right. [*Laughter*]

The President. That's what I tell all of the young people at the White House with their boundless energy. At some point, you stop working smart and you start working stupid. When you work hard, you just can't—there's a limit to how much anybody can do.

[*Mr. Scott introduced Dr. Hugh Craft, chief of pediatrics, Community Hospital of Roanoke Valley, VA, who discussed the importance of primary and preventive care for children and continuing education efforts for staff in smaller hos-*

pitals and then expressed support for the President's plan.]

The President. One of the things—you mentioned the area health education concept, which I think has really done wonders in rural America, all over the country. But one of the things that we have tried to do in this plan which we haven't talked about this morning is to provide some funds for electronic hookups with really great access to technology so you can have almost instantaneous and continuous contact with medical centers around the country. I think it isn't quite like being there, but it will go a long way toward bridging the gap that exists now.

[*Dr. McRoberts described an electronic system which linked Montgomery Memorial Hospital to the University of North Carolina for instant consultation but was discontinued for lack of support. Dr. Tom Townsend, East Tennessee State Medical School, discussed training and emphasized that medical schools must be reoriented to the needs of rural communities.*]

The President. You know, this has been a source of real controversy, by the way, in the medical community, as you know, because we are only, of all of our graduates from medical school now, only about 15 percent are family practitioners. And in most other major nations, about half the doctors are family practitioners, maybe slightly over half.

So in our bill, we propose over a 5-year period to change the mix of medical school slots that the Federal Government subsidizes, and as you know, they're heavily subsidized, to get to a point where about 55 percent have to be in family and general practice. And I met the other night with all the teaching hospitals in the Boston area to talk about how quickly that can be done, because as you pointed out, they're all sort of geared up and wired to their specialties and subspecialties and all that, and that's sort of where the money is. But I just think that we have a very compelling obligation to spend the taxpayers' money at the national level to try to remedy what is a blooming horrible crisis.

You know, we're here in a little rural area, but there is a shortage of family practice doctors in a lot of the major urban areas of the country. So I think it's not just the training setting; you actually have to get the med students into those slots, and we're going to have to change the subsidy ratio.

Now, again, this is something that almost never gets discussed in the larger debate about health care. But unless we're prepared to do what it takes to guarantee that we educate our young people in sufficient numbers to be family practitioners, all the economic subsidies in the world won't get them out there because they won't be there; people won't be there. And I think that's one thing that's very important, that the American people know that, that with all of the doctors we have, we actually have a shortage of family practitioners nationwide, and it's going to get worse unless we change the economic incentives for the next year.

Mr. Scott. Mr. President, this is a wonderful discussion, and I know that you have other commitments that you must attend to today, and we could sit here all day and all night——

The President. I'm having a good time.

[*Mr. Scott thanked the President for visiting and reiterated the hospital's commitment to the community and the need for health care reform to resolve the problems it faces.*]

The President. How much uncompensated care do you do here every year, do you know—just people who show up at the emergency room that are uninsured?

Ms. Howell. Fifty percent.

Dr. McRoberts. I would say it would be about 50 percent in the emergency room. Probably, what——

Ms. Howell. In emergency.

Q. Uncompensated care or less than total compensated care is better than 50 percent in our hospital.

Mr. Scott. That's true, our hospital, too.

The President. So that goes back to the first point you made, that universal coverage is a big deal and if people want medical care to continue in rural America and forget about the taxpayers and anything else, this hospital could pay more——

Mr. Scott. That's right.

The President. ——to pay the nurses more, to pay other people—to offer incentives to doctors to come directly if you had compensated care. And you'd have a—if you had a better array of services then because it was compensated, you could take better care of the pregnancies and everything else.

It all comes back to this universal care thing. We cannot be the only country in the world that can't figure out how to provide basic coverage to all its citizens. We can't justify this any longer.

Mr. Scott. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you all. Dr. Townsend, I'm glad to see you. Your father has been educating me about these things for years and years.

Dr. Tom Townsend. He's tried to figure it out.

Health Care

Q. Mr. President, why is it worth it for you to come here and talk to just such a few people when you have already basically done this before? You asked a lot of these same questions before.

The President. Because it's obvious to me that these things come in waves. I mean, the American people are thinking about it again now, and it's very important that we deal with some of these horrible health problems. Most people lobbying on Capitol Hill will be lobbying against universal coverage in one way or the other. But these folks who are out here giving health care know we've got to have it.

I also think it's very important to emphasize a lot of the things that are in our health care program that are not controversial on their face, but they could get lost unless we emphasize them, for example, all the incentives for people to come out here and become family practitioners.

And so the debate, in a funny way, is just beginning. We're getting all this work in subcommittees; we're getting things going forward. All the surveys show an interesting dichotomy. They show that support for our plan goes up and down based on what they heard about it from interest groups or in paid ads, but that if you tell them what the details are in our plan, there are more than two-thirds of the American people support all the specifics.

So what I'm trying to do is to get out here and highlight these real-world experiences that these doctors and nurses and other health care providers have so that we can focus the attention of the American people and the Congress on solving the real problems, not the rhetorical problems.

Q. And get this on local television.

The President. Well, yes, that's the idea.

Q. Mr. President, are you losing the public relations battle, Mr. President?

The President. No, I think we're winning it again now. And we're getting real movement in Congress. But I think we don't have the ability to raise the kind of funds or do the kind of nationally organized advertising that has been done by some against the program. And inevitably, a lot of the national organizations may get more publicity than local ones do. But when you get out here and you go beyond the rhetoric and get down to the details and the real-life experiences of these folks that are out here trying to take care of America, then the compelling case for reform, for universal coverage, for guaranteeing health security for all Americans, and getting the funds in here to these rural hospitals and providing more family doctors is overwhelming. And so I think we just have to keep hammering this home, not just on local television—I'll be grateful if you put this story on national television tonight. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Scott. Thank you, Mr. President, we appreciate you being here.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:04 a.m. in the activity room of the nursing facility at Montgomery Memorial Hospital. Harold A. Scott, Jr., chairman of the board, Montgomery Memorial Hospital, served as moderator.

Remarks to the Community in Troy
April 5, 1994

Thank you very much. Kerry, you did a terrific job on the tour and just now with the introduction. I do want to say, since a lot of you made comments about the basketball game, if it had come out the other way, I probably would have been in the Montgomery County Hospital as a patient today—[*laughter*]—rather than just someone trying to learn. I want to

thank my good friend Bob Jordan for what he said and for his long friendship and support for me. And I thank Congressman Hefner for representing you so well and faithfully, as well as for being fairly restrained last night. [*Laughter*] I brought all my North Carolina staff members and all the people that work at the White House who went to Duke to the game last night. And so in our little box there were more people "agin" me than for me—[*laughter*]—but it was a wonderful occasion.

This morning before we came here, I met with Kerry and some other folks who are here who helped to talk to me a little bit about some of the medical problems that you face here in this county and in similar places throughout our country. I'd just like to ask them to stand and be recognized, because I want you to know that I was with them before I came here, and a lot of what I have to say responds to what they said: Jim Bernstein, the director of the North Carolina Office of Rural Health and the president-elect of the National Rural Health Care Association; Dr. Hugh Craft is the chief of the pediatrics at Community Hospital in Roanoke, Virginia; Beth Howell, the director of nursing at your local hospital; Dr. Deborah McRoberts, who is one of your local family physicians; the chairman of the board of the Memorial Hospital, Hal Scott, who kind of emceed our event; and Dr. Tom Townsend, who is now at East Tennessee State University and has been a family practitioner for many years. And just by coincidence, his father is probably the dean of pediatric practice in our State. And I looked at him today, and I said, "I knew a Tom Townsend who was a doctor once," and he said, "He was my father." But I didn't organize that. I get accused of bringing Arkansas into everything. I didn't do that. [*Laughter*] I'd also like to thank the people here at this fine school for taking us in, your principal and your superintendent and the mayor of Troy. And I also know that these benches were constructed especially for this event by Jerry Holders, so I don't know what's going to happen to them, but I want to thank Jerry for making the benches available to us. He did a fine job.

I've been working on the issues that we talked about today and the things that you heard about today from the previous speakers for nearly 20 years now, since I was first elected attorney general of my State in 1983, or—excuse me—in '79 when I served as Governor for the first time. My wife and I started a rural health initiative, trying to connect our children's hospital to all of the rural hospitals in the State and deal with a lot of the issues that you've done so well with here in North Carolina.

In 1990, after years of dealing with the headaches of the Medicaid program as a Governor, I agreed to work with the then-Republican Governor of Delaware, who is now a Congressman from Delaware, on a Governors Association project, trying to figure out what we could do at the State level to deal with some of the terrible problems of health care: the rising costs, the strain on State budgets, the lack of reimbursement, the high infant mortality rates in a lot of rural areas, all the—and the lack of doctors. And after I worked on this for some time, and after I had been involved in this issue for a very long time, I came to the conclusion that a lot of the problems of the American health care system simply could not be addressed in the absence of a national effort to reform the way—primarily the way we finance health care and the way we provide health care professionals in America.

There's so much that's good about our health care system, and that which is good is the best in the world. So the trick is how to fix what's wrong and keep what's right. And that has been the great debate in which we have been engaged.

Over the last year or so, through the First Lady's task force, we have asked for the help of literally thousands and thousands of doctors and nurses and other health care providers and consumer groups to try to give us some sort of insights into what we should do. But the main point I want to make in the beginning is that my roots are in a county a lot like this one. And I sometimes think in Washington we lose track of the human face of America's problems and America's promise. And I'm deeply grateful to be here today to see both of those things.

First, let me say that rural America has a lot of folks who either don't have health insurance or who have very limited health insurance. There are a lot of small business people, there are a lot of farmers, there are a lot of self-employed people who have enormous difficulty with insurance policies that often have lifetime limits, very high deductibles, big copays, and premiums that go up every year. A lot of citizens I have met around this country have really told

me of the decisions that they make on an annual basis about whether they can even afford to insure their family. Seventeen percent of rural America has no health insurance at all. The folks at the hospital today told me that half of all of the emergency room business they do in the hospital are with people who have no insurance, who show up at the emergency room when the care is too late, when it's too expensive, because they didn't have insurance to get it on a regular basis. Twenty-five percent of our farm families have no health insurance in America. We have to do something about this. If you look at where we are, you can see here, at any given time in America our population is roughly 255 million people. At any given time in a year there will be a total of 58 million people every year who don't have health insurance at some time during the year. And on any given day, the figure is somewhere between 37 million and 40 million who don't—go uninsured.

There are 81 million Americans who have preexisting conditions. You heard Bob Jordan talking about someone who lost their job with IBM and had a preexisting condition. Now, people with someone in their family with a preexisting condition normally find themselves in one of three positions. Either they can't get insurance at all, or they're paying a whole lot more for it, or they're in a job where they got insurance before the preexisting condition that they had or their spouse or their child developed, and now they can't ever change their job because if they try to change jobs, they won't be able to get insured at a new job.

That is a huge deal in a country where the average 18-year-old is now going to change work eight times in a lifetime and in which labor mobility is going to be the key to our future economic growth, when big companies are downsizing and small companies are expanding. And we already know it's harder for small companies to get affordable insurance.

Then there are 133 million Americans, or a majority of our people, who have insurance but have lifetime limits on it, which means if they have serious illnesses they could run out of the lifetime limits. I met a family in Florida about 10 days ago that had written a letter to my wife about their problem. They had two sons with rare forms of cancer that apparently had some sort of genetic connection because both their boys had it. They had a daughter that at least to the present time had not developed this kind of cancer. They had a lifetime limit on their policy, and they felt the lifetime limit would run out before the first child was out of the house and eligible to be on Medicaid or something and certainly would clearly run out before the second child would. They had no idea how they were going to get care for their children when that happened.

So we have to decide whether we're going to do something about this. No other advanced country with the kind of national economy as strong as ours has failed to provide for health care security for its people. And there are basically only two ways to do that. You can do what Canada does, which is just to abolish the whole private insurance industry and pay for it with a tax. We do that with the Medicare program today. That's how we finance Medicare; that's how we finance Medicaid. You have low administrative costs, but there are all kinds of cost problems—cost control problems there.

The other thing you can do is to have the mixed system that we have and extend it to everybody. That is, employers can cover their employees; employees can pay part of their health care; employers can pay part of their health care. And then if they are very small businesses with low payrolls, you can provide a discount for them. But in other words, you just extend the system we have now that we're most comfortable with.

The third thing you can do is to keep on doing what we're doing, just talk about it, say how terrible it is, and figure we're just not smart enough to figure out how to do it. Now, let me just say, if we keep on doing what we're doing, a lot of bad things will happen. More and more hospitals like this one will either—will go under or have to really cut back on what they do. You won't be able—because this hospital doesn't have full reimbursement, it restricts the income that can be paid to the nurses; it restricts whatever incentives you can offer to the doctors. You get fewer doctors, and you get doctors like this doctor who told me she's, on a hard week, worked over 100 hours a week, and in a slow week worked an 80-hour week. Pretty soon the doctors are going to need doctors if you do that.

So I really don't think doing nothing is an option. Every year the number of Americans—we lose about—about 100,000 Americans a month lose their health insurance permanently. So the problem will get worse, not better. There

is a perception today, I think, in the Nation's Capital that maybe the problem won't get worse because there's so much managed care, that inflation in medical costs overall has gone down. Well, it has. It always goes down when there's the threat of real health care reform. But for small business people and farmers and a lot of individuals, health insurance has not gone down. It's still going up quite rapidly. And a lot of people are still losing their health insurance.

So we have to deal with the fact that there is plainly a crisis. I think that we ought to make the choice of guaranteed private insurance because, as a practical matter, I don't think we ought to just shut down all the health insurance companies in the country and figure out what all those people are going to do for a living and then figure out how to substitute a tax for a health insurance premium, when most people have health insurance and you could make the health insurance work better for small business people. People in Government and big business today normally have pretty good health insurance systems, and their inflation rates have come down within inflation, the inflation rate generally.

So I think the simplest way is simply to guarantee private health insurance to all Americans. That's what our plan does. It says every American should have health insurance that can never be taken away; that if you work, employers and employees should make a contribution to that health insurance plan. If you don't work, the Government should pay.

Now we're paying anyway. If somebody shows up at this emergency room and gets care when it's too late and too expensive, you're going to pay one way or the other. Either the hospital will have to find a way to pass the costs along to the other payers, or if the hospital can't do it, you pay for it in terms of reduced services, fewer doctors, and terrible financial strain on the hospital.

When everyone is covered, it reduces all this incentive to shift costs, and it provides the funds that you have in medically underserved areas that you need so desperately to hire more doctors and to keep the people that you have. I think that is terribly important.

There's another thing that's important about it, and that is when everybody has health insurance, then you can use more preventive care and you can have more primary care. Almost all of us were raised on that old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We ignore that almost entirely in health care.

You have here—the infant mortality rate in this country is well above the statewide average. Why? Because you have a whole lot of pregnant women who only have 7 prenatal visits when they ought to have 12, who have low birth weight babies who have problems. That has to be addressed. Because we do not do enough in this country to do enough primary and preventive work in health care. We have great high-tech medicine. If you're really sick, we do more in medical research than any other country. I don't propose to stop that; in fact, our plan would invest more in it. But where our real shortcoming is, is in primary and preventive care. So I think that is very important.

Now, the second big issue that I think we have to face is this: What kind of system are we going to have from the point of view of the patients? And should you have or not have a choice of the doctor or a medical plan you buy into? This is a big issue. I don't know how big an issue it is in Montgomery County, but I can tell you now that slightly less than half of the American people who are insured at work have a choice of more than one plan now. More and more employees are being required to buy into whatever plan that the employers decide it's the only one that he or she can afford, and there's less and less choice in these plans of what doctor you visit, what hospital you visit, and what you do. That is a big issue.

So I think that one of the things that I would like to emphasize is the need to have choice: not only insurance that can't be taken away, not only comprehensive benefits, not only no lifetime limits, but under our plan, if it passes the way we have proposed it, people will be able to have a choice every year of at least three different plans. You can join an HMO. You can have a fee-for-service practice—and if you're in a rural area, that may be the only option you have, just to go through the same system that you have now. Or there will be at least one other kind of plan offered, maybe a mix between the two. I think that's very important. Most Americans believe that they should have some say over their own health care. And most Americans believe that the quality of health care will be increased if their choices can be maintained.

And I can tell you that if we do nothing, if we do nothing for a couple of years anyway, people who get their insurance through big businesses and through Government, like I do, will continue to get good health care at reasonable prices. The price of that will be putting a price squeeze on everybody else, which means that teaching hospitals, for example, which are very important in rural areas to support you, will find it harder and harder to get adequate money. And it means that people who are small businesses and people who are self-employed will pay higher and higher premiums.

One of the great raging debates we're having now is in the small business community about whether it will be terrible for small business to have to insure their employees if the small businesses don't do it now. Well, the Director of the Small Business Administration, Erskine Bowles, from North Carolina, is here with me today. He spent 20 years helping to organize small businesses, get them started, help them expand. And he's one of the strongest advocates of our health care program because he knows most small businesses already insure their employees, don't get the insurance that they want, pay higher premiums than they should, and that the small business sector is going to be in worse trouble if we don't do something than if we do. So I think that this whole issue of having more choices is very, very important.

Let me also mention something else. If you're going to have comprehensive benefits and the right to choose your own doctor, then it seems to me we also have to outlaw some insurance practices. Let me just talk about this. Today insurance companies, as you just heard the story, can drop people for nearly any reason whatever. Under our plan, insurance companies couldn't drop coverage or cut benefits, couldn't increase rates just because you've got somebody in your family who's been sick, who's got a preexisting condition, couldn't use lifetime limits, and couldn't charge older people more than younger people just because they get older.

Now, how are we going to do this and not bankrupt the insurance company? The answer is you've got to cover everybody, and you've got to make it possible for insurance companies to make money the way grocery stores do, to make a little money on a lot of people instead of a lot of money on a few people. That's what community rating—you hear this—when you hear all this talk about community rating, you hear all these words that may not mean anything to you, that's all community rating means.

Why do you think people in Government—if you belong to the Federal employees health insurance plan, why do you think we have a good deal? Because there's a whole bunch of us. It's as simple as that. There are just a bunch of us, and we can get a good deal. And we can get a good deal whether we're the President in Washington or whether we are the postmaster in Troy. If you buy into the Federal health insurance plan, there's a lot of us.

So to make it possible for us to cure these insurance abuses and have it really work in a town like Troy or for a small business person or a farm family, you have to be able to put folks in large pools. That's what community rating means. That's all community rating means is you make money—insurance would make money the way grocery stores do. And just the way grocery stores have to allow for a certain amount of broken merchandise or stale bread or people making off with olives or whatever, if you've got a big enough base, then if you get a few people who are real sick you can spread it over the base, and people can still make a living doing it. That's basically what we're trying to do. I want to come back to how this affects rural America in a minute.

One of the programs that does work in the Government, I think, is Medicare. Most people think it works. It's very important that the American people know and that the senior citizens in this county know that our plan preserves Medicare. But it covers two things that are not covered in Medicare now. One is the prescription drug benefit—big problem. A lot of older people wind up going to hospitals because they can't afford to buy medicine that they should take to stay out of the hospital under Medicare. This will save money over the long run. There have been a couple of studies showing that it will. The second thing is, we begin to cover some long-term care coverage through Medicare. Today basically what the Government does is if old folks are real poor, they can get long-term care under Medicaid, and mostly it's institutional care, nursing home care. So we want to support in-home care and other community-based care.

I've already been over this. We want to guarantee the benefits that work. If small businesses have low payrolls and low profit margins and are strapped, we will provide discounts to those

small businesses so that they might pay as little as 4 percent of payroll. People say, "Well, I can't even afford that." But if all of the competitors have to pay, you can. I want to point this out. Seventy percent of the small businesses in America today provide some health insurance for their employees, 7 out of 10. Almost 100 percent of the small businesses where jobs are growing in numbers provide health care benefits for their employees.

Health care costs of small business are 35 percent more than they are for big business for the same benefits, 35 percent more, because they're small. Under our plan, you won't ever be at a competitive disadvantage because all of your competitors would also have to provide for health care coverage. You'd be able to get a better deal than you can now. And here's something else that has received almost no notice: Our health care plan folds the health care costs of workers' compensation and automobile insurance health care costs into this. So small businesses that are being killed by workers' compensation costs will have their workers' comp rates go down because the health care portion of it will be covered in the health care plan.

So health care—the small business community of this country will come out a winner in this, not a loser, if we do it. If we don't do it, what will happen is more and more small businesses will lose their health insurance every year, or they'll have higher copays, higher deductibles, and less coverage.

So let me just make one last comment about the rural areas. The biggest problem I heard today here was there are not enough doctors. You've got one doctor for nearly 8,000 people. That's not enough. You need many more. So do most folks in rural America. Why does this happen? Well, doctors make more money in cities, doctors have more support in cities, and frankly, our medical schools are turning out too many specialists and too few general practitioners for the needs of not just people in rural areas but all over the country. What does our plan do about that? Number one, it changes the incentives. The Federal Government spends an enormous amount of money to subsidize the training of doctors, as expensive as it is. We change our subsidy program over time to subsidize more family practitioners and fewer specialists. It's important; we've got to produce more family practitioners. If the doctors aren't there, no incentive will bring them here. Number two, we will dramatically increase the National Health Service Corps, another 7,000 doctors over the next few years, to pay people's way through medical school. Let them come out here and practice for a couple of years and pay their debts off. Number four, we give a $1,000-a-month tax credit, or a $12,000-a-year income subsidy, to doctors who will go to medically underserved areas for 5 years and a $500-a-month credit to other medical professionals that will go to underserved areas. That will make a huge difference. Number five, we help to hook these doctors up with new medical technology—to the medical centers in urban areas far away, which is very important, and we give certain tax incentives to make it easier for physicians to buy the laboratory and other equipment they need to feel good about their practice in rural areas.

Now, all these things will really help the terrible problems I heard about today. I'll say again, I don't see how your hospital is functioning with doctors where a slow week is an 80-hour week and a fast week is a 110-hour week. There is a limit to how long you can expect your physicians to do that and function at a high level of efficiency. You cannot do it. So we have to change that, and we're going to.

So in summary, we've got a plan that would expand the system we've got: guaranteed private insurance, keep your choice of doctors, provide real insurance reform in a way that will permit the insurance companies to function in our free enterprise economy and still make a profit, preserve Medicare but add a prescription drug benefit and a long-term care benefit, and guarantee these health benefits at work. And finally, there is a very special attention given to the problems of medically underserved areas, which are especially rural America, to get more doctors out there, more nurses out there, and keep the connections that physicians and other health care providers feel they need to folks in the big medical center areas so they can give high-quality care.

Now, we don't have to do any of this, but if we don't, the problems of this hospital are going to keep getting worse. You can organize a local community effort like you are, and it can make a real difference. You can raise money, you can do things, you can get some more doctors in here, and maybe you will escape the trend. But if the number of family practice doctors continues to go down, then

somebody in rural America is going to be hurt even if you aren't. If you escape—there are just only so many ways you can cut a pie that gets smaller. And even if you do that, if you keep having people who don't have insurance not come in here for primary and preventive care, showing up when they're real sick at the emergency room and half your emergency room load are people with uncompensated care, it's going to get worse.

So you're doing what you have to do to succeed, but your country is not doing what it should do to help you succeed. And that's what this health care reform issue is all about. And what I want to ask you to do is to take the experience that you have—this is the real world out here, that's what I heard these folks talking about—and support Bill Hefner and support the other Members of the Congress and say what Bill did. This is not a political deal. Everybody gets sick, regardless of their political party. And this country needs a health care system where the financing is as good as the medical care. That's what we need. And if we don't do this we are going to pay a terrible economic and human price. You know this. And what happens is we get up there in Washington, we start going to work on this, and all we ever hear from are lobbyists. Then the real world experience, what really is going on out here in the heartland of America, gets lost in a cloud of hot air.

I'm here today just to ask you to encourage this good Congressman and the other Members of Congress to deal with this issue and to deal with it now and not to fool with it any more. Sixty years ago we had a chance to guarantee health care coverage for all Americans, and we passed it up. Twenty years ago, under President Nixon, he proposed guaranteed private health insurance for all Americans with employers and employees paying their part, and we passed it. And every time we have passed it, we have let the problem get worse, we have put more of a burden on rural America, we've put more of a burden on small business people and farmers, and we have really played havoc with a significant percentage of the American people. We can do better than that. So I'm asking you to take what you know in your heart, your mind, and your life is the truth and say to the Congress of the United States, "The time to act is now, and we will support you."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:38 a.m. at Troy Elementary School. In his remarks, he referred to Kerry Anderson, Montgomery Memorial Hospital administrator; Bob Jordan, former Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina; Larry Robinson, principal, and Dewey Jackson, superintendent, Troy Elementary School; and Mayor Roy Maness of Troy.

Remarks in a Town Meeting in Charlotte, North Carolina

April 5, 1994

Q. Welcome, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. I'm hooked up.

Tom Donovan. Right. We will be getting to our first question for President Clinton, but first he would like to begin with some opening remarks.

Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. Well, first of all, I want to thank you for hosting this town meeting. And I want to thank all of you for participating and all the people in the communities that are hooked into us tonight. I try to do a number of these every year as a way of sort of getting in closer touch with the American people, listening to people directly about their concerns, and making a report.

Last year, in my first year as President, I devoted most of my time to trying to get the economy back in order, to impose some discipline on the Federal budget, and to start investing in growth for the jobs of the 21st century. This year we are working on trying to keep that economic renewal going. Our economy in 14 months has produced 2.3 million private sector jobs. That's more than twice as many as in the previous 4 years. If the budget which I have proposed to Congress passes, we will eliminate another 100 Government programs, cut another 200 and something more,

and have 3 years of reduction in the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. That's a long time. So we're moving in the right direction.

This year we're also trying to improve our political system. We've got a lobby reform law which will restrict lobbying in Washington and increase reporting requirements for lobbyists, which I think is a very good thing.

The Congress just passed and I just signed our major education bill for public education, Goals 2000, which for the first time will set world-class standards of excellence for our public schools and promote all kinds of domestic grassroots reforms, school district by school district, to achieve them.

We are dealing with welfare reform in the Congress. We are dealing with health care reform, and I know a lot of you have questions about that. I visited today in Troy, North Carolina, in a rural hospital and with people in that community, talking about the problems of providing health care in rural America.

And the first item of business—and I will close with this—when the Congress comes back will be to take up the crime bill. I know you just had a special legislative session here in North Carolina. Governor Hunt proposed some legislation. Our crime bill will put another 100,000 police officers on the street, will ban 28 kinds of assault weapons, will have a "three strikes and you're out" provision to affect the relatively small number of criminals that commit a large percentage of the truly violent crimes, and will provide some funds to communities to try to give our kids a chance to avoid getting in real trouble: more funds for drug treatment, for recreation, for alternatives to imprisonment for first-time offenders. It's going to be a very busy year in Congress.

What I want you to know is that this work is going on. Sometimes I think maybe out here in the country, because of what comes across the airwaves, you may not know that the work of the people is going on, and that's my first concern. And we're doing everything we can to push an agenda which would make this year, if we can complete it, even more important to the American people and their future than what happened last year.

Mr. Donovan. Mr. President, we will open up our town hall meeting now with questions, and Kim Hindrew is standing by with the first questioner.

Anticrime Efforts

[*Kim Hindrew introduced a participant who asked about funds for inner-city anticrime programs.*]

The President. Yes, there are. Let me just explain a little bit about how our crime bill works. This crime bill would do far more than Congress has often done in the past. It's not just a posturing bill, where we say we're getting tougher on crime but we don't give the cities and the rural areas the means to deal with it. We actually would put another 100,000 police officers on the street in our cities over the next 5 years in community policing, that is, where people could walk the streets, know their neighbors, know the kids, work with people, and prevent crime as well as catch criminals. We provide the communities funds to help to promote more community activities for young people, to help to provide for afterschool activities, for jobs, for recreational activities, for drug treatment, for the kinds of things that will prevent crime, as well as for boot camps and other alternatives to prison for first-time offenders who are nonviolent. And as I said, we do increase penalties for the relatively small number of people who commit a large number of the violent crimes. And we eliminate several—28, to be exact—kinds of assault weapons which have no hunting or sporting purpose, which are just used to make sure that gang members are often better armed than police officers.

So that's what this crime bill does. And it's all paid for not with a tax increase but with a trust fund which will be funded by reducing the Federal employment rolls by 252,000 over 5 years, not by firing anybody but by attrition. If this budget passes, this year's budget, combined with what we did last year, 5 years from my first year in office the Federal Government of the United States will be as small as it was when John Kennedy was President. It will be the smallest it has been in 30 years, which is a huge change. And all the money will be put right back into local communities and into law enforcement. So that's what we're going to do. It will make a difference, sir.

Health Care Reform

[*Ms. Hindrew introduced a participant who questioned the proposed health care program in light of Government inefficiency in the operation of programs such as Medicare and VA hospitals.*]

The President. Well, that's why I don't propose that the Government take it over. My program is, guaranteed private insurance. My program is, take the people who are working who don't have health insurance and extend the same system that they have now. Eighty percent of the people without health insurance in America today are in working families, and what we propose to do is to guarantee them private insurance and then give them the chance to choose their own doctor, choose their own medical plan, and to have a new choice every year, not to have the Government run it.

But let me just say, sir, I don't agree with you. I don't think Medicare is a poorly run program at all. And the Medicare program, I think, has worked right well. It only has a 3 percent administrative cost. By contrast, most private insurance plans have administrative costs 4 and 5 and 6 times that. So I don't think you can make a very good case of Medicare's not well run. I think it is. Medicaid is growing so fast and Medicare is growing so fast in part because there are more and more people on it because we don't have enough other kinds of insurance. But I don't think that either one of those programs, but particularly the Medicare program, is poorly managed. I think Medicare works real well for elderly people, and I think it ought to be left alone. Under my plan we leave it alone just as it is. But we don't extend Medicare to the uninsured, we extend private insurance. I think we should have a private plan.

I do believe that you're going to have to have some way to let small business people and self-employed people buy health insurance at the same competitive rates that people in the Government and people in big business get it now. Those of us that are in the Federal Government have terrific health insurance plans. Why? Because there's a whole lot of us, so we can get good plans. But farmers or self-employed people or small business people, they pay 35 to 40 percent more because they don't have any buying power. So under our system, what the Government does is to create buying pools, almost like old-fashioned farmers co-ops, so that people can buy insurance that's more adequate for lower cost. In California, the first big buying pool was set up by the State of California this year, and small businesses actually got their insurance at a lower cost. The same thing is about to happen in Florida. So that's what the Government does: We require private insurance and provide the buying pools. Otherwise it should all be left in the private sector, because I agree with you, we can't run it; we shouldn't try.

Mr. Donovan. Mr. President, you have vowed to veto any health care reform bill that does not include universal health care. Your plan has been changed somewhat. You've compromised, you've been willing to compromise. Are you still going to stick to that, or would you be willing to accept something short of universal health care?

The President. I think if you—well, let me just quote to you back what the doctors and the nurses and the hospital folks said in Troy, North Carolina, today. We were out there with doctors that have spent their entire life in rural areas. They said unless you're going to cover everybody, you can't have health care reform. In the hospital I saw in Troy today, 50 percent of the people who come into the emergency room are people without health insurance. That cost is either going to be passed onto the rest of the folks in Montgomery County who have insurance or is going to be absorbed by the hospital in ways that undermine their ability to provide health care. We are the only advanced country in the world that doesn't do this. I just refuse to believe we can't figure out how to cover all of our people just like every country we compete with does.

So no, that's something that I don't feel we can compromise on, because if we don't do that, we can't stop this explosion in cost. The gentleman mentioned how much Medicare and Medicaid's going up, how much other rates are going up. One of the ways we're going to get health care costs in line with inflation is to provide insurance to everybody, get primary and preventive care out there, and then let people buy it in a competitive marketplace. So you've got to cover everybody to get that done, so I can't compromise on that.

Mr. Donovan. Thank you. We're going to go to our first question tonight from Bristol, Connecticut, Mr. President.

The President. Bristol, Tennessee——

Mr. Donovan. I'm sorry, Bristol, Tennessee.

Mr. President. ——or Virginia, depending on which side of the line you're standing on, right? [*Laughter*]

Education

[*Steve Hawkins of WCYB, Bristol, TN, introduced a participant who asked about new education initiatives.*]

The President. Let me try to answer the question with three or four points. First of all, the national education goals for the year 2000 were developed at a meeting of the Governors and the White House under the previous administration. I represented the Governors in that. We stayed up all night long, and we wrote those educational goals.

The legislation I signed last week for the first time actually provides funds to school districts to promote the kind of grassroots reforms necessary to meet world-class standards. So we've finally done something on that. And also, we'll actually set up those standards in the law. They've never been done before. This country has never had any educational standards, any way of measuring whether students in Bristol, Tennessee, or New York City, or El Paso, Texas, were learning what they needed to know in a global economy.

The second thing we're doing is passing something called school-to-work legislation which will provide extra training opportunities for young people who don't want to go on to college but do need further training. Our evidence is that if you don't have at least 2 years of post-high school education or training when you get out of high school, you don't have a very good chance of getting a job with a growing income.

The third thing that we're trying to do is to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system so that people can continuously get education throughout their lifetimes.

And fourthly, there is in the crime bill, as well as in this education bill I just signed, a safe schools program which will provide more funds and other help to schools to try to make our children safe in their schools. There are an awful lot of schools in this country today where people aren't safe going to and from schools or aren't even safe in the schools. And if they're not safe there, learning can't occur. One of the goals that I worked real hard for back in 1989 to get adopted is that every school ought to be safe, disciplined, and drug free. And so we have a program here that will enable the schools to do that and will give our troubled schools, our most troubled schools, extra help to have the kind of security they need and the kind of learning environment they need and the kind of alternative dispute mechanisms our kids need to learn so that they can avoid violence.

So all these things are on the education calendar this year. This should be the most important year for education reform in 30 years if all these bills pass, and I think they will.

Community Policing

[*Mr. Donovan called on Sally Holiday of KXAN–TV, Austin, TX, to introduce the Austin police chief, who advocated community policing but asked about ensuring that funding would be directed to communities which understood how to implement the concept.*]

The President. Let me try to explain a little behind what the chief's question is. What she is saying is that community policing works if it's properly implemented. That means it's not just enough to let a city hire more police officers. The police officers have to be properly trained, properly deployed, and connected to the community so that they not only catch criminals, they actually work with people to prevent crime from occurring in the first place. We know this can happen in Texas—she's in Austin—and in the city of Houston, where they went to a more aggressive community policing situation, in 15 months the crime rate dropped 22 percent. And the mayor got reelected with 91 percent of the vote, and the two things were connected, believe me.

You can do something to bring the crime rate down. The answer to your question is—at least if I prevail, the bill has not come out in its final form yet—we will give some of this money out based on the size of the problem in cities. But some of the money will have to go to—the money will be tied to a commitment to genuine community policing strategies that work. In other words, if you give more money to a city and they hire all the police to sit behind desks, the crime rate will not go down. That's basically what she's saying. You've got to know that this money is going to be properly spent. To the extent that we can do it, we are going to have standards to make sure that the money will go—we want to give it to all major cities that need it, but we want them to agree

to implement strategies that work in order to get the money. And I thank you for what you're doing.

Health Care Reform

[*Mr. Donovan called on Callie King of WSLS–TV, Roanoke, VA. She introduced a health insurance agent from Rural Retreat, VA, who asked how health care reform would affect his business serving primarily self-employed and small business owners.*]

The President. Well, they would still be able to buy their insurance from you because we don't propose to abolish private health insurance. What we want to do is to require people who do not have any insurance to buy insurance, with employers paying a portion of the premium and employees paying a portion of the premium. We want to make it possible for you to offer health insurance to small business people and self-employed people at either lower rates or more comprehensive health care services for the rates that you've having to charge now, which is something, as you know, insurance companies can't do economically now if they're insuring people in small pools. So what we've proposed is some insurance reform that will change the nature of the economics of the health insurance industry, but leave it intact.

And let me just basically say what we propose to do. From the point of view of the people buying the health insurance, we want to make it possible for small business people and self-employed people to buy insurance at lower rates without inflation at 35 percent a year, which is what it's been averaging nationwide. We want to make it illegal for people to have higher rates because somebody in their family has been sick or because they're older. We want to make cutting people off illegal because somebody in their family has been sick. But we don't want to bankrupt insurance companies, so we propose to have people insured in larger pools, which will mean that smaller insurance companies will have to pool together to insure people in larger pools. But that way, it will be economical for the insurance industry to insure people, and the people will be free of these terrible problems.

Right now in America, 81 million Americans out of 255 million, 81 million, are in families where there is a so-called preexisting condition, where somebody in that family has been sick, which means either they're paying higher insurance costs, they can't get insurance at all, or they can't change the job they're in, because if they do, they can't get insurance in the next job.

These things are not this insurance agent's fault, this gentleman who has asked me this question. He can't help that; that's the way the market's organized. So what we have to do is to put people in bigger insurance pools and protect them from those kinds of abuses. But if they're in bigger pools, then the insurance companies, in essence, will be able to still provide those services, and they'll still be able to make a decent profit.

It will change. Your business will change, but you can still be in business, because I don't propose to take insurance out of this but to change the way it works so that everybody can be insured at an affordable price.

[*Mr. Donovan called on Ms. Hindrew to introduce a participant in Charlotte.*]

School Prayer and Community Values

Q. Good evening, Mr. President. Initially, I wanted to ask you a question about tobacco products, but I also realize that North Carolina is considered also as the Bible Belt, and I want to ask, since the Supreme Court ruling took prayer out of schools, the divorce rate, drug abuse, and violence has at least doubled. The following year, President Kennedy was killed. What other answer, as a nation who claims "In God we trust," do we have against these problems?

The President. Well, I don't think you can make a very—with all respect, I think the Supreme Court decision has been carried to the extent that I don't agree with. I agree with the original Supreme Court decision. Let me tell you what the original Supreme Court decision said, and most Southern Baptists, which I am, agreed with it. The original Supreme Court decision said that the State of New York legislature could not write a prayer which then had to get delivered in every schoolroom in the State of New York every day; in other words, that the Government couldn't write a prayer which then everybody who worked for every school system was obligated to read in every school every day. That's all it said. That's what it said.

Now, it's been carried to such an extent now where they say, some people have said you can't have a prayer at a graduation exercise. I person-

ally didn't agree with that. Why? Because if you're praying at a graduation exercise or a sporting event, it's a big open air thing, and no one's being coerced. I'm just telling you what my personal opinion is. I can't rewrite the Supreme Court decisions.

But I agree that the Government should not be in the business of requiring people to pray or telling them what prayers to pray. I do not agree that people should not be able to freely pray and to acknowledge God. We have a chaplain in the Congress, in the Senate and the House. So one of the most difficult decisions we've always had to face as a people is how we can have the freedom of religion without pretending that people have to be free from religion.

The Congress has tried to come to grips with this in two or three different ways and is trying to make it clear, for example, that school facilities could be made available for religious activities on an equal basis or that people could have periods of silent prayer where they're free to pray their own prayers.

I think what you're saying has some merit in the sense that Government programs can never supplant the role that has to be played by the family, by the church, by community institutions, by people that communicate values to children one-on-one. So I think what we have to do is to try to find ways, continually to find ways in which a society can communicate the values that hold people together.

And let me just say one thing, I think, that I've been advocating for nearly a decade now. I think that there ought to be a set of civic values that everybody can agree with that ought to be taught in our schools: good citizenship, respect for others, don't solve your problems violently, don't cheat and lie and steal, you know?—basic things that ought to be taught clearly and explicitly in the schools, plus, having periods where people can do quietly whatever they want to do. In other words, I think we can work this out in ways that recognize that you just can't have a value-free society. You can't do it. You can't hold people together unless we all agree on certain rules that make it possible to raise children and for us to live in peace together.

Tobacco Tax

Ms. Hindrew. Mr. President, I'll go back to this gentleman's original question, which did have to do with tobacco. This is obviously a large tobacco-growing area. Your administration wants to ban tobaccos or smoking in the workplace, and also you have proposed raising taxes on tobacco. What do you say to farmers in this area who say you're trying to put them out of business?

The President. Well, first of all, we do not propose banning smoking. The proposed regulation is based on a lot of evidence that people exposed to smoke can also contract cancer and other health problems. So what we propose to do is to say that if smoking is going to be allowed in the workplace, it has to be in separate rooms that are separately ventilated, that are properly ventilated, to protect nonsmokers from the benefits of secondary smoke. That's what we propose. And I think that's the right regulation.

On the tobacco tax, basically I attempted to put this whole health care program together without any new taxes. But we have to be able to pay for whatever we do. We don't want to run the Government deficit up. The proposal is that the Government will pay for the unemployed, that is, public funds will pay for the unemployed, and insurance will pay for the employed. In order to do that, we have to have some revenues. I propose that it come from two sources: one, from big companies that will get the biggest windfall from our changes, and two, from the tobacco tax, because tobacco's the only thing that, based on the health studies we know, there is no reasonable amount you can use it without getting hurt. So I thought it was a fair tax.

I know a lot of wonderful people grow tobacco, and it's been good to a lot of farmers. And believe me, the people that represent you in the Congress are not going to let anything be done without some effort to make sure—that the economic implications are considered on the people of North Carolina. But I still think it is a fair and reasonable way to deal with the terrible health care problem.

[*At this point, the television stations took a commercial break. Mr. Donovan then called on another participant from Charlotte.*]

NCAA Basketball Champions

Q. Mr. President, how about them Razorbacks?

The President. I was very proud of them. But it was a great game, too. I almost had a heart attack. I thought you all would have to visit me in the hospital tonight if we had lost that game. [*Laughter*]

Whitewater

Q. On a more serious note, Mr. President, with recent news reports about the First Lady's cattle futures earnings and with all these Whitewater allegations, many of us Americans are having a hard time with your credibility. How can you earn back our trust?

The President. First of all, I've not been accused of doing anything wrong. I'm still waiting for the first credible source to come up and say what it is I did wrong. Consider this, has any other previous President ever had to say, "Here's what we did 16, 17 years ago"? We lost money on one thing, so they attacked us on that. Then we made money on something, they attacked us on that. We paid our taxes. You now have all my tax bills, going back to 1977. I agreed to have a Special Counsel look into this just so I could have your trust back but, more important—because the press said that's what they wanted—so we could go back to work.

So the Watergate Special Counsel, Sam Dash—the man who handled Watergate—said, "Bill Clinton's not like previous administrations; they haven't stonewalled, they've given up all the information. Every time there's a subpoena they quickly comply." I've claimed no executive privilege; I've looked for no procedural ways to get around this. I say, you tell me what you want to know, I'll give you the information. I have done everything I could to be open and above board. They asked my wife about the commodities trading; she showed the reporter who asked about it all the trading documents we had all these years. She'd saved all those records; she showed them as soon as they asked about them.

So no one has accused us of doing anything illegal. We were attacked for losing money; we've been attacked for making money. And it was the only money we ever lost or made to amount to anything on investments. And it happened 15 years ago, and we've given all the information to this Special Counsel. If we did anything wrong, he'll find it out. All I've asked to do is let the poor man do his work—I've given him all the information—and let me be President in 1994, while somebody else worries about what happened in 1979. That's what I've asked.

Mr. Donovan. Mr. President, if I may follow——

The President. Let me just say this, I was elected Governor of my State five times. No one ever, even my roughest enemies, my strongest opponents, never suggested that there was a hint of scandal in my administration, that anything—and no one has accused me of abuse of power in this job, and no one will either. You will not be ashamed of what I do as President. And I tell you, what we need is a little perspective here. I said, "Okay, let's have this Special Counsel, and I will shovel him all the information I have." I'll answer all the questions they want to know. But I need to go about being President, worrying about the problems of the American people in 1994.

Q. Mr. President, are you one of us middle class people, or are you in with the villainous money-grubbing Republicans? [*Laughter*] I mean, that's where my question came from. I'm sorry.

The President, Well, let me say this. I grew up—I don't think that all Republicans are villainous. Sometimes I wonder in Washington, but I don't really think that. I believe that it is perfectly legitimate for people to invest money and risk it and make it or lose it; that's the free-enterprise system. What I did criticize about the 1980's, and I believe I was right, is that there was too much making money by pushing paper around in ways that cost people jobs and didn't increase the strength of the American economy, where you had people running companies, for example, taking pay raises 4 times as great as their workers got, 3 times as great as their profits went up, throwing people out of work, taking their health insurance away, and taking the money and running. That's what I didn't like.

But I think we have a stock market, we have a commodities market, we have a real estate system in America, and people have to invest their money and risk it. And if you invest money, sometimes you're going to make it, and sometimes you're going to lose it, whether you're a Democrat or a Republican or an independent. I think that's good. What you don't want is an abuse of the system in ways that hurt the public interest. And I think that's what we have to guard against. And I'm trying to

give us an economy where people will want to invest more money, want to put more money at risk in ways that create more jobs for middle class people.

I grew up in what you would charitably call a middle class family, at least by Arkansas standards; I don't know what that means in other places. And I had a good education. A guy said to me today, he said, "I like you. You were born without much, you got a good education, and you overmarried; you're kind of like me." [*Laughter*] That's what a guy said to me in Troy today, so that's about the way I feel.

Thank you.

Hillary Clinton's Investments

Mr. Donovan. Mr. President, if I may follow up on that, aside from the profit and loss, you pledged with your administration an administration that would work hard and play by the rules. There are analysts, however, that feel in terms of Mrs. Clinton's investment in the commodities, that that investment was not handled by the rules. In fact, it appears to them it was given preferential treatment to protect her from any potential loss.

The President. That's just not true.

Mr. Donovan. What can you tell us tonight that would prove them wrong?

The President. They must have never gotten a margin call in the commodities market; because she did, and she was about to have a baby, and she got out of it. I mean, all I can tell you is she had plenty of money at risk, and she could have lost it. And she actually did lose some money as well as making money.

She gave all the records to the people who asked for it, and they reviewed it. And it's just not true. It's not true that she didn't. She got advice to go in it from a friend of ours who was quoted extensively in the New York Times. They got into a very good market, and they made some money. A lot of the people who got into it at the same time in our area stayed in it too long and lost some money. She got cold feet and got out, and that's the only reason she didn't lose the money that she made. And I think that's the kind of thing that happens in the market every day. It's just not true. The records are there. You can look at the records. And she paid taxes on everything she made. And it's not true that she didn't have anything at risk.

Some of these same people also asserted for weeks and weeks and weeks that I didn't lose any money in the Whitewater thing. Now, the man that was head of the IRS for years has reviewed all the records, and he said we plainly lost money; we plainly paid the taxes we owed. You look at the taxes we paid, the percentage of our income we paid in taxes. I'm like most of you, I gave my records every year to an accountant, and I told them to resolve it out in favor of the Government. I never wanted anybody questioning whether I had paid the taxes that I owed, because I wasn't in my line of work for the money. I wanted to pay what I owed. And I have paid a significant percentage of my income in taxes every year, as I should have. And I have never tried to avoid paying what I owed.

So it's just not true that she did anything wrong or that I did anything wrong. And if we did, that's what we've got a Special Counsel for. And we've given him all the information. And everybody that's reviewed it said we haven't behaved like previous Presidents, we haven't stonewalled, we haven't backed up, haven't done anything. We've just given him the information. Everybody that's looked at this has said we've been very open with this Special Counsel. So let him do his job and let me be President. That's what I think we ought to do.

Forest Management Plan

[*The president of the Roanoke Regional Homebuilders Association asked how the Pacific Northwest forest plan would balance environmental concerns against the rising cost of lumber.*]

The President. Well, first, one of the reasons that the cost of lumber has gone up so much is that we had an explosion in building, because interest rates went down so low, the lowest we've had in over 20 years. And we drove them down real low last year with the deficit reduction plan. And there was a big spurt in building, so there was a shortage in lumber, so the price of lumber went up. That's always going to happen.

It is true that we've had to cut way back on clearing timber in the so-called old growth forests of the Pacific Northwest because there wasn't nearly as much timber up there as we had thought, and it takes forever and a day

to grow those tress, something like 200 years a tree.

So what we've tried to do, sir, I guess, will both help and hurt the situation. We have adopted a ceiling for timber cutting that is lower than the ceilings of the past. That will hurt, from your point of view. What will help is, we have moved aggressively to actually start cutting those trees again. It's been years, as you know, it's been years since any trees at all have been cut up there because it's all been tied up in environmental lawsuits in Federal court.

So what we're doing, we just got permission to start cutting trees, and we're trying to move so that we can cut the trees we can without losing the old growth forests. Only 10 percent of the old growth forests of the Pacific Northwest is still up there. And I don't think that in good conscience and legally we can allow it all to be destroyed. But we can clear more timber now if we can just keep pushing ahead and get these things out of the courts and back on the land where they belong.

Bosnia and North Korea

[*Ms. Hindrew introduced a participant in Charlotte who asked why North Korea should take U.S. threats to seize nuclear sites seriously, in view of the recent downsizing of the military and the perception of waffling on using military force in the former Yugoslavia.*]

The President. First of all, I have to correct your premise. I was very clear all during the campaign of 1992 that I did not think we should send our ground forces in to get in the middle of a civil war in Yugoslavia but that I would support using American forces as part of a NATO force if there could be a peace agreement and that I would make our air power available to support the United Nations mission there.

The United States took the lead in getting NATO to agree to do that last August, and as you know, the United States and NATO flights shot some planes down in Yugoslavia recently. And nearly everybody I know, sir, believes that it was the leadership, the aggressive leadership of the United States, which led to the cease-fire around Sarajevo, which helped to get the agreement between the Bosnian Muslims and the Croatians and which has made the progress that we've made. So I don't believe that we have been vacillating at all. There were some planes that were shot down in the former Yugoslavia as the result of the strength that we showed there, as we did in Iraq. When I received concrete evidence that there was an assassination attempt on former President Bush, we took military action there.

Now, the question is: What should we do with North Korea? This is a very serious thing. North Korea has said they want a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. North Korea has said they want to get along with South Korea. It is the most isolated regime in the world today. Nobody wants them to develop nuclear weapons, not China, their old ally. China doesn't want them to become a nuclear power. Japan doesn't want them to become a nuclear power because they don't want to have to think about developing nuclear weapons. South Korea certainly doesn't. Seoul, South Korea, by far the biggest city in South Korea, is very close to the North Korean border.

The question, sir, is: What is the proper way to try to get North Korea to comply? And what we have done is to try to work very closely first with the South Koreans—whatever we do, we have to do in partnership with them—and with the Japanese and the Chinese, pushing firmly, firmly, firmly, to get the inspections. We got more inspections. They didn't do everything they promised to do, and so now we've got the United Nations to make a very strong statement that they have to do it. If they don't do it, we'll continue to go forward.

But this is a very delicate thing. It's easy to talk about and difficult to do. North Korea and South Korea are right there together; their armies are facing each other. Seoul is a very big city on the border of North Korea. And we've got to work closely with the South Koreans and the others, and we're going to be very, very firm about it. But if I say we're going to do something, we're going to do it. I'm not going to threaten something that we're not prepared to do. I think what we should do is say less and do more in international politics.

Ms. Hindrew. Mr. President, several months ago, in November of last year, you said we will not allow North Korea to build a nuclear weapon. We now believe that there are at least two nuclear weapons and possibly a third. When you say we will not allow them to build it, what are you willing to do to stop them? And what are you willing to do now that we believe they have them?

The President. Well, the intelligence community believes now something they did not believe at that time, which is that they may have a rudimentary nuclear weapon which may or may not even be deliverable, but which may be a bomb in a literal sense. That may or may not have happened. You've seen that in the press.

We have to see what our options are. One of the things we can do is to continue to put economic pressure on North Korea. But if we do it through the United Nations, we have to carry along with us the South Koreans. After all, the South Koreans have the biggest stake. We have the next biggest stake because we have 40,000 soldiers in Korea. The next biggest stake is in the Japanese who are right there handy. And we have a lot of options short of the military option to continue to make it a very painful decision for the North Koreans to do. So we have not ruled out any of our options, and we will continue to press.

Ms. Hindrew. Specifically, what are those options? Economic sanctions don't seem to——

The President. Well, there's all kinds of economic—well, no, we haven't imposed economic sanctions yet.

Ms. Hindrew. No, we haven't imposed economic sanctions, but most analysts say that economic sanctions won't help.

The President. They may or may not. They may or may not. Economic sanctions have done a lot of damage in the places where they've been imposed. They just don't have immediate results.

Ms. Hindrew. Except North Korea is a different situation. It's incredibly isolated; it's very self-sufficient.

The President. It's not very—actually, it depends on how you define self-sufficiency. It's not doing—they're not doing very well.

Ms. Hindrew. No, they're not doing well, but they're still self-sufficient and they're not doing well.

The President. Well, that's right. So if they do even worse, then they'll have to pay a price for their irresponsible conduct. The thing I said to the North Koreans through formal and informal channels is, what are they getting for this? They get nothing for this. They literally are getting nothing. All they're doing is becoming more and more isolated. They're making themselves poorer. They're making themselves more alienated. Even the Chinese don't agree with what they're doing.

China now is doing 10 times as much business with South Korea as North Korea. So what we have to do is to try to find a way to reach them, get them to come to their senses, keep the commitments they've made. But it's very easy to talk tough here. You have to think about what the consequences are. I am determined to keep putting the pressure on, but I do not believe it serves any useful purpose to inflame the situation with rhetoric. That's what the North Koreans have done; it's a big mistake. We are sending Patriot missiles there. We can resume our military exercises there. We can impose stiffer economic sanctions. We have a lot of options there that we can still explore.

Interest Rates

[*Mr. Donovan called on a participant in Austin, TX, who asked if the administration would take responsibility for higher interest rates.*]

The President. Why do you think they went up?

Q. Well, I'm asking you.

The President. I'm asking you. You asked me to take responsibility, so I ask you why. They plainly went down after we declared our deficit reduction package. That's why they went down. They have gone up, I think, for two reasons, maybe three.

One is we had 7 percent economic growth in the last quarter of last year. That's the most economic growth we have had in 10 years. Second—we had 458,000 new jobs come into this economy in the month of March alone. That's the most new jobs we've had in any given month in over 6 years. When you have that kind of growth, some people are going to think that inflation is coming back in the economy, and interest rates will go up.

Secondly, I think there was an overreaction to what the Federal Reserve did. The Federal Reserve raised short-term interest rates in the hope that they would send a signal that they were going to fight inflation and that long-term rates would stabilize. Instead of that, the market overreacted to it.

The third thing that happened is most everybody in America thought the stock market was somewhat overvalued. When people pull their money out of the stock market, if they put their money into other securities, that will tend to raise long-term rates.

I think those are the reasons they've gone up. The issue is, are we going to continue to have economic growth or not? I think we are. And if you ask me to take responsibility because interest rates went up where we had 7 percent growth in the last 3 months of last year and 458,000 new jobs in March, I'll be glad to take responsibility for that if that's what you want. That's what I call a high class problem.

I do think that the markets are overreacting to what the Federal Reserve did. And I hope that they'll settle down. I hope the stock market will settle down; I hope the interest rates will go back down. But we still did the right thing, sir, to keep trying to bring the deficit down. And I still think we've got to pass this budget that will eliminate 115 programs, cut 200 and something others, and give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman. I think we ought to do that. I think it's good economics.

Anticrime Efforts

[*Ms. Hindrew introduced an 11-year-old girl in Charlotte, who asked what could be done to stop the growing crime rate.*]

The President. I think we have to do a lot of things. I think, first of all, really serious criminals who continue to repeat their crimes endangering people should be put away for longer periods—that young girl, Polly Klaas, who was kidnapped and killed, about your age, by a person who had done something like that before. A relatively small number of the criminals in this country are repeat offenders and truly dangerous. Those people can be identified with some accuracy, and they ought to be subject to our "three strikes and you're out" law. The second thing I think we need to do is to have what the police chief in Austin said, we have to have police that are on the street working with folks like you, making it safe for people to go to school, safe for children to be in school, and reducing the crime rate. The third thing we ought to do is to begin to take these dangerous weapons out of the hands of these young gang members and other people who do not have them for sporting or hunting purposes. And the fourth thing we need to do is to begin to teach young people, when they're your age and younger, nonviolent ways of dealing with their frustration and their anger and their differences. You've got kids just up and shooting each other today. The mayor of Baltimore told me a heart-wrenching story about an 18-year-old young man on Halloween day last October who was taking two little kids down the street and was shot dead by a 13-year-old who was just dared to do it by another teenager. These kids have got to be reached. We've got to reach these kids so they don't do that, before they become terrible problems. That's what I think we have to do.

The Economy

[*Mr. Hawkins introduced a participant in Bristol, TN, who expressed concern about Social Security and the impact of the deficit.*

The President. Let me say first, with regard to Social Security, right now the Social Security tax brings in more money than is necessary to pay out in Social Security every year. And Social Security should be stable for quite a long while now. I don't think you have to worry about that.

Secondly, does the deficit matter? Yes, it does. It matters when we have to take 15 cents of every dollar you pay in taxes to pay in interest on the debt. That's money we can't spend on education or health care or jobs or something else. And it can weaken our economy, because we have to borrow money sometimes from overseas.

Now, if we keep going, right now, the real way to look at the deficit is, what is the percentage of our deficit as a percentage of our national income? If you look at it that way and compare it to all the other major economies of the world, our deficit now, we've gotten it low enough so that it's smaller as a percentage of our national income than any of the countries we compete with, major economies, except one, except Japan. And if we keep going, we'll get it down below that. We have to keep driving it down.

The only way to get it to zero is to go back to the very first question I was asked. The only way to get it to zero, because we're cutting defense all we can, and that gentleman made—I don't think we can cut it any more. And I'm very concerned. I don't want the Congress to cut defense any more than is in our plan in this budget session. We're cutting defense already. We're cutting domestic spending that's discretionary for the first time since 1969. The only thing that's going up in this budget is that health care costs are still going up at 2 and

3 times the rate of inflation. So the only way we can get the deficit down to zero now is to bring health care costs in line with inflation. And that's what I'm trying hard to do. And I hope we can do that.

But as long as the deficit is going down instead of up, which it is now, it will be a smaller and smaller percentage of our income, and our economy will be stronger. And I think you can be confident that we're going in the right direction. And that's the important thing. We're going in the right direction, not the wrong direction.

President's Travel Costs

[*A participant in Charlotte asked what it cost the taxpayers for the President to attend the NCAA basketball championship games.*]

The President. I really—I don't know. But one of the reasons I scheduled this and I put this health care thing together here was because we had already planned for me to be out all week long doing this. And I had not been to North Carolina to do an event like this. So we decided that it would add no extra, except whatever it cost to prepare me to go in and out of that arena. And that's mostly because of the security.

But I would say to you what you have to decide is whether you think the President should either give up the Secret Service or should, for example, never throw out the first ball on opening day of baseball season. Because one of the things that's happened, particularly since President Reagan was shot back in 1981, is that the security surrounding the President—and especially since the violence has gone up in our country—has increased greatly. And it does, it costs too much money, and it's too disruptive to take the President around. I mean, to me it's really a troubling thing coming as I do from kind of ordinary surroundings in a little State where my lifestyle was very informal.

But I think what the American people have to decide is whether they want the President to stay home in the White House all the time. If you want the President to go out and be either a normal citizen contacting other citizens or do things the President normally does, like throwing out the first ball in baseball season, then you have to be willing to say that that's an ordinary part of the cost of being President.

Now, when I do go out for political events, for example, if I go speak to a fundraiser for somebody, they have to pay the cost of my going there. So if I do something political, that's—or any President, the same was true for President Bush and President Reagan—then you don't bear that cost; that is covered. But if we do something that is not political, you do bear the cost, even if it's what you might call—what you said, frivolous. I mean, if I go on vacation, the Secret Service goes with me; so that I pay for the cost of my personal expense on vacation, but you pay the cost of all the Presidential apparatus being there. That's something that has always been true and is now more costly, especially since the attempt on President Reagan's life.

Mr. Donovan. Thank you, Mr. President. We——

The President. I don't blame you. I didn't think it's disrespectful. It bothers me, too.

Mr. Donovan. We'll let you relax for a few moments. We'll take a break and come back with more questions for President Clinton.

Health Care Reform

[*Following a commercial break, a participant in Charlotte discussed the problems of temporary workers and asked how health care reform would apply to them.*]

The President. Thank you. First of all, I think a lot of you probably know this, but one of the reasons for the explosion of temporary workers in America may be that the employers don't have to pay for the benefits. So that's one of the things that happened.

Under our plan, here's how it would work. If a temporary worker worked 10 hours a week or more, the employer would have to pay a portion of the health insurance premium for the employee and the employee would have to pay a portion, and then we'd have a pool, a Government-funded pool, that would pay the rest. Because it isn't fair to make the employer pay the whole thing, for example, if the temporary worker's only working 20 hours a week, or 15 or 10; they would pay a portion. Then if it was 30 or more, the employer would just have to cover the temporary worker as long as the worker worked for the employer as if the employee were a regular employee. So you would be covered as a temporary worker always. And I think that's very important.

Let me just make one related point. I have spent a lot of the last 12 years of my life trying

to figure out how to help people who are on welfare get off of welfare and go to work. We just made a big change in the tax laws in America, cutting income taxes for almost 17 percent of the American people who work for very modest wages and are just above poverty line because we want to make sure that people always have an incentive to work.

The next big problem is making sure people have health care. A center here, right here in Charlotte, North Carolina, just reported in the last couple of days that having interviewed welfare recipients in Tennessee and North Carolina, 83 percent of them said they would take a minimum wage job and leave welfare if they had health coverage for their children. So I'm just supporting what this gentleman's saying. That's why it's very important. Our plan would cover that for you.

[*Ms. King introduced a small business owner who asked if the Government would subsidize his firm's projected insurance cost of $184,000 a year under the new plan.*]

The President. Well, first of all, is 8 percent of payroll—is that what 8 percent of payroll is for you?

Q. Question? What was that?

The President. Would 8 percent of payroll be $180,000?

Q. Eighty percent—eighty percent is your proposal, sir.

The President. I know. But there is a ceiling; even for the most prosperous businesses, no one can pay more than 7.9 percent of payroll. For small businesses that are eligible for a discount, it can go down as low as 3.5 percent of payroll. That's the maximum in a sliding scale in there.

Let me ask you a question. We don't want to take everybody else's time on this. I would appreciate it if you would actually write to me personally and send me this information. The short answer to your question is, no employer can pay more than 7.9 percent of payroll under our plan. Today, on average, American employers pay between 8 and 9.5 percent of payroll for health care. Small businesses with low average wages are eligible for discounts that will take the payroll costs down as far as 3.5 percent of payroll. I would not favor a small business mandate unless we can provide a discount to small businesses because there are too many that can't afford it.

I will say this, though, since you talk about the car dealership. I grew up in the car business, and I had a car dealer from Arkansas and his family staying with me the other night. And he pointed out he provided health insurance for 20 years, as you have, and his is right at 8 percent a payroll. And he said none of his competitors had done it, but he'd put three competitors out of business even though he had to pay it because he never lost any employees. So it's hard for me to believe that your payroll costs would be that great with only 70 employees, and that's why I'd like to ask you to write.

There's a ceiling of 7.9 percent for all businesses. Small businesses, depending on their size and their wage, are eligible for discounts that could go down to a low of 3.5 percent. That's how it would work.

Immigration

[*Ms. Hindrew introduced a student who asked if the Federal Government could take steps to educate and train Hispanic immigrants so that States would not feel forced to take drastic anti-immigration measures.*]

The President. I do think we should do more on education and training. But I also have to tell you, I think we should do more to keep people who are not legal immigrants out of the country if we can.

Now, we're a democracy with a vast border, so our ability to keep all illegal immigrants out is somewhat limited. But we have laws in this country that I think ought to be—I have encouraged immigration. I believe in immigration, but I think people should come here legally. And you know, there are people that have been waiting years to get in this country and who won't violate the laws. And people who come against the law get around that and get ahead of the ones that have been waiting years to come in. I don't think that's fair. So we're trying to stiffen the borders.

Now, when people are here, I think more of them should go to college. And I think more American citizens should be able to go to college. What we've done there is to try to lower the interest rates on college loans, stretch out the repayments, and permit more young people to earn money against college by doing community service. Those are the three things we're doing to try to get more education and training for kids that otherwise couldn't afford it who

are legally in this country, whether they're citizens or legal immigrants.

College Costs and Job Creation

[*Ms. Holiday introduced the student body president at the University of Texas in Austin, who asked about the Government's role in helping students pay their bills both before and after graduation.*]

The President. Well, first, let's talk about how you pay your bills when you're in school. My goal was when I became President to make sure that money was never a reason young people did not go to college. We know that the unemployment rate in America for high school dropouts is 11.5 percent. The unemployment rate for college graduates is 3.5 percent; with all the job problems, it's much lower.

So we are redoing the student loans so that the interest rates are lower and the repayment terms are better and you can get the money you need while you go to college. There also, year after next, will be 100,000 positions in America in community service so people can earn credit against their college—you can get the money to go to college while working in their communities. Now, when you get out, if you can get a job, and I'll come back to that in a minute, under our plan, you can pay these college loans off as a percentage of your income no matter how much money you borrow.

So the last thing I have to do is try to create more jobs. And I'll go back to what I said opening the program. In the last 14 months, our economy has produced 2.3 million new jobs. In the previous 4 years, the economy produced only a million new jobs in the private sector. So we're trying to make 8 million in this 4-year period, as opposed to about a million in the last 4-year period. If we make it, there will be more jobs for young people. That's what we have to do. And so far we're on track. We're on track to make that 8 million. And we've got to keep doing it. That's all I can tell you. There's nothing else I can do except to keep trying to create more jobs and help the private sector to create more jobs.

Teen Pregnancy

[*A participant asked about increasing the amount of sex education given in schools to deal with the increase in teen pregnancy.*]

The President. I think we should. It is largely a decision to be made at the local school district level. But I have worked on this problem for a long time; when I was a Governor I worked on it. And I can tell you what I've seen from my own experience works—what I believe works.

I believe if you have programs in the schools which are supported by community leaders, including religious leaders, which do two things: number one, tell young people that the only completely safe way to avoid teen pregnancy is to abstain from sex but that also, here is how your body works, here's what causes this, here's how families are built, here's how it all works, and here's what you should do to protect yourself so that you do not get in a position where you have an unwanted, premature pregnancy—I think those kind of clinics work. I know they do; I have seen them work, if they are supported by the community. And I could give you example after example where it's happened.

I personally believe it is a great mistake to pretend that this problem doesn't exist and to say that somebody else is going to handle it. This goes back to what this gentleman said. If we don't deal with this in the schools, I don't know where it will be dealt with. Now, I know a lot of religious leaders think that if you discuss this in schools, you'll be encouraging children to have sexual relations prematurely. I personally don't believe that because of the evidence. I think it's better to tell kids the truth, tell them they ought not to do it, tell them if they do it, here are the consequences and here's how to deal with it. That's what I think; I think we should be very up-front.

But it only works—I have seen this, I have seen this issue tear communities apart—it only works if you bring the community people, including the leaders of the community of faith, in on the front end and honestly and frankly discuss this. I saw a community in my State where a Methodist minister sat on a committee that voted to give the nurse in the health clinic the authority to distribute condoms. I saw another community which voted against doing it. Both communities had a decline in teen pregnancy because they agreed on the values that would be pressed, and they tried to get these kids to save their own lives and their future. So I think we can push it at the national level, but there has to be a belief at the local level

that your life and your generation's life is worth fighting for.

President's Record

[*Mr. Hawkins introduced a participant who cited discrepancies between campaign rhetoric and administration actions on taxes and foreign policy and asked why he should believe the President regarding the Whitewater allegations.*]

The President. Well, first of all, let's go through each one of those issues. If you take the Whitewater issue, you don't have to take my word for anything. Look at my tax returns. When's the last President that went back 17 years before he became President and gave his tax returns up? Just look at them; don't take my word for it.

A former Commissioner of the IRS said that all the Republican attacks on me saying that I owed more taxes and that I made money instead of lost money on Whitewater were flat wrong. I have been the subject, sir, of false charges. People saying things about me that are not true don't make my credibility an issue. They make their credibility an issue, not mine.

Secondly, we have a different position on Bosnia, a different position on Haiti, and a different position on China. We have not solved the Bosnian process, but I would remind you that because of the leadership of this administration, we have got an agreement now with the Europeans that we worked with. There is a safe zone around Sarajevo; there's an agreement between the Bosnian Muslims and the Croatians; we are making progress in Bosnia. We have a significantly different policy in China that a lot of people disagree with, but it's clearly different from the policy of the previous administration. On Haiti, our policy in Haiti is different. Our policy on return of the Haitians is the same because I became convinced, after I became President, that hundreds and hundreds of Haitians were going to die trying to come to the shores of this country unless we set up a system that would allow them to apply for refugee status in Haiti before they came here. And we have set up a system that did not exist when I became President to allow the Haitians to apply for refugee status in Haiti before they came here. So I just disagree with that.

On the middle class tax cut, let me just point out to you, sir, that after the election, the deficit by the previous administration was revised upward by more than $50 billion in the next year. I didn't do that; I didn't have control of those figures.

So here's what I had to do. Do I go through with a whole middle class tax cut and let the deficit balloon and have interest rates higher and weaken this economy? Or do I tell the American people the truth, which is what I did: The deficit is bigger than I thought it was going to be, so I can't go the whole way. I'm going to give 17 percent of the working people in this country an income tax cut, which you never heard about last year. On April 15th, 1.2 percent get an income tax increase, 17 percent almost—16.6 percent—get an income tax cut. And I still believe there ought to be a family tax credit for the rest of middle class America. But I have a 4-year term, sir, not a one-year term.

I haven't abandoned it; I can't get everything done in one year. I'm doing the very best I can and, by the way, the independent analysis last year said that we got more done in the first year of our Presidency than anybody in the last 30 years. So I haven't given up on that commitment; I just can't get it done. I think I have done a remarkable job of doing what I said I would do, and I think you ought to trust me.

Mr. Donovan. Mr. President, we're back to home base for our next question.

The President. You ought to be free to disagree with me, but disagreeing with me is different from trust. We ought not to mix our apples and oranges here.

Anticrime Efforts

[*Ms. Hindrew introduced a participant who asked what could be done to ensure that laws favor the citizen instead of the criminal.*]

The President. First, I believe as I said, that "three strikes and you're out" laws will help. You just passed one here in North Carolina, too. Keep in mind, most criminal law, folks, is State law carried out by local prosecutors and local police forces. That's why I think what I can do is to help change the environment: more police, deal with the assault weapons, give the local folks the resources they need to fight crime and to help kids before they get in trouble.

I also support capital punishment, and since 1981 have been on record, at least since then, in trying to accelerate the appeals process. I think it is wrong to have appeals processes that

take 6, 7, 8, 9 years. And there are things that can be done to accelerate that, which we are debating in the Congress as well now.

But I think it's important—what you need is certainty and clarity of punishment. We need a clean, meaningful, credible "three strikes and you're out" law. We don't want to put the kitchen sink in there. Take the serious violent offenses and put them there. And then the States that have these laws should enforce the laws, whatever they are. That's what I believe.

We had a capital punishment law in Arkansas when I was Governor, and I carried it out. But it is not the sole answer, believe me. What you've got to do, I think, is to reduce the crime rate and—you heard the police chief in Austin—most law enforcement people I know think that putting more police on the street in the proper way and connecting them to the community again will do more to lower crime than anything else we can do. But I do agree with you on the appeals, too.

Community Activism

[*A participant affirmed his continued support for the President and asked what average Americans could do specifically on the local level to help him.*]

The President. Let me just give you a few, real quickly. First of all, you can tell your Member of Congress, whether you're a Republican or Democrat or whether they're Republicans or Democrats: Pass the crime bill, deal with the health care crisis, and don't let anything divert us from the major business of the country. Let's pass the budget, keep the deficit coming down, pass the crime bill, deal with the health care crisis, deal with welfare reform, act to rein in some of the excessive lobbying activities. In other words, do the country's business.

Then, here in every community—believe me, I mean, I used to live in a community, I didn't always have this job where I, to go back to what the lady said, travel around with a big retinue—if you really want to help my agenda, what can be done in your community to help people walk the streets and fight crime? What can be done in your community to put males like you, one-on-one, in touch with these young men before they get in trouble or when they're on the edge of being in trouble, to help them rescue their lives? I met a man today who works in a program like this, who introduced me to a 17-year-old boy who was orphaned, living alone in his house at 17, but still in school, obeying the law, graduating from high school, looking forward to a better life. Citizens have got to get involved in saving these children one-on-one. The most important thing you could do is to figure—in my judgment, to help carry out my agenda—is figure out whether in your community everything has been done to make the streets safe, the schools safe, the kids have a better future, recreational opportunities for kids, the kind of things that make communities strong and bridge racial and income divides that are tearing this country apart. That's what I think we have to do. If you want to help my agenda, make your community strong, and America will work. Personal volunteer time, committing to that kind of thing, that will work.

Mr. Donovan. Thank you, Mr. President. In the couple of minutes we have remaining, we'd like to have you, if you will, please reflect on what you've heard here tonight: 90 minutes' worth of questions, it's gone very fast, and you've answered a variety of questions. What will you take back to Washington with you from tonight?

The President. A deeply rewarding sense that the American people love this country and that most people in this country get up every day and go to work and do the very best they can with their jobs and with their families and with their communities, and they want me and they want those of us who live in Washington not to become diverted from their business. We have some serious problems, but don't forget, folks, we also have some great strengths in this country.

We've still got the strongest economy in the world. We've still got the most flexible economy with the greatest chance to make the changes we need to make to go into the 21st century as the greatest country in the world. And the only thing that could divert us, the only thing that can defeat us is ourselves. And I also think, frankly, I've been reassured that I think you all have a pretty realistic idea about what it is that I have to do and what it is that you have to do. We've all got jobs to do. Some things have to be done by the President and the Congress. Some things have to be done by the private sector and community leaders. Some things have to be done by the State and local government.

And I try always to think about how I can be a leader with a voice for all the people and still be very up front with the American people about what I have to do and what you all have to do. Because these are things we have to do together. The Government cannot solve all the problems of the country. But together we can solve the problems of the country, and together we can move ahead.

I always come away with this—I come away here so much more energized and optimistic because I think people are real realistic and yet hopeful out here. I don't think the American people are as cynical as sometimes people in public life think they are. I think you all still believe in yourselves and your potential and your country.

Mr. Donovan. Congress is coming back from its break. And I'll just ask you just in a few seconds, have you heard anything here tonight that will change your agenda when you go back to Washington?

The President. No, but I'm going to tell them that near as I can tell, people sure want them to pass that crime bill and not fool around with it, do it right away. That's where we're going to start.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 7:35 p.m. at the WCNC–TV studios.

Exchange With Reporters in Charlotte
April 5, 1994

Supreme Court Justice Resignation

Q. Mr. President, have you heard about Justice Blackmun's resignation tomorrow?

The President. I can't comment on it. Let's let him speak for himself.

Q. Have you spoken to him in the last two days?

The President. I have not.

Q. Have you got a short list, Mr. President?

The President. Let Justice Blackmun speak for himself. I have not spoken to him. We have to let him speak for himself.

Q. Has he written to you? Has he notified you?

The President. No. I have not talked to him. I have not talked to him or, to the best of my knowledge, we have received no letter from him. Let's let him speak for himself—some communication with him tomorrow.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:45 p.m. outside the WCNC–TV studios. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on the Resignation of Supreme Court Justice Harry A. Blackmun and an Exchange With Reporters
April 6, 1994

The President. Good morning. It is my duty and my honor on behalf of the people of the United States of America to thank Justice Blackmun for his lifetime of service to our Nation.

I have received his letter announcing his intention to step down from the Supreme Court. In so doing, he will step up into our history. During his 24 years on our highest court, Justice Blackmun has become part of the rich and evolving story of American justice and constitutional law with majesty and reason, with scholarship and grace. He is a good man who has earned the respect and the gratitude of every one of his fellow countrymen and women.

When President Nixon nominated Harry Blackmun for service on the Court, his candidacy naturally occasioned a great deal of speculation about what kind of Justice he would be. Some labeled him a strict constructionist. But he rejected any attempt to tag him with a label, saying, and I quote, "I've been called

liberal and conservative. Labels are deceiving. I call them as I see them." Twenty-four years later, we can say that he did exactly what he said he would do 24 years ago.

It was President Woodrow Wilson who called our judiciary "the balance wheel of our entire system." It is meant to maintain the nice adjustment between individual rights and Government powers which constitutes political liberty. Harry Blackmun has been a steady and strong hand on that balance wheel.

In cases argued before him, he found the human dimension and struck the right balance in the struggle over how we might best overcome our legacy of racism, in protecting the women's reproductive rights, in providing poor people and sick people access to the lowest priced prescription drugs, in opening the courthouse doors to the mentally ill and upholding tough sentencing guidelines that keep hardened criminals confined in prison, in averting a constitutional crisis by voting with a united Court to tell the President who appointed him to obey the law.

Those of us who have studied the law can at times be lost in its abstractions. The habits, the procedures, the language of the law can separate lawyers from the people who look to the bar for justice. Justice Blackmun's identification was firmly and decisively with the ordinary people of this country, with their concerns. And his humanity was often given voice not only in majority opinions but in his dissents.

When he stood apart from the Court and aligned himself with an abused son against a violent parent and an indifferent child welfare agency, he appealed to the Court, "What is required of us is moral ambition. Poor Joshua. It is a sad commentary upon American life and constitutional principles that Joshua and his mother are denied by this Court the opportunity to have their rights protected." As he promised, his opinions defied labels. Only the word "justice" applies. Justice has not only been his title, it has been his guiding light.

Consider the history of which he has been a part. His tenure on the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court extended through the terms of nine Presidents. Fewer than 110 Americans have served on the Supreme Court, and Justice Blackmun served with 17 of them. Of the Judiciary Committee members who unanimously approved his nomination, including strong people in the Senate like John McClellan and Sam Ervin, Phil Hart, Hugh Scott, Mack Mathias, only three remain, Senators Kennedy, Byrd, and Thurmond. He's been part of a very lively period in American history. And he has served us well.

Let me also say on a personal note, one of the most rewarding experiences of my public life and my personal life has been the opportunity that Hillary and I have had to get to know Harry Blackmun and his wonderful wife, Dotty, who is here with us today. I have seen his passion in a private way for the people of this country, for its history, for its leaders, for its institutions, for its laws, for holding us together and moving us forward.

I can only say that every one of us who serves in any capacity in public life would do very well by the people of the United States if we could bring to our work half the integrity, the passion, and the love for this country that Justice Blackmun has given us on the United States Supreme Court for 24 years. And I thank him very much.

[*At this point, Justice Blackmun made brief remarks.*]

Supreme Court Nomination

Q. Mr. President, these are such large shoes to fill. Have you thought about the kind of person you would want? And if we could take you back to politics and the practical nature of politics, would it be possible, for instance, to elevate someone from the Senate, such as George Mitchell, without jeopardizing your program, such as health care?

The President. Well, today I'd like to make just one statement about that because I think today should be Justice Blackmun's day. We'll have a lot of time in the days ahead to discuss this.

The shoes are large. The role that he has filled on this Court is terribly important. I will attempt to appoint someone of genuine stature and a largeness of ability and spirit to the Court. I will try to do it in a timely fashion, in an appropriate and timely fashion, that is, within a reasonable amount of time. But I want to make sure that we have reviewed the appropriate options, and I will do that.

And I think we'll have lots of time to talk about it in the days ahead. But I just don't think I should say much more today. I think this should be Justice Blackmun's day.

Roe v. *Wade*

Q. Mr. President, Justice Blackmun has been known for his commitment to the decision in *Roe* versus *Wade* that legalizes abortion. How important is it for the Supreme Court to keep that philosophy toward the right to abortion? And I wondered if Justice Blackmun might say a few words about where he thinks the Court might be headed on that issue.

The President. Well, I don't know if he wants to talk about it. You know, of course, that I agree with the decision, and I think it's an important one in a very difficult and complex area of our Nation's life. But again, I don't want to talk about the appointment of a new Justice today.

Q. Justice Blackmun, could you say a few words about *Roe* versus *Wade*, what it's meant and why you think that it has been an important decision for our country?

Justice Blackmun. I didn't hear that. Can you repeat it?

Q. I'm sorry. Could you say a few words about the decision in *Roe* versus *Wade* and about why you think it's been important for women in this country, your continued commitment to it, and where you think the Court might be headed on it?

Justice Blackmun. Well, I didn't come in here to indulge in a question-and-answer session, but I'll try to answer that. Roe against Wade hit me early in my tenure on the Supreme Court. And people forget that it was a 7-to-2 decision. They always typify it as a Blackmun opinion. But I'll say what I've said many times publicly: I think it was right in 1973, and I think it was right today. It's a step that had to be taken as we go down the road toward the full emancipation of women.

Supreme Court Nomination

Q. Mr. President, I take it you've had some advance warning that this might be coming. Could you give us some sense of how much opportunity you've had to get your process started and how far along it might be?

The President. Well, I spoke a little this morning with our staff about it. We will have, I think, a good process that will involve Mr. Cutler, the White House Counsel, the Attorney General, Mr. McLarty, and Mr. Lader, who's been overseeing our personnel operations. And I think it will proceed in a very deliberate way. You know, Justice Blackmun referred in his letter to a conversation we had several months ago indicating that he might—or that he intended to leave at some time during this year or announce his intention. I, frankly, kept hoping he would change his mind. But I think we are prepared, and I think we proceed forthwith.

Q. Mr. President—this is for Justice Blackmun. I thought you had taken the public decision that your doctors would tell you when it was time to go. That having been so, can you say how you reached your decision to retire? And would you add to that how you can get along without a daily fix of hate mail? [*Laughter*]

Justice Blackmun. I missed the punch line.

The President. He asked how you were going to get along without your daily fix of hate mail. He offered to take some of mine. [*Laughter*]

Justice Blackmun. I think the President and I have a lot to share in those hate mail things, but we'll see. We'll let the future take care of itself. I'm advised there's a vacancy on the 8th Circuit I think I'll apply for. I'll be turned down, I know. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, it took you 3 months the last time. Will it take you that long this time?

The President. Thank you. Let's go.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:34 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for William H. Natcher in Bowling Green, Kentucky

April 6, 1994

To the family of our friend Bill Natcher; Mr. Speaker; Governor; distinguished Members of Congress; all those who have preceded me on the program: Reverend Welch; Reverend

Bridges, thank you for that wonderful sermon; Mr. Orendorf, thank you for making us laugh and for being so wise.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for proving that Reverend Bridges was right, there are still noble and good people in public life in America. Thank you all for making my role almost completely irrelevant. There is hardly anything else left to say.

I think I would like to tell you two things about Bill Natcher from my point of view. The country doesn't work very well in tough times, when difficult decisions have to be made, if the President cannot work with the Congress. We faced an enormously difficult position, Bill Natcher and I did, when I became President and he took the reins of the Appropriations Committee. Our country was drowning in debt, our deficit had been going up, our national debt had tripled in 12 years, and yet every person who studied the issue knew that there were some things we needed to invest even more money in. You heard people talk already today about the National Institute of Health, the need we had to make the changes so that our country could go into the next century and more Bill Natchers would have a chance to make their way in life. We had to find a way to bridle this debt and then invest more in education and in scientific research and in making the transition from a defense to a domestic, high-technology economy. And all that fell on the shoulders of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I said to myself—I didn't know Mr. Natcher when I became President. I knew about him; nearly everybody in American politics did. Everybody's asking, "Can this young guy from Arkansas who has only been a Governor, never been in Congress, be President?" And I'm saying, "Can a man who doesn't own a fax machine run the Appropriations Committee?" [*Laughter*]

Well, let me tell you, he came to see me one day, and we sat alone in the Oval Office, and he almost held my hand, which is just about what I needed. And he said, "Now, Mr. President"—how many of you heard him say that to you, right—[*laughter*]—"now, we're going to get through this all right, and you're going to make some hard decisions, and I'm going to help you. And then if we're real lucky, we'll get it through the Congress. And you will have to be willing to be misunderstood for a while," which I thought was a delicate way of putting the position we were in. [*Laughter*]

But he said, "The end will bring us out all right." And sure enough, he set about doing his work. And he worked with all of the Members in the Congress and figured out some way or another to produce a budget that both brought the deficit down and spent more money on things that were critical to our future.

It was a service to the Nation that those of you here in his home district made possible. And it was a remarkable thing, a great gift that he helped to give to our country. And it was very, very hard to do. And I agree with the Speaker: It will affect people's lives in ways that are even more important than the shining example he set by never missing a vote and by being able to be in such harmony with his constituents that he never had to raise money or spend it or campaign or politic in ways that those of us who are more mortal have to do. And I thank him for that.

The other thing I thank him for, which may have an enduring benefit to the country, is far more personal. You heard the Speaker talk about how he was the chairman of the Gym Committee, and they have this dinner every year. And you know, I read all about how I spend too much time at McDonald's, and so I'm always trying to watch my weight in there. But I never wanted to offend Mr. Natcher. So I show up at his dinner, and he takes me to be seated, and he lays a big steak and a baked potato and peach cobbler there. And by the time he got through talking to me, I not only did not offend him, he had talked me into having two of everything. [*Laughter*]

And we talked some more, and our relationship developed some more. And then when he got terribly ill, I went out to Bethesda to see him, and I had the great honor of being there and presented him with the President's Citizens Medal. And I pinned it on his pajamas, and I talked to him about his life.

And I thought to myself: Why is it that I am so moved by this man? What is it that he has done, not just the votes and the no contributions and all that, what is it that he has done that if the rest of us could do it, we could really be true to the Founders of this country, true to the challenges of our time? We could bring more harmony and a stronger sense of community to our people. What is it, exactly?

And I think what it was is that he found a way to live in Washington and work in politics and still be exactly the way he would have been if he'd been here in Bowling Green running a hardware store. And this country works well when people in Washington treat each other the way they would have to treat each other if they were living in Bowling Green. And it doesn't work very well when everybody up there thinks, "Oh, this is a different place, and we have to treat each other differently, and we have to muscle each other around, and we have to posture rather than produce." And we're all so worried because we're bound to be misunderstood, being filtered to 250-plus million people, so that all of our positions on complicated issues get simplified and often distorted.

But somehow, Bill Natcher just had enough internal strength and coherence. Maybe he was just enough old-fashioned that he literally was able to live every day as he would have lived if he'd been here all the time. That was the beauty of his legacy. And if the rest of us can remember that about him, even if we miss a few votes or have to go out and raise campaign contributions, if we can just imagine the roots that we had, the childhood friends that we had, who always reminded us of our foibles as well as our strengths, if we can remember what the church choir sounds like on Sunday, even on the Sundays when we don't show up, and every day imagine that we were living where the people who sent us to Washington still live, then we could do something really precious for Bill Natcher. We could do for the American people what he would have done had he lived another 84 years.

God bless you, Mr. Natcher, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. at Eastwood Baptist Church. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Paul M. Welch, pastor, Eastwood Baptist Church; Rev. Richard W. Bridges, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bowling Green, KY; and Top Orendorf, who delivered the eulogy of friendship.

Remarks on Arrival in Topeka, Kansas
April 7, 1994

Thank you, Governor Finney, for your friendship, your leadership, and your kind remarks, and for your belief that every American and every Kansan ought to have health care that can never be taken away. Thank you, Congressman Slattery, for your long personal friendship and your support and for being such a strong voice in the Congress not only for fiscal responsibility but for basic sanity in our national policies.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm glad to be back in Kansas. I want to thank Major General Rueger for welcoming me, and Colonel Dewayne Ellinson. I want to thank the people who helped to put this event together today, the carpenters local, the floorlayers local. I want to thank the Topeka High School Band over there and the cheerleaders and all those who are cheering. The people who are here from Pauline South Elementary School, thank you for coming. I want to thank the members of the National Guard and the police officers and others who made this day possible. I also want to acknowledge in the audience today the presence of the first American woman to be the Treasurer of the United States, Georgia Neese Gray. How are you, ma'am? God bless you for being here. I want to thank your Lieutenant Governor, your attorney general, your State treasurer, your local mayor, and the chairman of the Democratic Party for meeting me here at the airport. But mostly I just want to tell you it's nice to be back in Kansas.

You know, since Jim was kind enough to mention the basketball game, you all know that for most of my public life I didn't live in Washington, DC. I was the Governor of one of your neighboring States. I lived and worked in an atmosphere very much like the way you all live and work. And I didn't understand what I often saw in Washington, where every position was pushed to its logical extreme, whether left or right, where it seemed that every debate took on more rhetoric than reality and shed more heat than light, where people seemed to be debating whether the Government could do ev-

erything or the Government had to do nothing, where people were either told they were on their own or not challenged to assume any responsibility for their own future.

I ran for President because that didn't make much sense to me, because I thought we ought to come together as a people, we ought to bridge the lines that are dividing us, and we ought to move to the 21st century together, recognizing that Government cannot solve all the problems but that we have a Government to discharge those responsibilities which have to be done by all of us together through our elected officials. I believed then and I believe even more strongly today that instead of paralyzing extremism, what this country needs is moderate, aggressive progressivism of people who are dedicated to getting together and getting things done. Cut down on the rhetoric, turn up the action, put people first, and move the country forward.

Now, there has been a lot of rhetoric about the deficit and how terrible it was, but it tripled in the last 3 years. Instead of that, we have adopted an aggressive economic program designed to reduce the deficit, hold down interest rates, increase investment, and get growth back into this economy. In the past 14 months, the American economy has produced 2.5 million private sector jobs, twice as many as were produced in the previous 4 years. That's the kind of action I went to Washington to take.

I have asked the United States Congress to pass a new budget that cuts spending in 300 different areas, eliminates 100 different Government programs, still invests more in education, in high-technology jobs, in defense transitions to help the people who won the cold war to win in the face of defense cutbacks, in health research and the things that will help us to win in the 21st century. And if it is adopted, it will mark the first time since 1969 that the President has proposed and the Congress has adopted an actual decrease in domestic spending, exclusive of health care and Social Security, and it will mark the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States that we reduced the Government's deficit 3 years in a row. That's action, not rhetoric.

We also have many challenges to face. The United States Congress has already done some things in the area of education and training which will be important for the future of Kansas, and more are on the way. Last year we reformed the college loan program so that more young people could borrow the money to go to college at lower interest rates and pay the money back on better terms, and so that tens of thousands of our young people could work in their communities solving problems at the grassroots level in the national service program and earn money to invest in a college education or further education and training. That will move our country forward.

Just a couple of days ago I signed out in California a bill called Goals 2000, which for the first time in the history of America will write into our laws world class education standards for all our schools and all our students and support grassroots reform, not Government mandates but grassroots reform in every community in America to meet those world class standards.

Soon the Congress will pass a bill we call school-to-work, for all the young people in Kansas and throughout the country who know they need more training after high school but don't want to go to 4-year colleges. We know from the census data that every one of our young people needs to finish high school and should get at least 2 years more of some sort of training if they want to get a good job with a growing income. We don't have a system to move people from school to work, but at the end of 4 years, if this bill passes and I get to sign it, we will.

Moving our people to the 21st century by making sure that they can change jobs, learn new skills, and always be able to compete and win, this is the kind of thing that I wanted to be President to do. It's a real thing, not a rhetorical thing, that will change the lives of the American people.

And finally in this area, I have asked the United States Congress to completely change the unemployment system. You know and I know that even in the months when we create a lot of jobs in America, a lot of jobs go away. All over America today, small businesses are creating jobs; big businesses are still downsizing. We know that the average 18-year-old—you look at those young people out there from this high school—the average one of these young people will change work eight times in a lifetime. We do not need to have an unemployment system that says you can live on unemployment payments for several months, and then your unemployment will run out and you still won't have a job. That's what's happening today. Most peo-

ple do not get called back to their old job. We need a reemployment system so that the first day people are unemployed they immediately begin to train for, look for, and have help in finding a new job to build a new American economy. And we are going to do that this year in Washington.

We're also trying to make your Government more responsive to you. The House of Representatives has before it historic legislation limiting the influence of lobbyists in Washington, increasing the influence of ordinary citizens. And I urge them to pass the lobby reform legislation soon when they come back.

In addition to that, this Congress adopted last year an economic plan which, as you will find out on April 15th, raised the income taxes of the top 1.2 percent of the American people and devoted 100 percent of that money to deficit reduction—every last red cent—and lowered the income taxes of one-sixth of the American people who are working 40 hours a week, who have children in the home, who are hovering just above the poverty line. We don't want them to go into welfare. We want them to stay in the work force. So we say, lower the taxes of the people who are working hard and playing by the rules, reward work over welfare, and make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents. And we did that for one-sixth of the American taxpaying families. And I am proud of that.

I do want to thank Governor Finney for what she said about the response of our administration during the flood. We did everything we could to try to help people all over this country, but especially here, who were devastated by that flood. During the flood, when the Missouri River inundated the town of Elwood about 100 miles from here, FEMA responded with disaster relief, and the Corps of Engineers already today is guarding Elwood against the flooding in the future by helping to rebuild the levee.

It's just one town, but there are hundreds of towns like that. Every time we had a disaster we have tried to say to the American people, "This is about people. This is not about ideology. It's not about political party. It's about delivering the goods." What I want is to see the Government work all day every day the way we work when we've got a disaster. Why should we wait for a disaster to do the right thing? We ought to get together and do the right thing all day every day to move this country forward.

That brings me to the last two things I want to say to you today. The first business Congress will face when it comes back is action on the crime bill. I think all of you know that over the last 20 years we've had a big increase in violent crime and that even though many of our major cities are beginning to see small declines in the overall crime rate, we still have a higher rate of violent crime than any other major nation. We already have by far the highest percentage of our people in prison of any major nation. And still there seems to be no end in sight.

Some people say the answer is tougher punishment. Other people say the answer is to reach these young people before they get in trouble and try to give them a better life. I say both are right, and we must do both. We have to be tough, but we have to be smart.

I started out my career in public life as an attorney general almost 20 years ago, and I thought crime was bad then. But I never dreamed that I would live to see the time when children would actually stay home from school, over 150,000 every day, because they were afraid to walk to school or afraid to sit in a classroom or afraid to walk in a hall. I never dreamed I would see towns, even towns in my home State of Arkansas, where gang initiations would require people to go in and pull robberies with guns that could turn into murders. I never dreamed I would see young people, better armed than police officers, with semiautomatic weapons shooting people at random. I never dreamed I would see that. And I tell you, we have got to do something about it.

Our crime bill will do the following things: Number one, it will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, working the streets, working the neighborhoods, knowing the people who live there, in community policing. And it will lower the crime rate. If there are those of you here who don't believe that you can do it, let me say all you have to do is look at the examples all over America. In the city of Houston, Texas, which had one of the highest crime rates, one of the highest murder rates in the entire country, when the mayor got elected and put 660 more police officers on the street and they started working with the communities, the crime rate went down 22 percent in 15 months. The murder rate went down 25 percent. And the mayor got reelected with 91 percent. And I think the two things were connected. We can

do better. We need more police officers on the street helping to make our young people and our families safer.

The bill also toughens sentences for a lot of crimes and says if you commit three crimes which cause violence or are reasonably likely to cause serious violence, you are not eligible for parole. A small percentage of criminals do a large percentage of the violent harm in this country. We should identify them and isolate them. And that is very important.

Finally, the bill provides funds to give drug treatment to young people, to have community recreation for young people, to provide young people a place to go after school or before school, to give communities the means to deal with all these kids that are coming from broken families in difficult neighborhoods and troubled circumstances to keep these things from happening in the first place. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. My mother told me that when I was 6 years old, and it's a whole lot more true today than it was 40 years ago. We are trying to give you an ounce of prevention, and I hope you in Kansas will take full advantage of it when the crime bill passes.

Now, the last thing I want to say is when we leave here, Congressman Slattery's going to take me over to a forum. We're going to hear from a bunch of small business people and talk about whether we can provide health security for all Americans.

Let me just tell you what the stakes are. We are the only country in the world with an advanced economy that doesn't provide health care security to all its citizens. All of our competitors have figured out how to do it. We are spending 40 to 50 percent more of our income on health care than any of our competitors. We are spending about $90 billion a year—and that's real money everywhere, folks—on paperwork and rules and regulation because of the way we organize the financing of health care that nobody else does.

On any given week in America 58 million Americans have no health insurance; 81 million Americans live in families where somebody has a preexisting condition, a child with diabetes, a father who's had a heart attack, a mother who's had cancer. They either can't get health insurance, or they pay more than they can afford, or they can never change the job they're in because their new employer will not insure them. Three-quarters of the American people have lifetime limits on their insurance policy so that, God forbid, if they should have one child with a terrible illness that drags on for 10 or 15 years, they could lose all their insurance at the time they most need it. That is the reality of the world in which we live. No other nation permits this to happen, only the United States.

The result of all this is, small business is paying 35 percent more for health insurance than big business and government today. Every day more and more people lose their health insurance; about 100,000 a month lose it forever. The Government, as Congressman Slattery will tell you, is cutting defense spending, cutting domestic spending, cutting everything, but health care costs are still going up at 2 to 3 times the rate of inflation so that we can pay more for the same health care. This system is not working.

We have the best doctors, the best nurses, the best health care providers, the best medical research, the best technology in the world, and the worst system of financing health care. And we have to do something about it.

Now, those who like the system the way they have it now say that I want to give this country some sort of Government program of health care. I don't. You have one, though. It's Medicare, the Government program for older people. And most older people feel pretty secure with it. But I don't propose to do that. What I want to do is to extend the system we have now, guaranteed private health insurance for all Americans, and to extend the choices we have now, give every American family at least three choices every year of doctors and health care plans.

I want to protect people from unfair insurance practices just as Governor Finney is trying to do here. I don't think people should pay more because they are older or pay an unreasonable amount because somebody in their family has been sick. I don't think people should be able to be cut off of health insurance.

I want to have these benefits guaranteed at work. Why? Because 80 percent of the people who are uninsured are in working families. And 90 percent of the health insurance in America today is covered at work where the employer and the employee share the costs.

Can we do it without bankrupting small business? Of course we can. You have to give discounts to really small businesses that operate

on limited profit margins. Of course we can. Can we do it and be fair? If everybody does it so no competitor has an advantage, yes, we can.

Will we continue to be the only country in the world that shovels more of our health care dollars into paperwork and less into health care? Will we continue to be the only advanced country that has another 100,000 Americans a month lose their health insurance? Will we continue to discriminate against small business people and self-employed people and let them pay 35 to 40 percent more? Will we continue to have a situation where rural folks don't have access to doctors? I don't think so.

I believe we can do better. I think you think we can do better. And if we cool the rhetoric and talk about the facts and have practical and compassionate approaches to this, we will solve this problem. I'm here in Kansas to try to do it today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. at the Kansas Air National Guard ramp. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. James F. Rueger, Adjutant General of Kansas; Col. Dewayne Ellinson, Commander, 190th Air Refueling Group, Kansas Air National Guard; Robert T. Stephen, Kansas attorney general; Sally Thompson, State treasurer; Mayor Henry Felker of Topeka; and Dennis M. Langley, Kansas Democratic Party chairman.

Remarks in a Health Care Roundtable in Topeka
April 7, 1994

The President. First, thank you, Congressman Slattery, for hosting us. Congressman Glickman, thank you for coming. Governor Finney, it's always good to be with you. I see former Governor Carlin out there; thank you for coming. Most of all, thank you to the small business people who are here on this panel.

I'd like to spend most of my time listening to these folks talk here and dealing with how their specific circumstances would be affected by health care reform, if we can pass it. But let me try to set the stage, if I might, for how we came to this place and how I came to spend the amount of time that I have, that my wife has, that our administration has, working on this health care issue.

Before I became President, as I think all of you know, I was the Governor of your neighboring State of Arkansas for a dozen years. I grew up in a family with a mother who was a nurse anesthetist. I grew up hanging around hospitals, talking to doctors and nurses all my life, having a passionate interest in health care from the point of health care providers. As a Governor, I was forced to deal with the problem of health care from the point of view of people who are paying for it.

First of all, in State Government, we had huge burdens under the Medicaid program, which is a shared program for paying for health care for poor people paid for by the Federal and the State Government. And secondly, my job was to try to increase the economic base of my State, both small and large businesses. And I watched medical inflation driving up medical costs rapidly.

I spent in 1990 an enormous amount of time as a Governor, long before I ever dreamed I'd run for President, talking to literally almost 1,000 health care providers personally in my State and hundreds of business people about the problems in the health care system and what could be done about it. Without going into a great deal of detail, let me say I reached the conclusion that we could not solve this problem as long as we continued to be the only advanced economy in the entire world that could not figure out how to provide basic health care coverage to all of our citizens. Every country with which we compete has figured this out, and we haven't.

Now, we have the best doctors, the best nurses, the best health care providers, the best medical research, the best medical technology in the world. We also have, by far, the most bureaucratic and administratively costly health care system in the world. There's more paperwork in our system today, and it costs more

to administer this system, by far, than any other system in the world. We also discriminate against small business people, farmers, and self-employed people in the provision of health insurance; they tend to pay more.

We discriminate also against people based on their age or whether anybody in their family has ever been sick or not. We also, in a funny way—Jim Slattery alluded to this—we actually discourage people from leaving welfare for minimum-wage jobs because if you stay on welfare, you're covered by Medicaid, the Government program for poor people. If you take a minimum-wage job without health insurance, you're going to lower your income and put your children at risk because you lose your health insurance by going to work. Instead, you start paying taxes to pay for the health insurance of the people who didn't go to work.

These are things that are present in our system that you don't find in other systems. In addition, a lot of people who pay health insurance just pay too much. This plant here, for example, where we are, as is my understanding, has offered health insurance to its employees since its beginning; with the price of health care going up has had to ask the employees to share the costs. I do not know what they pay, and I have not even discussed it with our host. But I'll bet you anything that on average, they pay more than they fairly could because here's what happens: The people who don't have any health care coverage in this country, if they get sick, will eventually get health care. But they tend to get it when it's too late and too expensive. They show up at the emergency room, and the hospital does one of two things. They either pass the cost along to all the rest of us who have insurance, and we pay it in higher rates, or they eat it, and they get in more trouble.

I was in a rural hospital in North Carolina a couple of days ago with Mr. Bowles, who is from North Carolina, as you can see, and the hospital folks there told me one-half of all their emergency room bills were from people who had no health insurance who just waited until they got real sick and showed up at the door, couldn't pay. And they were either going to reduce the quality of care at the hospital or pass the cost along to everybody else in the area who had health insurance.

So, is this a national problem? Yes, it is. At any given time in America, 39 million Americans don't have health insurance. During any given year, 58 million Americans will be without health insurance at some time during the year, out of a total population of 255 million. Eighty-one million of us, more than one in four, live in families where somebody has had a pre-existing condition: a child with diabetes, a father with a heart attack, a mother who's had cancer. And we either pay higher rates or we can't get health insurance, or we've got a job with health insurance but we can never change jobs, because if we change jobs, nobody will insure us because someone in our family has been sick. One hundred and thirty-three million of us, a majority, are insured with lifetime limits. So if, God forbid, we should have a child with a pronounced and prolonged chronic problem, we could run out of health care coverage just when we need it most. None of these conditions exist in the countries with which we are competing for the economic opportunities of the 21st century. Only the United States has somehow not been able to figure out how to provide health care security to all of its people.

Now, if we want to do that, we have some options. But none of them are simple or easy. If this were simple or easy, somebody would have done it already. What are our options to cover all Americans, to stop the cost-shifting, to allow small business people and self-employed people and farmers to buy insurance on terms that are comparable to what those of us in government or big business can get, and to stop discrimination against people who have had somebody in their family that's sick or who are older workers? What are our options?

I would argue that we only have three. We can do what some other countries like Canada do; we could have a Government-run system. We could have private doctors and hospitals, but we could abolish insurance and substitute a tax and just pay for health care. The only part of our system today that's like that is Medicare and Medicaid for poor people. But the elderly program for Medicare is the thing that's most like that here. That's the way everybody gets their health care paid in Canada.

We could, instead of that, just build on the system we've got, keep a private system with private insurance, private health care providers but organize it in a way that bad insurance practices would be abolished and that small business people and self-employed people could get a break by being in buying pools that would enable them, kind of like a farmer's co-op, to

buy on better terms. Or we could say, it's too hard, somebody will be discomforted by this, and we're not going to do anything. Now, that's an option. But that option means—I just want you to know what that option means.

If we do nothing, if we don't go to universal coverage, the following things will happen: More Americans will continue to lose their health insurance; medical inflation will continue to make less and less coverage available, especially to small business. And I want you to know what's going to happen to your Government, at a time when we need more money to invest in education, training, new technologies, and the jobs of the future. The budget I asked Congress to adopt this year cuts defense and, for the first time since 1969, cuts discretionary domestic spending. And the only thing that goes up is Social Security by the cost of living and health care costs by 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. Pretty soon, you're going to be paying all your money to the Federal Government to pay interest on the debt and more money for the same health care because we are cutting defense, we are cutting investments in discretionary domestic areas.

So I would argue that doing nothing is not an attractive option. I would argue that we shouldn't have a Government insurance system when we have a private insurance system now that is working pretty well for people who can take the maximum advantage of it. That's why I argue that what we ought to have is guaranteed private insurance for all Americans. Eighty percent of the people without health insurance in this country live and work in families. Ninety percent of the people who have health insurance, private health insurance, get it through their place of work. So the question is, should there be some system through which the people who don't have health insurance now or who have very minimal health insurance that doesn't amount to anything get an adequate insurance package through their place of work? I think the answer to that is yes, and that's why I'm out pushing this program.

So let me just say, my program rests on five principles: Guarantee private insurance. Give the people who are insured, that is, the families who are insured, a choice, and give it to them every year, not just once but every year, of how they get their health care, either through fee-for-service medicine, just picking their doctor and paying; through a health maintenance organization; or through some other way of getting it. But we guarantee three choices to everybody every year. We would outlaw unfair insurance practices. I've already mentioned them, cutting people off because they've had somebody in their family sick, for example. We would protect the Medicare program for elderly people and not fold it in, because it works and most senior citizens like it. And we would do this—we would guarantee private insurance by using the workplace, because that's where most people get their insurance now, by requiring employers and employees to contribute to health insurance.

Now, would that mean that some people would pay more than they do now? Yes, it would. It would mean that people that don't pay anything, for example, would have to pay more. But keep in mind, all those folks are benefited by the present system we have. It's just like the roads you drive on. We all benefit from the hospitals, from the medical research, from the doctors, from the nurses, from the work done at the Kansas Medical School. We all benefit from it. And when we get sick, we're going to take advantage of it whether we can pay for it or not. But if you want to stop cost-shifting and allow small business people and self-employed people to buy on competitive terms, you have to find a way to make sure everybody's covered from the beginning and everyone has some responsibility for what they do.

Our figures—we'll talk more about it with each of these examples here—show that over half the American people would pay the same or less money for the same or better insurance if our plan passed just as it is without any modification, because so many people in the small business sector are paying exorbitant rates for limited health insurance.

We do a lot of things to help small business. We already increased the expensing provision, as Erskine Bowles said, from $10,000 to $17,500 a year on the income tax. For people who are self-employed, we extend the deduction, which is now only 25 percent for self-employed people, totally unfair for medical premiums, to 100 percent. These things will help to alleviate it. Furthermore, there are discounts for businesses that are quite small with limited profit margins and low average wages to try to keep the cost down. So we'll talk about all that by going through some of these specific examples that are here now.

The main thing I want to say is, we can discuss the details of this plan and whether you think all the details are right. But I do want to make it clear that if you say there should be no mandate and we shouldn't abolish private health insurance and replace it with a tax the way Medicare's funded, then we're arguing for continuation of the present system, never getting to the point where we cover everybody, having the most administratively expensive system in the entire world, more money on paperwork, less money on health care, and having this problem get worse. There are no simple, easy answers. We have to try to take the best answer for America.

So having said that, let me start and ask—I don't know that it matters where I start, but I'll start with David Porterfield, who owns a flower shop in Topeka. Where are you, David? Tell us what your situation is, how many employees do you have, and what's your situation.

[*David Porterfield said that he once provided health insurance for his small staff, but due to high medical costs for one employee, the rates tripled. He explained that in his efforts to find another insurance company, he learned that many insurance companies "red lined" florist businesses and would no longer provide policies due to the incidence of AIDS in the florist industry.*]

The President. I'd like to make an observation about this, if I might, because you see this quite a lot. Both cases—you have someone who has got a serious health problem, a diabetes problem, with a small business, it blows your rates up, and you can't afford to keep your coverage; or a certain industry gets red lined, a certain business. If you look at it today from the point of view of the person in the insurance business, trying to be responsive and trying to still make a profit in the American free enterprise system, if you insure people and they're in fairly small pools, and one person has a huge medical bill, that can wipe out the whole profit in the insurance policy in the small pool. If you have one or two AIDS patients in a small pool, the same thing can happen.

Now, the reason that I think that what we're trying to do is so important to small business people is this: What we're trying to do is to create the conditions that existed in the beginning. When health insurance first started, when Blue Cross first got started, insurance was just what you would normally think. All of us were put in a big pool and paid roughly the same rates, and it was for the people that got sick. And we all bought insurance against getting sick, in the same way you buy insurance for life insurance. And the premiums are set based on the probabilities, but everybody is sort of treated the same at a certain point in time. Well, what's happened now is, we're the only country in the world with 1,500 separate companies, writing literally thousands and thousands of different policies, so that people are in smaller and smaller pools. And sometimes the administrative cost and the profit margin against the premium is enormous.

What we need to do is to go back to community rating where you would be put into a very large pool, so if you had one patient, one employee, who turned out to be a diabetic, that problem would be spread over a very large number of people. And the insurance business would, in effect, have to make money the way grocery stores do, a little bit of money on a lot of people, instead of a sizable amount of money on a few people where you can't afford the risk of having even one person who's real sick or the policy becomes unprofitable.

This is key. We cannot do this and be fair to small business and really do it unless we can go to community rating and all of us can share these risks. I think it's very important.

I'd like to go to David Hoffman, if I might, now to make the point in another way with somebody who's kept insurance and had to pay an enormous premium for it or at least did until recently. Would you talk, David, about your experience?

[*David Hoffman explained that as the employees of his architecture firm aged and needed more medical attention, his insurance premiums increased by 35 percent, to 12 percent of payroll for the firm's share of the cost.*]

The President. Let me try to make an observation here about these two cases. Under the plan that we propose, no one could pay more than 7.9 percent of payroll, no employer, for the health insurance premiums. So in the case of the architectural firm, David's firm, they would actually pay less, considerably less than they're paying now. Why would they be able to pay less? Well, because they would be, again, in a big pool where they'd have more bargaining

power and it would be more economical to insure them.

Now, in the case of the florist shop, they would obviously pay more since they can't get insurance now. But because it's a smaller business, they would be eligible for a bigger discount. And for somewhere in the range of, let's say, 6 percent of payroll, they'd be able to get a comprehensive benefit package, and no one would get cut off.

Again, it all goes back to the economics of scale. Now, the problem is that some people will say—and we'll explore this because we're going to come to some harder cases as we go around the table—some people will say, "Well, that's fine, Mr. President, but I can't afford 4 percent of payroll. My payroll is 50 percent of my cost of doing business, so 4 percent of payroll adds 2 percent to the cost of doing business. And I can't add 2 percent of the cost of doing business; my profit margin is less than that." Some people say that.

Now, what we have to do is to—we need to kind of work through that. And that's one reason I asked Erskine Bowles to be head of the Small Business Administration, because he spent 20 years starting small businesses instead of in politics or doing something else, to try to work through these things.

There's no question that the ability to bear this cost is greater if all your competitors have to do it as well. And that's one point that David Hoffman made, I thought, very eloquently. I was in a—we have someone here who's in the food service business—I know I was in a restaurant in Columbus, Ohio, with a woman who had 20 employees full-time and 20 part-time and had had cancer. And she insured the full-time employees, she didn't insure the part-time employees, and she paid high rates because she had cancer 5 years ago. And she said, "I'm in the worst of all worlds; I insure my full-time employees because I feel that I should; but my competitors don't, so they have an advantage over me. And I feel guilty that I don't help my part-time employees." And she paid very high rates because one person—it happened to be the owner there—paid for her previous illness.

So again, this whole thing will only work if everyone contributes. But as a result of contributing, you get to be in big buying pools, so at least your rates are manageable. In your case, I just don't think anybody should be paying 12.5 percent of payroll for a reasonable health insurance policy. We know that the economics of the competition—we've had it analyzed by too many people—will permit us to have a ceiling of about 7.9 percent of payroll. And you might actually qualify for a modest, but not a great, discount there because your employees make a good living.

I'd like to go on now to Sheryl Wohlford, who is from Wichita, and have her talk a little bit about her situation because it's slightly different. And it will get more complicated as we go around the table to show some of the problems we've got with this.

Sheryl.

[*Sheryl Wohlford expressed concern that her insurance premium costs of 5.5 percent of payroll, to cover the majority of her employees, would rise even more under the President's plan. Representative Jim Slattery asked if she had discussed her projected cost increase with her insurance agent, and she said she had not. Small Business Administrator Erskine Bowles then stated that small businesses would get better coverage at better rates under the new plan.*]

The President. Sheryl asked two questions. I think we ought to try to deal with them as forthrightly as possible. The first question is, okay, if I have to go from 5.5 to 7.9, how do I know it's going to stay at 7.9? I mean, that may be the most important question of all. And the answer to that question is—I mean, I can only tell you where I'm coming from on this—is that we looked at what the average employer contribution was for a good health care plan that included primary and preventive benefits—because one of the ways you get health care costs down is to emphasize primary and preventive benefits; nearly any physician will tell you that—and it was about 8 percent. So we decided to go with 7.9 percent. And from my point of view, if we can't manage at that, we'll have to find some other way of dealing with it, not raising the payroll cost. I just don't think we can. The whole idea is to try to get health care costs as close to the rate of inflation plus population growth as possible.

The second issue is what about people who—if you go back to Sheryl's situation, she went from 5.5 percent, let's say, to 7.9 percent of payroll. You should know that we provide discounts for small businesses if they have fewer than 70 to 75 employees, and if the average

annual wage is $24,000 a year or less. Is that right, Erskine?

So if you go over either one of those, then the discount system goes away. But the main reason for the difference—and I haven't looked at the health care package—is that she's on a 50–50 cost share. And the reason we went to an 80–20 is that that was the average cost share of employers and employees in the private sector insured now. But I'll bet you that the package will be better, too, as a result of that, because again of the bulk buying plan. So even she would benefit from that.

But we've got to be up front about this. Not everybody pays less. Some people pay more, and that's part of the assessment you have to calculate. But I do think you can rely on the 7.9 percent. I do not believe the Congress would enact a program and I do not believe that I would support it unless we could do that.

And let me also say, we had lots and lots of insurance actuaries and others look at this for a year and constantly labor over the costs. So we would not knowingly do anything that would run the cost up. And I will say that, as Erskine was reminding me earlier, our ability to predict these costs now is far better than it used to be. We've been pretty good about predicting what's going to happen to our medical costs for the last few years. And I think that ability is pretty well intact.

Let's go on now to James Heiman, who's in, again, in a different situation. And I'd like for him to talk about his businesses and what he does about it and how he thinks he'd be affected by this.

[*James Heiman stated that his cost to provide health insurance for all the employees in his agriculture-related companies increased by 2 to 3 percent overnight due to an employee's health problems and his own. While he found a more affordable policy, he expressed concern that the President's plan would be able to hold administrative costs down.*]

The President. I think there's a lot of well-founded skepticism about the ability of the Government to fix anything; I understand that. And that's one of the reasons that I did not want us to get into a situation like the Canadian health care system, which a lot of people I respect favor, which is inexpensive administratively but has huge cost problems because it's all Government financed. If you save the private insurance system, and you keep the employers and the employees directly involved in trying to manage their costs, then our view is that we'll have much better luck in trying to control the costs in the future.

But under your situation, you would plainly pay considerably less because you would not only have a maximum of 7.9 percent, but with about 60 employees—I understand that's about how many you have—you would qualify for some kind of discount there, which I think would be important.

And let me explain why the administrative costs would go down. Presently, if you have 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies and you overlay on that the Government's program of Medicare and Medicaid, every doctor's office and hospital in America has to hire a huge number of people to figure out what is and isn't covered under every policy. Every insurance company in the country has to hire a huge number of people to figure out what is and isn't covered. So instead of facilitating the payment of health care bills for people who have paid their insurance, you literally have an untold number of people in the doctor's offices and the hospitals and the insurance company figuring out what is and isn't covered. And the burden of that is staggering.

I visited the Children's Hospital in Washington the other day, and they estimated that they could have another 100,000 children's visits a year if the doctors and the nurses had a single form with a single benefit package as opposed to what they've got now. It was a staggering encounter. And I would urge any of you—I don't know if there are any doctors and nurses in the audience, but I've got a friend at home, I mean in Washington, who grew up with me, who just had to hire—there's two doctors in his office, and they have a lot of clerical workers. Now they've had to hire a third person—or a fourth person to do nothing but just telephone insurance companies all day trying to get payments as they struggle to find out what is and isn't covered. And that's why we can simplify this.

And a lot of people say, well, if you put small businesses in these big alliances and buying pools, that's going to be a huge government bureaucracy. Let me just give you one concrete example, because in order to give you good rates, you have to be in a big buying pool; that's what we talked about for the florist shop

or the architects or anybody else. The State of California just set up a small business buying pool, put 40,000 businesses and their employees in it. They hired only 13 people to operate it, and the insurance premiums for the people in the pool all went down this year instead of up. And Florida is starting it and having the same experience.

So the question on these alliances is, how do you have enough cooperative buying power, just like the old-fashioned farmers co-ops which you have in Kansas and Arkansas, to give the small business people the same sort of break that those of us in government and big businesses have.

Dan, were you going to say something? You look like you were about to.

[*Representative Dan Glickman asked if Ms. Wohlford paid for self or family coverage, and she responded that she paid 50 percent of either plan. He then suggested that under the President's plan, a majority of small businesses would have lower premium rates, even combining self and family coverage.*]

The President. That's correct for a couple of reasons. One is—and I don't think it applies, though. We've got to be careful; I don't want to overclaim. I don't think it applies to Sheryl. If you're incorporated, it wouldn't apply.

But, for example, we've got a lot of small business—and we're going to Regina in a minute; I think she'd be covered like this—we have a lot of small businesses where the small business, let's say, has four or five employees, and there's a family policy for the owner of the small business. And then they may or may not cover the individuals who work for them. The family policy alone is often so expensive and if it's under a self-employed provision, only 25 percent of it is deductible under the income tax code, that when you look at the 100 percent deductibility we would provide, plus the ability to buy more insurance at a lower cost, there are an awful lot of small businesses in this country who could insure their families and their employees and their families for less money than they're paying just for their family policy today. And a lot of farmers—there are a huge number of farmers that are in that situation just because their family policies are so high and because they don't have any access to these buying pools.

[*Administrator Bowles stressed large buying pools and simplification of the insurance system as ways to lower the cost of health care for small businesses.*]

The President. You don't feel strongly about that, do you? [*Laughter*] That was great. Thank you.

I'd like to now ask Gina Jaramillo to talk a little bit about a situation in her restaurant. And let me preface this by saying that one of the toughest issues that we face here is the restaurant business, because you have a lot of part-time employees; you have a lot of young, single employees who don't feel like they need health insurance and probably think they're going to live forever; you have a lot of businesses operating on relatively narrow profit margins. And it is an enormous part of our economy now; over 40 percent of the American food dollar is spent eating out. So this is a very big deal and probably in some ways the biggest sector of our economy with large numbers of workers without insurance. You also have lot of part-time employees and a lot of turnover. So I'd like to hear her talk a bit about that.

[*Regina Jaramillo explained that while she and her husband bought insurance for their own family after they gave up their former jobs to run the family restaurant, they could not afford to provide health insurance for their 12 employees, at a cost of more than 10 percent of payroll. She expressed hope that the President's plan would lower that cost.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. What percentage of your total cost of doing business do you estimate is in labor costs, what you pay your employees?

Ms. Jaramillo. My payroll? My payroll was at approximately—excuse me, I did write this down—$86,000 a year that I pay in payroll.

The President. But of your total cost of operations, what would you say that is? Is that about half your total cost of operation, the rest is food and utilities and operation and maintenance——

Ms. Jaramillo. No, I'd say it's at least a third.

The President. About a third. So I just want to try to lay this out, because actually you are in—because your restaurant is small, we estimate that you would qualify for the maximum discount, and you could actually insure your employees for about what you're paying now for your family under our program, because you'd

go into a big buying pool and because you'd be eligible for a discount because you're a very small business. But it's not fair to say that all food service workers would be like you, all food service, because there are a lot of restaurants that have 100 employees or 150 employees, so they don't qualify for discounts. They would have to pay the 7.9 percent.

So in your case, if our plan were to pass, we think that there would be no increase for you or just absolutely minimum, because you would qualify for the small business discount to the maximum degree. But let's say you had a restaurant of 100 employees or 200 employees, some of them have 200 employees, with a lot of part-timers. You would only pay for the part-timers now while they were actually working. You'd have no responsibility when they don't work for you. At 7.9 percent—then the real cost, additional cost of doing business would be one-third of that because the payroll is a third of total cost or something less than 3 percent.

And that's what we have to figure out, to what extent could all restaurants pass that on if they were all in the same boat, if they were all treated the same way? Would we change our habits, our eating habits, if our food prices went up that much? Would more of us eat at home? I mean, these are the kinds of questions that it's hard to answer. But my instinct is that if all the competitors in this business were treated the same way, that most of us have ingrained habits of eating out because we have more and more families where both the man and the woman are working and working longer hours, and I think it's doubtful that habits would change within that range, where the maximum increase—if 100 percent of it were passed on to the customers, which it might not be—was still less than 3 percent. In Regina's case it wouldn't happen that way, but it would in a case of a cafeteria with 150 employees, if our plan passed just as it is, with the 80–20 match.

But for the smaller businesses, again I would say, families still have to pay too much for their health insurance if they have to buy them as individual families. So you would get a 100 percent deduction instead of a 25 percent deduction for the premium you pay, plus a discount. So you'd be able to insure your employees for about what you're paying now.

Let's go on to Alonzo Harrison, who runs a construction company, and let him talk about his situation, because this again is a, I think, a pretty typical small business situation where he'd get some discount but would still have to pay more.

[*Alonzo Harrison explained that he could not afford to provide health insurance for his employees but tried to help them find it at a reasonable cost. He discussed his medical expenses for an illness that occurred during a trip to Washington, DC.*]

The President. You ought to try living there. [*Laughter*] Actually, it's not bad.

[*Mr. Harrison then expressed his concern about costs as well as portable coverage for seasonal employees during the times they would not be working.*]

The President. Our program, as proposed, would make health care entirely portable, including for part-time employees. And essentially what would happen is the employers and the employees would have the responsibility for paying while the employee was working for the employer—or seasonal workers. And then when you weren't working, then the Government would help to make sure that the plan is portable and people kept it year-round. It would be the same plan.

For part-time employees, as opposed to seasonal workers, the same thing would be true. It depends on how you define part-time, but if the worker worked more than 10 but less than 30 hours a week, the employer would have a responsibility to pay for some of the premium but not the full premium. You have to go over 30 hours a week before he'd have to pay for the full premium. And again, if there were differences, then the Government would help make up the difference there. So that the responsibility would be there, but it would be based on how much time the employee is actually working for the employer.

In your case, because you have a smaller business—except when you're hiring your seasonal employees full-time—you would qualify for a small business discount. Could you afford this if it was between 4 and 5 percent of payroll?

Mr. Harrison. We think so. But again, since we're not paying it now, it would be an extra cost. And since our profit margin still isn't where we'd like for it to be, that means we're going to have to do something as it relates to raising our prices; meaning then that, yes, we could

put that in a part of our budget, but then the cost is going to be in our bid.

The President. Would it help knowing that everybody that competed with you had to do the same thing?

Mr. Harrison. Absolutely.

The President. I mean, since at least in the contracting work you do, presumably the work has to be done. Somebody's got to have it done by someone.

[*Mr. Harrison explained that the cost of workman's compensation was one of his concerns because his business involved dangerous work.*]

The President. One of the things that we're working on doing—we haven't figured out how to solve it entirely yet, but I think would make a huge difference to small businesses, especially to people like you with big workers' comp bills, but a lot of businesses that aren't particularly dangerous have big workers' comp bills—is to try to figure out a way to take the health care portion of workers' comp and at least have some common administration of it so that you're not, in effect, paying twice for it. Because right now, as you know, workers' comp, it's a disability program, it's an unemployment program, and it's a health care program, all three. But if you have a health care system, we think we can figure out how to moderate a lot of the health care portion of workers' comp costs, which has accounted for approximately 50 percent of the rate increases in State after State in the last few years, in this health care thing. And that would also be a big boost to small business, because it's all part of the same cost of operations.

Jim? Anybody else have anything they want to say?

[*Representative Slattery stated that Congress would address the issues that the participants discussed including requiring everyone to contribute to the health care system so some businesses would not be paying more than others.*]

The President. I'd like to emphasize that for most of the last 20 years, big businesses have paid way more than their fair share of the health care, and the rest of us have sort of ridden along with them. I mean, you've got some companies paying 15, 16 percent of payroll for health care. In other words, they've paid more than the percentage of our total wealth we spend on health care. And the rest of us have benefited from that.

Now, big businesses and governments are finding that they can get competitive arrangements and buy health care for less money or at least they don't have to go up as much as inflation anymore, which is going to put more and more pressure on small business; which is why we've got to find a way, unless we want more and more people to be without insurance altogether, why we've got to find a way to get everybody insured and then get them in these larger pools.

Let me just make one remark that I meant to say to our friend with the construction company. He said some of his best workers were over 60, including his father. Let me tell you, the fastest growing group of Americans are people over 65. More and more Americans are going to work well into their seventies. The average 18-year-old is going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime now. You have people in their late fifties and sixties losing their jobs because the defense business is cutting back. And there they are, 59 years old, some of them still with kids at home not even out of high school, having to find new jobs.

This health care issue is a big issue. And one of the things that I think is very important about community rating is that we not discriminate against people in their sixties who are otherwise healthy and able to be good workers. Because if you do that, you're going to make it harder for people to change jobs. And one of the reasons that America—believe it or not, with all of our economic problems, we have a lower unemployment rate than all of our major competitors except Japan. We're now creating more jobs than all of them. And one of the reasons is that people can move freely in and out of the job market. But it's going to be harder and harder and harder for older people unless we remove this discrimination against age.

So your company would be especially helped by that. In other words, you'd be able to buy insurance on much fairer rates if we said that vigorous working people in their sixties shouldn't be charged more than vigorous working people in their thirties. It would make a big difference. But again I will say, since the odds are still greater that a 60-year-old will get sick than that a 30-year-old will get sick, the only way the insurance industry can provide this health insurance and not go broke is if you have big pools

of people where the risk can be broadly spread. That's the only fair way to do it.

Dan, you want to say anything?

[*Representative Glickman discussed the inclusion of workers' compensation in the health insurance plan and then questioned the average 80 percent employer share of the cost.*]

The President. That includes all businesses all the way to the top. I do not know what the average is for people with 50 employees or 60 employees or less.

[*Representative Glickman suggested that an 80 percent employer share might be too much for small businesses.*]

The President. You're at 50–50; you're at 80–20. What were you when you had insurance?

Q. We were 50–50.

The President. In part of his business, you're at 100.

Representative Glickman. So, it's just a thought.

[*Administrator Bowles stated that without universal coverage and participation in large buying pools, small businesses would continue to pay high costs for health care. Mr. Hoffman then asked about the problem of professional liability.*]

The President. For doctors worried about being sued? You mean, physicians worried about being sued?

Q. Physicians, hospitals, yes, the whole group.

The President. We've proposed two things in our bill. First was limitation on the percentage of lawyers' fees in the contingency cases. The second is something that has actually worked to hold down medical costs where it's been tried, and that is to give different kinds of doctors the benefit of medical practice guidelines developed by their own professional associations nationally, that if the doctor can demonstrate that he or she followed these guidelines, that raises a presumption that the doctor was not negligent.

Now, this is a big deal in rural areas. This could be a big deal in rural Kansas, for example, where you've got a lot of general practitioners who are out in the country and somebody shows up with a broken arm or someone needs a baby delivered and a lot of doctors just won't do it anymore. They just won't do it. They won't even set simple fractures in some of the country places in my State. They'll send them to the biggest medical center, where there's a specialist, where the cost is 5 times as great. And so what we've tried to do—the State of Maine had an experience with this, basically developing simple practice guidelines. It's funny, we do it with pilots all the time; every time one of us gets up in an airplane with somebody else, we expect the pilot to have the practice guidelines. That's what they are. And they are checked off.

And if we could give that to doctors and just not say that there could be no negligence but just say that that raises a presumption that the doctor did the right thing, we believe that would drive down malpractice rates considerably and let doctors free to practice medicine with common sense instead of just bending over backwards to order a lot of tests, for example, in cases oftentimes when they know they shouldn't do it but they're just guarding against a lawsuit.

[*Mr. Porterfield asked about employer responsibility for coverage of various part-time employees under the new plan.*]

The President. If the employee works less than 10 hours a week, the answer is no. Isn't that right, Erskine?

Administrator Bowles. Also, you're not responsible for covering anybody who works less than 10 hours a week. You're not responsible for covering anyone who is under the age of 18, period. And you're also not required to cover anyone who is under the age of 24 who is also a full-time student.

The President. And I believe, in addition to that—you've asked me a question slightly different from the way it's ever been asked me before. But I believe that all retiree health plans are left intact and that therefore you would not have the responsibility to pay for someone who is a retired worker with a retiree health plan from another company. I believe that is right.

If it's wrong, I'll get back to you and tell you. But I'm almost sure that's right because one of the things that we tried to do is to make sure that people like retired State employees and retired other people knew that they weren't going to have their benefits eroded if they happen to have a better plan than our minimum plan. So if they've got the kind of plan you say, my belief is that they would not be required to be covered.

Let me just say one thing in closing in response to what Jim Slattery said. The toughest

part of this is obviously the mandate, which is why we tried to work out a discount. The main thing I want you to know is I have no interest in the Government running the health care system of the country. I am trying to use the power of the Government to organize the market so that small business people and self-employed people can get access to good benefits and so that these kinds of discriminatory practices that insurance companies follow today will not have to be followed in order for people to make money in insurance.

And I believe you have to require everyone to be covered in order to stop the boat from leaking because there's always going to be people who will be dropping their folks even if others pick them up if we adopt these new changes. So it seems to me that that is something we just have to work through. That is the whole concept that has led some of the small business groups to oppose what we're doing. But I think it's also important that you understand that I will not sign a bill that does not have discounts for very small businesses with low payrolls and low profit margins. I won't do that.

I want a bill that preserves the private delivery system we have and that makes the competition that is working very well now for Federal employees and for large businesses available for people in the small business sector. But I think that none of it will get done unless we can provide the security that every American will know there will always be some health care coverage there. That will also stop a lot of the unfair cost-shifting and permit people to compete on a more even basis. So that is what we are trying to achieve.

I hope that you will be supportive of all the Members of your congressional delegation without regard to party in trying to work through this with less rhetoric and more reality.

You know, I've tried to just get around here and listen to people's real life stories and try to work through the real life stories in a way that solves the problem and permits America to take advantage of what we have, which is the best medical delivery system in the country, and fix what we have, which is the worst financing system in the world. We've got the best medical care in the world, the worst financing system; we ought to be able to figure out how to do that. I think we can. And we have to do it in a way that permits small business to flourish because small business is the main generator of new jobs for the American economy.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:03 p.m. at the Topeka Foundry and Ironworks Co.

Remarks on Arrival in Kansas City, Missouri

April 7, 1994

Thank you very much, Governor Carnahan, Mayor and Mrs. Cleaver, Mr. Holden, Speaker Griffin, and all of you. Thank you for coming out today. I didn't know there would be such a good crowd here. I'd like to stay with you longer, but I'm afraid I'll be late to the meeting if I stay too long.

I do want to say a word or two if I might. First of all, I thank you for your sentiments, and I thank the Mayor and the Governor for what they said. I've had the opportunity to come to Missouri quite a lot since I've been President, mostly because of the terrible ravages of the floods that gripped your State. I'm proud of the work that we were able to do together and proud of the response of my administration to the problems of people during that flood.

Frankly, the one thing that bothers me is that we can't have our National Government function all the time the way it did during that flood. Why does there have to be an emergency before people will stop using all the hot air and rhetoric that seems to grip Washington, put aside the special interests, talk to one another, ask what the problem is, and try to get it solved? I ran for President because that's what I wanted to do.

When I was the Governor of your neighboring State to the south, it never occurred to me that I could get by day-in and day-out just on hot air. It never occurred to me that the pur-

pose of politics was to try to take words and push people to the furthest extreme, to the left or the right. And I ran for President because I got tired of all the rhetoric, people saying Government couldn't do anything or Government could do everything, people saying everybody out there is on their own or people saying that people had no responsibility to improve their own lot. And I felt that if we could pull this country together and face our problems, we could go into the next century with the American dream alive and well. That's what we're trying to do, and we've made a good beginning on it.

I just want to point out that in the 15 months that I've been President, since we got our economic plan in place, trying to drive down interest rates and drive up investment, our economy has produced 2.5 million jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than were produced in the previous 4-year period. After 12 years of talking about the deficit while the national debt tripled, if the Congress adopts the budget I have given them now, we'll eliminate 100 Federal programs, cut over 200 more, have the first decrease in discretionary domestic spending since 1969, and we'll have 3 years of declining Government deficits for the first time since Harry Truman of Independence, Missouri, was President of the United States of America.

One of the things that bothers me is that sometimes I think that out here in the country, folks are worried that nothing's getting done in Washington because of what they read about in the papers. Let me tell you, we are moving more rapidly to do more things than we did even last year. The Congress is moving forward at a record pace on the budget. The Congress will take up a crime bill as soon as it comes back on Monday, which will put 100,000 police officers on the street, take assault weapons off the street; it will stiffen penalties and reduce parole for seriously dangerous repeat violent offenders; and it will give our children the means to have recreational facilities, alternatives to imprisonment for first offenses, and other things that will give them a chance to avoid the trouble that has come to so many people in the high crime areas of our country. We can do better, and we're going to with that crime bill.

We have an education bill that we just passed that, for the first time in the history of the country, provides world class standards for all of our schools and encourages grassroots reforms to achieve them. Soon after the Congress comes back we're going to pass the school-to-work bill, which says to all the kids that don't go on to 4-year colleges, "We care about you, too; your education, your training, and your future's important. We want you to be able to get at least 2 years of further training after you leave high school."

These are the kinds of things that we're doing up there. And I came here tonight also to talk about this health care issue. Let me remind you, my fellow Americans, that health care in America costs 40 to 50 percent more of our income than it does in any other country, and yet we're the only advanced country that doesn't provide health insurance to all of our people so that all of our working people have health care security.

Let me remind you that people on welfare get health care paid for by the Government. But if someone leaves welfare and takes a minimum wage job without health insurance, then that person puts his or her family at risk. The kids don't have health insurance, and you start paying taxes for somebody who wouldn't go to work to have health care. That is crazy, and we can do better.

Let me remind you that we have 81 million Americans—81 million of us live in families where somebody's been sick, where there's been a child with diabetes, a father with a heart attack, a mother with cancer. And they have what the insurance companies call preexisting conditions, which means that under the present system, you either pay higher insurance rates, you can't get insurance at all, or you can never change your job because if you do you lose your health insurance. No other country tolerates that. We live in a country where the average 18-year-old will change jobs eight times in a lifetime; when people in their fifties and sixties are losing their jobs, having to find new ones, and they can't get health insurance now because they're older and their rates are higher than younger people. That is wrong. We can do better. And we can do better without messing up what's good about America's health care system.

So all of my adversaries on this health care thing, I wish everybody would just tone the rhetoric down and talk about the real existence of real problems and how we can solve them. The truth is I don't want the Government to run the health care system. It's a private system; it ought to stay private. What I want is guaran-

teed private insurance for everybody. I want all of you to be able to choose your doctor or your health care plan, not just once but every year. More and more workers and their families are losing the right to choose their health care plan. I want to guarantee it for all Americans. And I want people to be guaranteed those benefits in the workplace, just like most of us are today. And finally, I want small business people and self-employed people to have access to the same good competitive rates that those of us in Government and big business do today. I think that is fair, reasonable, and just. And if we don't do it, we're going to continue to have serious problems in this country.

I hope you will help us provide health care security for all. We've been fooling with it for 60 years. We haven't done it yet. And what have we got to show for it? Continued problems. We can do better, and this year we're going to, with your help.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:35 p.m. at the Kansas City Downtown Municipal Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO, and his wife, Dianne; Bob Holden, Missouri State treasurer; and Bob Griffin, speaker, Missouri House of Representatives.

Remarks in a Town Meeting on Health Care in Kansas City
April 7, 1994

Wendall Anschutz. Welcome to News 5's town hall meeting with President Bill Clinton. Tonight the President joins us to talk about the health care crisis in our country and his plans to reform the health care system. It's a rare opportunity for people in the Midwest to talk face to face about their concerns. So, ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the President of the United States.

The President. Thank you, Wendall, and thank you, Ann. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen here in Kansas City and those in Tulsa, Topeka, and Omaha, who are also joining us.

I came here tonight to talk to you a little bit about my hopes for health care reform for America and to listen and learn from you and to try to answer your questions. I'd like to make a brief opening statement, if I might, and sort of summarize what is in our administration's health care proposal.

Let me begin by saying that I have been interested in health care a long time. My mother was a nurse anesthetist. I grew up around hospitals. I watched health care change and diversify. I was an attorney general when I had to fight for the rights of our elderly people in nursing homes in my State. And then for a dozen years I was a Governor, when I saw, every year, our State have to pay more and more and more in Medicaid program—that's the Government's program for poor folks and for elderly people in nursing homes—oftentimes paying 2 and 3 and 4 times the rate of inflation for the same health care.

I have, in the last 4 years, since long before I ever thought about running for President, talked to literally thousands of doctors and nurses and health care professionals and families who have been dislocated by the health care system. And I decided that we had to do something about it for the following reasons. And let me just try to set them out for you.

First of all, our country is the only advanced country in the world that doesn't provide health care security for all of its citizens. All the countries we compete with, all the wealthier countries, provide health security. Only the United States does not do that. And we pay a dear price for it.

We're a nation of about 255 million people. At any given time, 39 million of us are uninsured. In every year, 58 million are uninsured. Eighty-one million Americans live in families where there's somebody with a so-called preexisting condition, where there's been a child with diabetes or a daddy with a heart attack or a mother that's had cancer. And what that means is that they can't either get insurance or they pay much more than anybody else, or

they can never change jobs again, because if they change jobs they'll lose their insurance.

There are so many Americans who have special problems. I met a young woman again at the airport here in Kansas City today, a wonderful young woman named Vicki Waite, a young girl that has brittle bone disease. She came to see me back during the campaign, and I was glad to see her again. Her mother gave me a letter, sort of talking about their hopes and their dreams and their worries about the health care system. I could tell you a lot of stories about that. But I think we have got to find a way to cover everybody.

Another thing that you will recognize here in Missouri because you see it in the changing job market, people are changing jobs more than ever before. And it's very important that people be able to change jobs without losing their health care or their families losing it. Even though since I became President—I'm proud of this—we've had an economic program that passed, and our economy has created 2.5 million new jobs in the last 15 months, more than in the previous 4 years. But still, as you all know, a lot of big companies are still laying off even as smaller companies create jobs.

How are we going to guarantee that people will always have health insurance? It's a huge problem. There are lots of other problems with our system: 133 million of us have health insurance policies with lifetime limits, which means that if any of us have children with long-term illnesses, we can run out of health insurance just when we need it most. The main thing is almost no American is secure unless you work for big government or big business.

Another thing I'd like to point out is most small business people want to provide health insurance and many do, but that rates for small businesses and self-employed people and farmers, on the average, are 35 to 40 percent higher than the same insurance rates for big business and government, and that's not fair, either. So I think we've got to do something to turn this around.

Now, let's look at what our choices are. What I want to do is to guarantee private insurance, not to have the Government take over the program, and I'll tell you why. We have basically three choices today.

We can just do away with private health insurance all together and pass a tax and cover everybody through a tax, like the Medicare program for senior citizens. I don't favor doing that. It would be administratively simple, but it would put the Government in health care too much, I think, and we'd have less competition and therefore less control over prices. Or we can have more competition, but guarantee private health insurance to everybody. That's what I want to do, with a comprehensive benefit package that includes primary and preventive health care, with no lifetime limits and with insurance that can't be lost just because a worker gets older or someone in your family gets sick.

I also propose in our plan to keep choice because I think choice is very important for quality. People should be able to choose their doctors or a high-quality health care plan, not employers. And insurance companies shouldn't be able to deny anybody coverage. Now, today, more and more Americans insured at work are losing their right to choose. Fewer than half of American workers have any choice at all over their doctors or their health care plan today. Our plan would guarantee that every year every working family would have at least three choices and pick among them.

We have to make some insurance reforms. It would be illegal under our plan for anyone to be dropped or to have their benefits cut by insurance companies, for rates to be increased just because somebody in the family had been sick, for lifetime limits to be used to cut off benefits, or for older workers to be charged more than younger ones. This is a big deal, folks. I've met people in their late fifties and mid-sixties who are losing their jobs, who have to get new jobs, who are good and reliable workers, but employers are scared to hire them because their rates are higher.

Now, let me say—we'll come back to this—the only way we can do this fairly is to reform the insurance market, because if you have 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies, it's hard to afford to be fair to small business people. The only way you can be fair to small business people is let small business people and self-employed people go into big, big pools and be insured the way big business and government people are.

I want to preserve Medicare, leave it like it is—it's working for elderly people—except we ought to add a prescription drug benefit which is very important to elderly people and will save money for our health care system over the long run. And I think we should cover things other

than nursing home care, including in-home care, because the fastest growing groups of Americans are people over 80, and we need to provide for their care and help their families.

This is the most controversial part of our plan, I suppose, at least among organized groups. I think the benefits should be guaranteed at work. That is, I think employers and employees who presently aren't covered should contribute to their health insurance, and then the Government should cover the unemployed, should cover part-time employees when they're not working, and should help to provide discounts to small businesses that have low payrolls, low profit margins, and relatively high costs now.

If we cover employees at work and give discounts to small business and have the Government help the unemployed, I think that's the fairest way. Why? Because 9 out of 10 Americans who have health insurance have it through their workplace. And 8 out of 10 Americans, believe it or not, who are uninsured have someone in their family who works. So I just want to build on what we've got now: guaranteed private insurance; preserve the right to choose a doctor or health care plan; change the insurance practices that don't work but also, don't put the insurance companies out of business, let them insure people in bigger pools; preserve Medicare; and guarantee the health benefits through the workplace. That's our plan.

There may be other ideas and better ones, but let me say, I'm absolutely convinced if we don't do anything, we're going to continue to have millions of Americans in misery, millions of Americans insecure; we're going to pay 40 to 50 percent more than any other country in our income in health care and have less to show for it. I don't think that's an acceptable solution. So for those who don't agree with me, I hope they have an idea about how we can provide health security to all of our people. America can do it if every other country can do it.

Thank you.

Mr. Anschutz. The President, as you just heard, of course, has answered some basic questions about his plan. And I know it has raised some questions in the minds of our viewers as well, and that's what we want to get to now.

We have in our studio about 160 people from the Kansas City area who have questions for the President. We also have three other cities that will join us in tonight's town hall meeting via satellite: From Tulsa, Oklahoma, and CBS station KOTV, we are joined by our host Glenda Silvy. From the capital city of Kansas, Topeka, and the studios of WIBW–TV, we are joined by host Ralph Hipp. And then from our neighbor State to the north, from Omaha, Nebraska, we are joined by station KMTV–TV and our host there, Loretta Carroll. So that is kind of the cast for tonight's program. Let's get on with the questioning. The first comes from here at home, Ann Peterson, my co-host, and she has the first lady.

Ann Peterson. Thank you, Wendall.

Welcome, Mr. President, to Kansas City and here to KCTV. I 'd like you to meet a woman who nearly lost her mother to a medical emergency. She didn't get the care she needed because she was worried about cost. What is your question to the President?

Inaction on Health Care

Q. First of all, I would like to say, good evening, Mr. President, and thank you for being here. Mr. President, could you please explain why Washington continually fails to put the country's priorities back in the order in which they belong and why our officials can't or won't take a serious and compassionate look at our health care reform?

Thank you.

The President. Well, I didn't write that question for her, honestly. [*Laughter*]

Let me try to give you an answer that's not so—that's a little more objective, maybe not quite so favorable to my position. This is a complicated issue. You wrote us a letter, didn't you? Didn't you write a letter to my wife?

Q. Yes, I did.

The President. And your mother got health care late, expensive, because she was afraid she couldn't afford it?

Q. Yes, exactly.

The President. This is something I should tell all of you, another point I didn't make in my opening remarks, but let me say, as all of you know just from common sense, most people in America who don't have insurance get health care if they're real sick. But they get it when it's too late, too expensive. They usually get it at an emergency room. They don't pay, and then the emergency room at the hospital has to decide whether they're going to pass the cost along to the rest of us, so that we pay more than we should, or whether they are going to absorb it and therefore weaken the financial

condition of our health care providers in our communities. So I want to set that up.

Now, why hasn't this been done? People have been trying for 60 years to do this. First of all, because America historically is very anti-Government. We think the Government would mess up a one-car parade. [*Laughter*] And so, we are afraid for the Government to do anything involving health care.

Secondly, because small business people, in general, often think that they cannot afford any more requirements from Government. They're paying a lot for worker's comp. They're paying a lot for Social Security. They have a lot of costs. They are worried about whether they can do this. And I hope we get a chance to talk about this, because I believe most small business people will come out ahead on our plan, and I'd like to explain why. That's a problem.

Third, because the thing that's wrong with the American health care system is not the health care providers. We've got the best doctors and nurses and medical research and medical technology in the whole world. The thing that's wrong with our system is the way it's financed. But a lot of good people are employed in the way it's financed now. You know, we are the only country in the World with 1,500 separate health insurance companies writing thousands of different policies which, in turn, require literally hundreds of thousands of clerical workers in doctors' offices, hospitals, and insurance offices to figure out what's not covered. Right?

It's not a good way to spend money, but there are a lot of good people doing it. And there are a lot of good people, independent insurance agencies, for example, that are doing the best they can for their own clients within this system. If we cut back on the administrative costs and spend the money on health care, we'll create more jobs in health care, but we'll lose jobs in the paperwork end of health care. We spend about $90 billion a year in the United States, more on administration and paperwork than any country would under any other system.

So a lot of things will get changed. People are scared of change, skeptical of the Government. Small business is sensitive, and the health insurance financing system will be changed. That's what's against our changing the system. I think the arguments for it are much more powerful, but oftentimes, it's harder to change than it is to stay the same. That's why we haven't done it. That's why we need stories like your mother's story out there to remind us of the human issues at stake.

Q. Thank you.

Mr. Anschutz. Let's get on now to our satellite coverage of tonight's town hall meeting. As you know, we have three other stations who are involved. And let's go to the first one in Tulsa, Oklahoma, where Glenda Silvy is standing by.

Hello, Glenda.

Glenda Silvy. Hello, Wendall. Thank you.

And Tulsa also welcomes you, Mr. President. Our first question comes from a man who has a question relating to rural health care.

Rural Medicine

Q. Mr. President, I am a physician in a small town in Oklahoma. I wonder if the health care in the rural areas will continue to be provided by physicians or by other trained individuals such as physician's assistants, nurse practitioners, et cetera, as opposed to continued physician care for our patients. I think this is an important issue, and I'd like an idea of the Clinton approach to the plan.

The President. Well, first, sir, I think that medical professionals should be able to do what they are trained and properly qualified to do. But what I hope we can do is to put more physicians out in rural America.

Under our plan, there are some very special incentives to try to get more doctors to go into the rural areas and the small towns. We want to revive the National Health Service Corps and put another 7,000 doctors out paying off their medical school bills by practicing in underserved areas over the next 5 years.

In addition to that, we propose to give significant tax credits to people as income incentives to go out and practice in rural areas, in shortage areas. Physicians get quite a bit, and where there's a nurse shortage, nurses and other health professionals can get some as well.

And the third thing we're going to try do is to give more support to physicians in rural areas, do more to connect them with medical centers through technology, do more to provide tax incentives for them to buy their own equipment so they can provide high quality care.

So my goal is to have more people like you in small towns and rural areas. I just came back from Troy, North Carolina, where I was talking to doctors there about the terrible medical shortage. And I met a woman who told me

that she had worked 100 hours a week for 2 or 3 months in a row, and she was now down to her slow season where she was down to 80 hours a week, because they didn't have any more doctors. So I think that one of the things we have to do is to try to keep the doctors in rural America if we're going to keep rural America alive.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you, Tulsa. We go now to Topeka, up to the north. Ralph Hipp is there.

Ralph, good evening.

Ralph Hipp. Good evening, Wendall, and good evening, Mr. President. We're delighted to be a part of your town hall meeting here in the Kansas capital, home of the Menninger Foundation. And I'd like to introduce this gentleman, who has a special question of interest about that field.

Mental Health Care

Q. Mr. President, mental health insurance coverage needs to be equal and at parity with physical health insurance coverage. Has Tipper Gore discussed the importance of this with you?

The President. Yes. [*Laughter*]

You want me to talk about it a little bit? Let me ask you, just curious, we're here in Kansas City, how many of you agree with what he said, that health insurance policies should include mental health coverage as well as physical coverage? How many of you agree? [*Applause*] I'm glad to see it. I think it shows our country's come a long way in that issue, that there are a lot of mental problems that are literally illnesses that can be treated, sometimes with medicine, sometimes in other ways. One of the things that we seek to do, sir, in this plan, and I want to make full disclosure here, we do cover mental health under our health care plan as a protected benefit. But it's not required to be put in all health insurance policies until the year 2000, and I want to explain why.

The last thing in the world I want to do is to cost you more money instead of save you money by doing this. I have worked too hard to try to bring the Government deficit down to see it go up, for example. And because mental health benefits have never been provided on a comprehensive basis before, there is no agreement among the experts about what it will cost. I'll bet you this gentleman with the Menninger Foundation believes mental health benefits over the long run will save money in the health care system. I do, too. But we can't prove it. So we're going to have to phase the mental health benefits in. But by the year 2000, they will be covered just like physical health benefits in all comprehensive health packages for all Americans if this plan passes.

I wish we could do it quicker, but we can't prove what the cost will be, and we can't put the budget at risk. So we're going to have to phase it in.

Mr. Anschutz. Let's complete our circuit now by going up to Omaha, Nebraska, and Loretta Carroll.

Loretta Carroll. Good evening, Wendall. An Omaha good evening, Mr. President. I'm here talking with this woman; she helps families who have family members with Alzheimer's. And Karen, you've been there yourself with your own dad.

Long-Term and Respite Care

Q. Mr. President, I helped my mother at one time when she was caring for my father, and that was some time ago. What I'd like to ask you is that my experience with meeting with caregivers every week of Alzheimer's patients is that they do not get much relief. And they become prisoners in their own homes. As you know, Medicare does not cover Alzheimer's care in the home because it doesn't have much rehab potential. What will the new health care plan do to help these caregivers so they can have some relief?

The President. I think probably almost everybody understood that question, but let me try to put it in a larger context. Alzheimer's is growing very rapidly in our country as our population ages. But a lot of other infirmities are growing as well. Today, Medicare, the Government's program for elderly people, normally doesn't cover any kind of in-home care unless it's part of a rehabilitation program, she said.

There are limited coverages for nursing home care under Medicare. Most of our older people who get any help from the Government in nursing homes have to spend themselves into poverty so they can get into the Medicaid program.

If you look at the fact that people over 65, and within that group, people over 80, are the fastest growing group of our population in percentage terms. We want to encourage people to stay at home. We want to encourage people who want to, to become as independent as they can. But what that means is, if children are

willing to take care of their parents and save society a whole lot of money that they could cost the rest of us just by spending their parents into poverty and putting them in a nursing home, we should give them a little bit of help in terms of respite care and help when they're providing help in their homes or in the community.

So under our plan, we would, just like mental health care, which—we would phase in over the next few years a long-term care benefit so that for children who are taking care of their parents in the home, to use your example, who have Alzheimer's or who have had a stroke, for example—I met a couple taking care of the lady's mother for 9 years after she had a stroke, the other day—they would be able to get some relief, someone to come in and watch the parent, take care of the parent on a regular basis while they took some time off, got to go do errands or do whatever needed to be done, so that we would encourage these families staying together. It would save our country a lot of money over the long run. And I think it recognizes what's happening to our population.

Thank you.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you, Omaha, for the question, and we'll get back to you in a few minutes. Now back to our own studio audience, Mr. President, and Ann has another question.

Ms. Peterson. Mr. President, I'd like you to meet a woman who is a cancer survivor, and she is also surviving changes in the health insurance plan. Would you explain?

Choice of Physician

Q. Yes. Welcome, President Clinton. My surgery was delayed for approximately 2 months because originally I'd gone to my OB that I'd gone to for 18 years. He sent me to a surgeon and then the mammograms and so forth. And then when you find out that you're going to have to have surgery, to then stop—they were off-plan, by the way, with my insurance carrier, which is provided by my employer—to have to stop and choose doctors that you know nothing about—and the disease is devastating, but then to choose another doctor is just as devastating. And what I wanted to know is how can you 100 percent ensure or guarantee that under your health plan and the plan that my employer would choose, that we would have the choice of our own doctors?

The President. I want to make sure everyone here and everyone in our other studios understood what she said. She said her previous doctor, her personal choice, was off-plan. Why don't you explain to everybody what that means, in case they don't know.

Q. Off-plan? It can either be off-plan where they don't pay anything at all, or they pay quite a bit less, either 50, 60, 70 percent.

The President. So, in other words, your employer chose an insurance plan for you that did not permit you to keep the doctor that you had been dealing with——

Q. Correct.

The President. ——which, when you have a serious condition like cancer, is terrifying to have to go to a new doctor.

Q. Correct.

The President. That's what you're trying—I just want to make sure everybody understands that, because one of the charges that's been leveled against our plan which is absolutely untrue is that I'm trying to restrict the choice of the American people. The American people are having their choices restricted now. Now, let me just say something very briefly. In defense of your employer and many others, a lot of times the employer says, "Hey, that's all I can afford is an HMO, and I'm doing the best I can, and I think they'll provide quality care."

Here's how our plan works. Under our plan, your employer would have an obligation to contribute a certain amount to your insurance, and it would not change, no matter what plan you chose. Then every year, your employer would be part—unless you have more than—unless it's a very large employer.

Q. It's a small company.

The President. If it's a small employer, the small company, then, would be part of a big buyer's co-op to guarantee lower rates and choices. And you would be given, through this cooperative, at least three choices. You'd be able to buy into an HMO like the one you've got here. But you'd also be able to pay a small premium so if you wanted to, you could opt out and get the services from the doctor of your choice with exactly the same contribution, no more if you bought the premium. You could buy fee-for-service medicine on your own, just keep your doctor. You'd pay a little more. Or you could—you'd always have to have at least one third choice.

And under our bill, if it passes, every year you'd be able to revise that. You'd be able to reconsider it. But you would always have the right to choose. And even though you might pay a little more for fee-for-service medicine, your employer would not be disadvantaged, he'd pay the same, regardless, and you would pay less than you would now because your small business would be part of a big buyer's pool.

So even if you took the most expensive choice, it would be in all probability less than you're paying now because you'd be part of a big pool.

Q. That would be wonderful.

Thank you.

Small Business

Mr. Anschutz. And the small business would pay less?

The President. It depends. Most people in America, if our plan passed, would get the same or better health care for the same or lower costs. Some small businesses would pay more. It depends on what they're paying. I'd have to know. Let me just tell you briefly how it works.

The average business in America today pays 8 to 9 percent of payroll for health insurance. Under our system, everybody would pay a maximum of 7.9 percent. Small businesses with fewer than 70 employees and average wages of under $24,000 a year or less, average wages, would be eligible for discounts going down to as low as 3.5 percent of payroll on a sliding scale. That's how it would work.

Mr. Anschutz. That answers your question?

Q. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you. And now back to the television monitors, another circuit here. We'll go back to Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Part-Time Workers

Q. Mr. President, I'm a full-time college student. I have a part-time job, and I have no health insurance. How will your plan help me? And how will I be able to pay for it?

The President. How many hours a week do you work?

Q. I work 25 to 30 hours a week, sir, and I'm currently taking 13 hours at a college here in town.

The President. Good for you. When you get your degree, you'll be glad that you worked for it like that, if you can get it, and I think you can.

Under our plan, the cost of insuring part-time workers would be shared between the employer, the employee, and the Government. So if you work—let's just say you work 20 hours a week, which is half-time, your employer would pay half the premium that the employer would pay if your worked 40 hours a week. And you would similarly pay your obligation, then the difference would be made up with help from the Government. But you would have to pay, and so would your employer, if you work more than 10 hours a week, but you would be eligible to get health care coverage.

Let me say that one of the most interesting and controversial parts of any health care plan is how you treat younger workers. And here's a young man who wants health care coverage. But there are a lot of young folks who don't, who don't want to be forced to pay anything because they say, "Hey, I'm young, and I'm healthy, and I'm not married and I have no responsibilities to anybody, and I ought to have the right not to pay." And you can say that, but the truth is if they have a car accident or a skiing accident or they, God forbid, get sick, they still go to the hospital and then the rest of you still have to pay if they don't have any insurance. So I think this is the fair way to do it, and you would be able to be insured under our plan.

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

Mr. Anschutz. Once again, Mr. President, it's a pleasure to have you here at our town hall meeting. And our next question is via satellite again from Topeka.

Mr. Hipp. Thank you, Wendall. And, Mr. President, we'd like for you to meet this young woman. She is a single mother with a small child. And she simply could not find a doctor. Now, you've reconciled with your husband, right about that? So, you'll be covered by his insurance in May. And your question has to do with access to health care and the problems you've had. Why don't you tell the President about those.

Medicaid Patients

Q. Right. Mr. President, my daughter and I were on State assistance for 10 months. And when you're on assistance, you get the medical

card to help you out if you have to go to the doctor for anything. And when my daughter got sick, I had a hard time finding a doctor in the Topeka area that would accept her because she was on the medical card. And I was told by a caseworker that it was just unfortunate because we came onto the system at a very bad time, and that usually it isn't this way. But unfortunately, there just aren't any doctors that are accepting new patients with that type of coverage.

And my question to you is, what can you do to help low-income families get better access to health care? Not just people that have jobs and don't have insurance because of their jobs, but perhaps people that don't have jobs at all through some unknown circumstances that they couldn't control.

The President. I want to make sure everyone who's listening to us understands this. I mean, I understand it very well, but I want to make sure all of you do. For awhile, she was on public assistance. If you're not employed and you're on public assistance, you're eligible for health insurance from the Government under the Medicaid program. In almost every State in the country, the Medicaid program reimburses doctors at less than their cost of providing the service. And it's a paperwork hassle, so a lot of doctors don't take Medicaid patients. You can understand it from the doctor's point of view. But when you see a young woman with a baby like that, it makes you sick; it makes you want to cry. So what she's asking is, "Okay, I had insurance, but nobody took me anyway; how are we going to fix that?"

The answer is that under our program people on Medicaid would be covered under the same plans that people who are privately employed would. So, for example, we would put Medicaid folks in with others into these big buying pools, and they would get exactly the same services on exactly the same terms. And because the doctors would be reimbursed in exactly the same way, the physician might not even know whether the person was on public assistance or had a job, because the plans would be the same. And what happened to you, ma'am, would not happen again in the future if this plan were to pass. And I think it's quite important.

Mr. Anschutz. We're glad that question came up tonight. Thank you in Topeka. Go up to Omaha.

Ms. Carroll. Thanks, Wendall. Mr. President, Tuesday in North Carolina we talked about the cost of health care reform for service industries, specifically restaurants. Here with me now is this gentleman, the CEO of Godfather's Pizza. He has some concerns about that.

Small Business

Q. Thank you very much. Mr. President, thank you very much for this opportunity. And I would first like to commend you on making health care a national priority. In your State of the Union Speech, you indicated that 9 out of 10 Americans currently have health care insurance primarily through their employers. And tonight you indicated that out of those people who do not have insurance, 8 out of 10 of them work for someone. And your plan would force employers to pay this insurance for those people that they currently do not cover. I would contend that employers who do not cover employees, do not for one simple reason, and it relates to cost.

Now, I have gone through the rigors of calculating the impact of your plan on my business, which has about 525 units throughout the country, and we employ in total over 10,000 employees. I have also talked with hundreds of other business people, and they've also calculated the cost impact on their businesses.

I believe that this is something that we should and can fix. But for many, many businesses like mine, the cost of your plan is simply a cost that will cause us to eliminate jobs. In going through my own calculations, the number of jobs that we would have to eliminate to try and absorb this cost is a lot greater than I ever anticipated. Your averages about the impact on smaller businesses, those are all well intended. But all of the averages represent a wide spectrum in terms of the businesses impacted.

On behalf of all those business owners that are in a situation similar to mine, my question is quite simply, if I'm forced to do this, what will I tell those people whose jobs I will have to eliminate?

The President. Let's talk a minute about what you would have to do. Are any of your employees insured now?

Q. Yes, sir. Approximately one-third of my employees are insured now.

The President. And of the one-third that are insured now, what percent of payroll does their insurance cost?

Q. My insurance costs, at the present time, run about 2½ percent of payroll.

The President. And what do you provide them? Do they share the cost 50–50 or something like that?

Q. Cost 75 percent paid for by my company and 25 percent paid for by the employee. Now, two-thirds of my employees are part-time or short-term workers that fall into the class that you identified earlier.

The President. Okay. And if they are part-time or short-term workers, they wouldn't add all that much. You wouldn't have to pay the whole 7.9 percent for them because they don't work all the time.

All right, let me ask you this—on average, food service businesses' payroll is about one-third of the total cost of doing business. Is that about what it is?

Q. That is an adequate estimation, yes sir.

The President. So, suppose, since you have part-time workers and some wouldn't have to be covered, so you wouldn't go from 2½ percent of payroll to 7.9 percent. You might go to something like 6 percent. If you had 6 percent of payroll, let's just say, instead of 2½. Let's say 6½ percent, that's a good even number. You have 4 percent of payroll. And that's one-third of your total costs, so you would add about 1½ percent to the total cost of doing business.

Would that really cause you to lay a lot of people off if all your competitors had to do it too? Only if people stop eating out. If all your competitors had to do it, and your cost of doing business went up 1½ percent, wouldn't that leave you in the same position you are in now? Why wouldn't they all be in the same position, and why wouldn't you all be able to raise the price of pizza 2 percent? I'm a satisfied customer. I'd keep buying from you. [*Laughter*]

No, I'm serious. This is a very important—let me say—this is a very important question because a huge number of Americans are involved in the food industry; 40 percent of the American food dollar is spent eating out now, 40 percent. So this is not an idle question. This man is raising a very important question in terms of employment.

What if all your competitors were just like you? Wouldn't you be able to do it, then?

Q. Okay, first of all, Mr. President, with all due respect, your calculation on what the impact would do, quite honestly, is incorrect.

Let's take, for example, the fact that after I went through my calculations, your calculation or your example of the 6 percent or the 7.9—and in my case, it works out to 7.9 percent. Now, let's suppose that 30 percent of my costs are labor costs, 7.9 times that would be the 2 to 2½ percent that you are referring to. The problem with that calculation, sir, is the fact that those, most of those 30 percent of the people currently have zero. So when I calculate in the fact that I have to go from no coverage on those employees to full coverage at the 7.9 percent rate, it actually works out to be approximately 16 percent.

Now, your other point about having to pass it on to my customers in the competitive marketplace, it simply doesn't work that way because the larger competitors have more staying power before they go bankrupt than a smaller competitor. They have more staff that they could simply do without until the marketplace reestablishes itself.

So what I'm saying and suggesting is that the assumptions about the impact on a business like mine are simply not correct because we are very labor intensive, we have a large number of part-time and short-term employees that we do not cover for one simple reason: We can't afford it. My bottom-line net profit for the last 2 years was less than 1.5 percent of my top-line sales. When we calculate the cost just for my company, under your plan, it equates to 3 times what my bottom line profitability is.

What is one of the biggest misconceptions, sir, is the fact that a company like mine only makes between 1 and 3 percent of top-line sales. And because we have a large population of employees that we would like to cover, but simply the dynamics of our business will not allow us to do that under your proposed plan.

The President. Let me ask you a favor. Would you send to me personally your calculations? Because I know we've got to go on to other questions, but let me remind you, if it added 4.5 percent to the cost of doing business and his labor costs were only one-third of his total costs, then all you have to do is multiply it by three, it would have to be 13.5 percent of payroll. And that maximum is 7.9 percent. So it's just—we can't get there. Send it to me; we'll work on it.

Mr. Anschutz. I'm sure a lot of this health care reform debate is going to be over numbers.

The President. That's right.

Mr. Anschutz. Maybe that will all come out in the wash. That's what——

The President. Let me also just say, for those who are listening to us, on part-time employees, you don't pay the full premium unless the employee works 30 hours a week or more. Anything less, the employer pays a smaller percentage of the premium.

Ms. Peterson. Mr. President, this gentleman is helping his son and daughter-in-law pay for skyrocketing medical bills to help them so that they don't go under financially. Why don't you explain.

Preexisting Conditions

Q. Mr. President, we have a daughter-in-law with complications from two back surgeries. She's at a point now that she cannot work, and she's losing her job and, therefore, her insurance. Her husband's insurance won't pick it up because it's preexisting conditions. My son's income is $1,080. And just to give you an idea of how this cost reflects, Sharon has therapy three times a week for 15 to 20 minutes, physical therapy. Each session costs $438.

Right now they're over $12,000 in debt, and it's climbing. What can you tell a family like this? What kind of hope do they have?

The President. Let me ask you a question. Your son has insurance?

Q. Yes.

The President. But they won't pick up the family because of your daughter-in-law's preexisting condition?

Q. It wouldn't pay the preexisting conditions, so——

The President. How big is the company for which your son works?

Q. Well, it's the largest—first or second largest company in my town, a very large business.

The President. See, even for a large business, it's difficult. I want to explain why—it's not so many—the bad in this is the way the financing is organized, not necessarily the company. Under our plan, your son would have a right to insure his family at any place of work, now and in the future. But the private insurance company who provides the insurance would not go broke even with your daughter-in-law's problems, because they would be in a very large pool.

So to go back to the gentleman who was on television here with the pizza company, insurance companies would make money the way Blue Cross originally did and the way food stores do now or large eating establishments, a little bit of money on a lot of sales, a lot of people. And that's how we would do it. But your son under our plan would have a right to have his family insured at this job or at any other. But the company wouldn't go broke trying to provide the employer's share of the premium, and the insurance company wouldn't go broke, because they'd be in a very big pool, and the risk would be broadly spread.

Mr. Anschutz. Mr. President, let's move on to Tulsa, Oklahoma, again if we can.

Ms. Silvy. Mr. President, this gentleman is an internist with a managed care organization here in Tulsa, and his question relates to medical technology.

Medical Technology

Q. Thank you. This will be a piece of pizza compared to Omaha. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton, my question has to do with medical technology. Organizations like the one I work for, and we insure working folks and Medicare recipients, we deal on a daily basis with tough decisions about medical technology. There was a letter to a medical director of an insurance company to your wife in a well respected medical journal not long ago. And you probably saw that letter. And hospitals and other health care organizations struggle with this as well. Part of it is wrapped up in tort issues and malpractice concerns that payer organizations have, that hospitals have.

And the question I have for you is in looking at new and emerging medical technologies and technologies that are diffused in our country, throughout our country. And those technologies are oftentimes applied to folks who are at the end of their life who have really no meaningful hope of recovery, and yet there's a compulsion really to continue to do things. And I'm really wondering how your health plan addresses that issue.

The President. Well, let me mention—let me talk about this from two or three different points. This is a big issue, and it's an issue that I'm very sensitive to now. As you know, I just lost my mother a few months ago. My father-in-law died last year. My family's been through this personally. And I would like to say three or four things about it.

First of all, on balance, we like having the best medical technology in the world, and we

want to have access to it if we need it. And our plan actually continues a commitment to invest more, for example, in academic medical centers which have this technology and in medical research, generally, and I think we should. On the other hand, we don't want to have a lot of money spent on technology if it's totally useless. Let me just mention three things which the present system does, and he alluded to two of them.

One is, a lot of doctors are worried about malpractice claims so they may do tests whether they think the patient needs it or not, just so later on they can say they did it in case they get sued. That costs all of us a lot of money if there's no reason to do it. What's the answer to that? Our plan would require the national professional associations to promulgate medical practice guidelines that then the doctors could use, and if they use these guidelines, those guidelines would, in effect, be a first line of defense in a malpractice case. It would at least raise the presumption that the doctor had not been negligent.

Problem number two, hospitals get to competing with one another, and they're afraid—if one has an MRI, the other hospital's afraid it won't get any patients unless it gets an MRI. So a town needs one MRI and winds up with two so everybody can compete with one another. We try to make sure that there's equal access to technology, but that hospitals don't feel like they have to do that, double the cost of technology to everybody, when the facilities could be properly shared.

Point number three is the really difficult one, and that is the question of when should people in their last months, or their last year, give up expensive technology? My own view of that is that a lot of people have made that decision for themselves, but they don't formalize it. And so one of the things we're trying to encourage people to do is to make sensible living wills, to make these decisions. I think that's a lot better than having medical professionals try to get between a grief-stricken child and a parent on life support, or sometimes a grief-stricken parent and a child on life support. So I think what we should do is to try to encourage the use of living wills, encourage families to talk about this in honest ways. And I think America will move to this and save the money that can be saved and still keep the benefits of technology.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you, Mr. President. As we told you earlier, we're talking with four communities, not only ours but Tulsa, Topeka, and Omaha. At this point, we're ready to go back to Topeka.

Mr. Hipp. Okay, Wendall. Mr. President, this gentleman has lived in the capital of Kansas for 18 years. And Paul doesn't have a lot of faith, frankly, in the Government's ability to administer health care, and he's got a question about that for you, sir.

Managing the System

Q. Mr. President, good evening. In view of the Government's past poor performance, i.e., Social Security, welfare, Federal budget, the deficit, and pork barrel spending, can you explain to us how the Federal Government can manage health care, another socialistic program, in an economical and efficient manner?

The President. Well, I have two things to say about it. Number one is, the Federal Government's not going to manage this program. Under our program, if my program passes, the private sector will manage it. The only thing the Federal Government will do is two things basically. We will require everybody to have health insurance and employers and employees to share responsibility for it. That includes good primary and preventive benefits.

We will then say that insurance has got to be what it used to be when it started: You can't cut people off because somebody in the family got sick; you can't charge old folks too much if they're still working and they're healthy; and small business people and farmers and self-employed people have the right to be in big buying groups so that they can get the same kind of deal that Government employees and that big business employees get today. That's not a big Government business program.

Let me give you one example, sir. The State of California just set up a small business buying group with 40,000 businesses in it. And the businesses that entered actually got a reduction in their health insurance costs by going into the buying pool. And there was no big Government bureaucracy. They hired 13 people to run the insurance buying and handle the paperwork for these 40,000. So I don't want the Government to run it.

Q. Is there going to be less paperwork, instead of more?

The President. Absolutely. Right now we've got the most expensive—right now, sir, we have the most expensive system in the world in America. We have 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies, and then the two Government programs for older people and for poor people on top of that. So we've got more bureaucracy and more paperwork and more money spent on that and less on health care than any other country in the world. So I don't want the Government to run the health care system. I just want to make sure the system works for the benefit of everybody.

Mr. Anschutz. Well, we hope that answered your question. We're moving on to Omaha now.

The President. But I'm not going to let Social Security get in trouble, either. And the deficit's coming down, not going up. Go ahead.

Mr. Anschutz. Go ahead, Loretta.

Ms. Carroll. This gentleman was diagnosed as having full-blown AIDS back in 1991. He is now disabled, and he has really had a tough time with the current health care system.

AIDS

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. As she said, I'm a person who's living with full-blown AIDS. When I was first diagnosed HIV-positive in 1989, I was part of an HMO program of which I had to fight tooth and nail to get to an infectious disease doctor. I was forced to see a family practice doctor who was not educated or interested in treating my symptoms of the illness. I'd like to know from you, with health care reform, we've already voted to reform Medicaid in Nebraska to start charging patients for copayments. Will health care reform enhance, or is it going to restrict, the availability of quality care, the availability of low-cost prescriptions, and the access to doctors who are educated and interested enough to treat HIV infections without having caps on expenditures and those sorts of services that we need to survive?

The President. Health care reform will enhance the quality and range of services you can get. It will require everybody to pay something, but it will place limits on that something. Let me just say, one of the things that people who are HIV-positive or people who have AIDS will get out of this program is that we will cover for the first time, in all health care plans, prescription medicines. And there will be a copay and a deductible, but there will also be an annual limit.

So for someone like you who has very expensive medical bills for medicine, you would benefit enormously from that because of the very reasonable copay and deductible and annual limit. Let me say something in your behalf. All the rest of us would gain, too, for this reason: A lot of people, like this gentleman, who have AIDS can't get health insurance anymore and are forced out of the workplace. And all of us are better off if everybody in his position can work as long as possible, can be independent as long as possible, can be self-supporting as long as possible. And we need a health care system where employers can afford to properly and fully ensure their employees without going broke so that they can live as long and as well as possible.

But you would be much better off under our plan because you get choice of doctor, adequate care, and prescription medicine would be covered after a modest effort required on your part.

Q. But with all due respect, with my disability check and having to pay rent and utilities and food and everything else, I am left with $20 a month, and I do not think that that's enough to have to pay copayments to go to the doctor or pay for prescriptions.

The President. No, I'm talking about not now. At your income level now, you probably have no responsibility at all. But I'm talking about back when you were working; suppose you needed medicine to maintain your condition. Even then, every health insurance package would have had to cover medicine with a modest copay to help people stay as independent as long as possible. With your present income, those responsibilities would be dramatically less. And if your income is what you say, you wouldn't have any copay responsibility.

Q. If I could not pay, would I be denied services?

The President. No. Nobody who cannot pay would be denied services. But people who can pay will have to pay something.

Mr. Anschutz. Okay, we'll have to move on now. I hope we answered your question, sir. We will continue with our town hall meeting with President Clinton in just a moment. But first, this time out.

[*The television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Anschutz. We've been going for about an hour so far with questions. It doesn't seem

that long, does it, Mr. President? About a half hour left, and I know we have a lot of questions to go. So let's return to our studios.

Ms. Peterson. Mr. President, I'd like you to meet a doctor from Children's Mercy Hospital. She's very concerned about the toll violence is taking on our health care industry and our Nation as a whole and especially our young people.

Violence and Health Care

Q. Good evening, President Clinton, and thank you for taking the time to come and meet with us in Kansas City. Over the years I've seen many changes in my practice as a pediatric emergency medicine physician. By far and away, the most frightening is the escalation of violent injuries involving our children, both as victims and as witnesses. My question for you is this: Are we going to be able to provide these children the acute care, the rehabilitation, and the mental health services they need, both the victims and the witnesses, under your plan for health care reform?

The President. The short answer is yes. The long answer is what I said earlier about mental health benefits. We phase them in, and we don't fully have them covered until the year 2000. So that, except in extreme circumstances, they wouldn't all be covered under all health insurance practices.

Now, some children's hospitals will be eligible for certain payments that will permit that to be done. But the short answer is yes, the comprehensive services will be provided, but we won't have full mental health coverage until the year 2000 under the plan as it is presently drawn.

But let me just say to all of you—I know we're running out of time, and I want to be quick, but violence is one of the biggest health problems we have. And you need to know that even though I believe we can bring down the cost of health care in terms of things that we're out of line with other countries on, principally in paperwork and unnecessary procedures and undue fear of malpractice, as long as we are the most violent country in the world and we've got more kids getting shot up and cut and brutalized, we're going to have higher medical costs than other countries and busy emergency rooms.

It's a human problem. It's also a horrible public health problem, which is why I hope we can pass this crime bill and do some other things that will drive down the rate of crime and violence in our country because it is swallowing up a lot of your health dollars as well as tearing the heart out of a lot of your children.

Q. And a lot of the doctors.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you. Thank you for doing it, though.

Mr. Anschutz. Mr. President, Glenda Silvy in Tulsa has another question to ask you. And Glenda, I would ask you in the interest of time—we're getting toward the end, and we have a lot of ground we'd like to cover, so if we could kind of keep it fairly condensed.

Ms. Silvy. Mr. President, this is a woman with a question about services to the elderly.

Services for the Elderly

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about the transportation for the frail elderly because it has become a very serious problem in Tulsa and other cities. Limited personal resources rule out hiring taxis to take people in for doctors appointments and dialysis and also adult day care centers and other therapeutic activities. Does the plan address this growing problem?

The President. I have to tell you the truth. I'm not sure what's covered and what's not with transportation. And what I will do is, after this is over, I'll get your name and address, and I'll get you an answer. And I wish I could give you an answer on the air, but I don't want to say the wrong thing, and I don't want to mislead you. So, I will write you as soon as I find out. I'm sorry, I don't remember.

Q. I'll look for it, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

The President. I'll sure get it then.

Mr. Anschutz. I'm sure she'll get it. Let's move on to Topeka. Ralph.

The President. I wish I had her in my office, that's for sure. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Anschutz. Yes, she's pretty sharp. Are you ready, Ralph?

Mr. Hipp. Yes, Wendall and Mr. President. We have a short question from a girl who is 9 years old, goes to Central Grade School up in Holton, Kansas, and has a question of concern to people her age.

Immunizations

Q. Mr. President, I would like to know how your new health care program will help to make sure that all children get their immunizations.

Mr. Anschutz. Good question.

The President. That's a great question. It will help in two ways. First of all, immunizations will be covered under everybody's health insurance policies for families so that children's immunizations will be covered under the family health insurance policy.

The second thing we will do under our plan is to make sure that the public health offices all over the country, which do a lot of immunizations for children, have enough money to do them without overcharging the parents. In my State of Arkansas, for example, 85 percent of our children, 85 percent, including children from well-off families, get their shots in the public health offices. So we do it in those two ways. And a lot more children will be immunized if this plan passes.

Thank you. Great question.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you. Up to Omaha.

Ms. Carroll. Thanks. This woman is with Mutual of Omaha, which employs 6,000 people here in Omaha, 4,000 agents nationwide.

Insurance Companies

Q. Mr. President, thank you so much for the opportunity tonight for us to provide input. We wanted to let you know that we do support universal coverage as well as universal and comprehensive health care reform. Given our agreement on so many basic issues, I have to say that we're disappointed in—our 6,000 employees who work very hard at Mutual of Omaha—in the personal attacks that we felt by the administration and the fact that they're doing the best job that they can.

My first question is, why have you taken this approach? And secondly, as we try to build consensus with your team and other teams in Congress, will you acknowledge the positive steps that we've taken to reduce costs as well as the fact that we support many of your basic goals as well?

The President. Yes, but let me try to defend myself first. Tonight, how many times tonight did I go out of my way to explain this problem from the insurance companies' point of view? A lot, right? And let me further say, I went to Connecticut the other day, which is the other big center of health insurance companies, where five of the six biggest companies in Connecticut refused to join in this health insurance association multi-million dollar attack on our health care reform efforts. And I complimented those companies for what they're trying to do. So I believe that we have a lot in common. And I believe most insurance companies support universal coverage. And I would be more than happy to continue to work with them.

What I have tried to do is to answer the attacks on our plan by the ads, the multi-million-dollar ad campaign, that I don't have the money to answer in paid ads yet—I hope I do someday—from the health insurance association. Nothing would please me more than to tone down the rhetoric, to sit around like we're doing now in private and recognize that a lot of companies, particularly a lot of the bigger companies, have done a lot to help control heath care costs.

I guess what I want to do is to try to take the initiatives that you've already taken and that you've proved we can take to help larger companies, to help Government employees, to help others control health care costs and make those available to all Americans, first with coverage and first with affordable rates for people who have small businesses.

I can't believe we can't reach agreement on this. I think we can. And nothing would please me more than to have this conversation with you and everybody in your business all over America. And I thank you for what you said.

Q. We'll take you up on that.

Mr. Anschutz. Okay. Thank you in Omaha. And now to our studio.

Ms. Petersen. Mr. President, this gentleman is with Marion Merrill Dow, a major pharmaceutical company based here in Kansas City. What is your question for the President?

Drug Prices

Q. Mr. President, good evening. I appreciate the chance to visit with you. I'd like to begin by saying that I applaud your efforts to bring health care to the top of the national agenda. I think that's very important.

Let me say that, at the same time, I'm somewhat concerned about some of the provisions of the bill, particularly some of the provisions that relate to Government control and intervention in the business, things like the committee that would discuss the appropriateness of new drug prices. I believe that that's the function of the open market, and I'm very concerned about the implications there.

It appears that the investment community is also concerned about that. The market has taken the value of pharmaceutical stocks and bio-

technology stocks down by many billions of dollars over the past 18 months. And there's been a considerable loss of jobs in our industry.

My question is, what assurances can you give the American people that your bill will not permanently damage this industry which is so helpful and brings cures to so many people, and allows us to continue the research that we're doing to solve the many diseases that we've heard spoken about here tonight?

The President. First of all, let me explain what he was talking about to the rest of you. The pharmaceutical industry in America is very important to all of us, not only because we want to get the best in emerging prescription drugs, it's also a big part of our high-tech economy. We have clearly the dominant pharmaceutical industry in the world. It provides enormous numbers of jobs in America and helps us to sell our products overseas.

As you know, all around the world, sometimes you can sell products in other countries quicker than you can here because of the Government regulation, which I'm trying to speed up.

Under the health care plan as it is presented, a committee would be able to decide whether or not the price of a given drug was excessive. The reason that provision was put in there is because there are so many drugs that are made in America, where Americans have paid in all kinds of ways for the research to be done, which costs much less in other countries than they do in America.

What the pharmaceutical industry, however, is legitimately concerned about is that they have to go out and raise huge amounts of money in the biotechnology area to raise money to develop new ground-breaking drugs, and they believe those drugs ought to be able to charge for the enormous cost of their development in the first place, which I agree with.

And what I think we have to do, sir, is to work that out. You know, last year the biotechnology industry asked me to give special incentives in terms of capital gains taxes for investment in that area. We did. I was trying to build them up, and I've been as disturbed as you have by what's happened to the markets.

So what we have to do is enter into some sort of understanding so we can protect the right to develop and market new drugs. I'm very concerned about it myself. I do not want to do anything to hurt it. And it's a very important part of our economy.

But let me also say that generally, pharmaceuticals will do well because so many more people are going to have drug coverage. That's why the Pharmacists Association strongly endorses our health plan. We can work this out.

Mr. Anschutz. Let's move along now and get back to the satellites in Tulsa.

Ms. Silvy. This woman has a question about Native American health care.

Native American Health Care

Q. Mr. President, I have Medicare and insurance benefits from retirement, but I'm real concerned about the Native Americans living in our city, in the city that I live in that do not have the benefits that I have. What will happen to their urban clinics that they go to now for medical care?

The President. For the people at all the other places, Native Americans have a Native American health service funded through Federal funds. It's a separate health service, sort of like the Veterans Administration network is separate. Our plan, ma'am, will put more resources into that network, will strengthen it, will enable Native Americans to choose to use the Native American network and to bring whatever insurance policies and support they have to that network in addition to taking the extra money we put in it.

So the Native American network, we believe, will be better off if our plan passes. And I have committed that to the leaders of tribes all over the country. We're going to keep working on it until they're absolutely satisfied that that's what's going to happen. That is an obligation we have. We cannot break it.

[*The television stations took a commercial break.*]

Mr. Anschutz. Welcome back. We have about another 15 minutes on the program, and we want to cover as much ground as we can. President Clinton, so far, how do you feel about the questioning? Has it been——

The President. I think the people have done a good job. And we've gotten a broad range of questions.

Mr. Anschutz. Some agree, some argumentative, but that's the kind of thing we want.

The President. It's a complicated issue. We should have an argument.

Mr. Anschutz. Okay, I think we have Omaha next. Is that right? Topeka. Let's go to Topeka and Ralph Hipp. Ralph.

Mr. Hipp. Wendall and Mr. President, this is a woman who lost her daughter last year to complications from a bone marrow transplant from an unrelated donor that cost $350,000. And if there's any bright spot about you losing your daughter last year, it's been that you have become an advocate for other transplant families. So at least there's something going on that you are continuing to work with this. And you did have insurance for that operation. Why don't you tell the President about your situation and your question.

Transplants

Q. Thank you, Mr. President, for your gift of time this evening.

Fortunately, our daughter's insurance provided coverage for her transplant. But we also realize there are many patients facing organ transplants. And their insurance companies do not provide coverage for them, nor do they provide coverage for the donor's expenses which is also part of the transplant process. My question to you, Mr. President, is: What will be in your health care program that will help provide coverage for all patients needing bone marrow transplants and also for their donor's expenses?

The President. Transplants are covered when they are appropriate. When it's an appropriate medical procedure and the doctor decides it's appropriate, it gets recommended, the transplant will be covered. And there are no lifetime limits on our policies, keep in mind, unlike most policies now. Three out of four policies now have lifetime limits. So that would not be a problem.

I have to tell you, I don't know about the donor's expenses. I'll have to check on that. I can't answer that. But when it is an appropriate medical recommendation, it would be covered. It's a normal thing that would clearly be warranted by the treatment and by the doctor's treatment of the patient. And I think it should be. And again, there are no lifetime limits on the policy, so that won't be a problem.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you, Topeka. We go by satellite now to Omaha, Nebraska.

Ms. Carroll. Thanks Wendall. This gentleman is a veteran, and he's very healthy right now, but he's also concerned about what's happening at the local VA hospitals and other hospitals just like it.

Veterans Health Care

Q. Mr. President, Commander, all veterans, as well as the employees of all the VA hospitals, are very concerned on what is happening at the hospitals. They keep reducing the budget, keep pushing the employees out the door. Consequently, that is reducing the care for the veteran. How will your new plan affect the VA?

The President. I'm glad you asked that, because we were talking about it during the last break. And let me thank you for your service, for wearing your cap tonight. You look fine, and I appreciate you asking the question.

Let me also back up and tell the rest of you, the veterans hospital network has been suffering in recent years because we have had a reduction in the number of patients going into these hospitals, leading to a reduction in the budget, which means that those who are left behind don't have and oftentimes the quality or the range of care that they want.

One real problem is that the veteran can go in and qualify to be cared for in the veterans hospital. But the only money the hospital gets is whatever the budget is from the Government, so that a veteran has another hospital policy, an insurance policy, or is covered by Medicare or whatever, that money can't flow to the hospital. So what we have done, sir, is to make sure that veterans on a priority basis, then their family members, can be cared for through the veterans health care network, and that all sources, including this insurance policy, can go in income to the hospitals and to the doctors in the veterans health care network so that they can get adequate funds.

And the Veterans Administration is quite excited about this, the veterans health care network, because they think they are going to be able to get these veterans into these hospitals and that finally they're going to be able to be reimbursed in an appropriate way just as any other hospital would be able to. So we don't want to continue to cut their budget; we want to give them access to other different funds. And I think it's going to be the salvation of the veterans health care network myself.

Mr. Anschutz. Does that answer your question, sir?

The President. Do you understand? I mean, like if you have Medicare or if you have an

insurance policy or CHAMPUS whatever now, none of that money flows to the hospital now. Under our plan, you'd be able to go there, take your insurance policy, and get the hospital reimbursed that way, as well as through whatever budget we get directly from the hospitals through the Congress.

Mr. Anschutz. Quickly your follow-up, sir.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. Anschutz. Okay, good. Let's move back to our studios here at TV 5.

Ms. Petersen. Mr. President, I'd like you to meet this woman. She is 16 years old and has lost six of her adoptive relatives to smoking-related illnesses. What is your question?

Smoking

Q. As a high school student, I see the heightening use of tobacco among my age range. And I feel it's not only the responsibility of the Government to help those that have existing health complications but also to prevent it. So my question tonight is why do we continue to use subsidies to help support tobacco growers when tobacco is harmful to us?

The President. We don't use direct Government subsidies to support tobacco. We do organize the market with non-taxpayer funds actually to keep growers out of the market. It keeps the prices higher and does provide an income for the people who are in tobacco farming now. I think if you abolish the present Federal program—I want to talk about what we're trying to do to reduce smoking in a minute—but I think, if you abolish the Federal program, what would happen is the big tobacco companies would come in and actually plant more tobacco at lower prices and try to make it more readily available.

Now, what we are doing is, the only tax we propose to raise in this program is a 75 cent tax on tobacco to pay for the medical care of the unemployed uninsured. And we ask big companies that get a big windfall, that is whose insurance rates will drop way down, to pay a little bit, too. We have proposed in Federal buildings totally smoke-free areas unless the rooms are separate and completely separately ventilated. The Food and Drug Administration is conducting an investigation, even as we're here tonight, on the nicotine content of cigarettes and whether there's been any direct attempt to increase the nicotine content so that it has a more addictive effect on people who smoke.

We are doing our best to be aggressive in trying to tell young people that they should not smoke, that there are dangers to smoking, and that those who are around smokers in closed spaces can also be exposed. A few thousand people a year die from lung cancer induced by smoke, even though they're nonsmokers. This is a very serious problem, and we're taking some strong steps in that direction. And I appreciate you raising the issue.

Mr. Anschutz. Mr. President, we're going to try for one more round-robin of our remote stations. We go again to Tulsa.

Ms. Silvy. This gentleman has a question about public health.

Public Health Services

Q. Good evening, Mr. President. As you know, public health departments provide preventive health services to millions in our great land. And as you well know, the preventive health services are much more cost-effective to give than treating an illness. How will your health care plan affect the provision of our services related to public health?

The President. When the young lady a few moments ago asked the immunization question, I alluded to this. In our plan, there is provision for the expenditure of I think it's around a billion dollars a year more of Federal funds to public health units all around the country, every year, than we're providing now to try to expand the preventive and primary services provided.

As I said, I know in my State, we relied very heavily on public health clinics. And in a lot of rural areas and in underserved inner-city areas, they are very important. And in many places, everywhere they provide the immunizations for kids. So we'll continue to support them at a higher level than we are now if the plan passes as it is.

Mr. Anschutz. Thank you, Tulsa. And, Glenda Silvy, we thank you very much for participating tonight. If we don't get back to you, thanks again.

Now, let's go on to Topeka and Ralph Hipp.

Mr. Hipp. Thanks again, Wendall, and this is probably our final question. Mr. President, we've enjoyed being with you here in Topeka, Kansas, tonight. A doctor has our next question.

Lifestyles

Q. Mr. Clinton, unhealthy lifestyles contribute to a majority of the medical diseases we treat today. How would the medical savings plan encourage each of us to become more responsible and to follow a more healthy lifestyle?

The President. Well, there's nothing in this plan that would mandate diets, for example. But I think—[*laughter*]—no, don't laugh, this is a very serious question. This man has said something that is quite important. And I'd like to know what you think we can do other than requiring people to pay a portion of their own health insurance.

A lot of employers themselves are providing such incentives. What we have done is to organize this in the hope that each State and each health group within the State, each of these health alliances, will themselves undertake incentives to encourage employers, for example, to provide exercise facilities, to encourage healthy lifestyles, to do health education, instead of having national mandates, but to give these alliances the incentives to do it to keep the cost of health care down. It is a very, very important thing to do.

We have not mandated specific things in here. But I think the incentives for the groups within State by State to do it will be overwhelming to try to keep the cost of health care down in the future. And he has asked a very important question. I'm glad you brought it up before we got off the air.

Mr. Anschutz. Ralph, thank you for being with us in Topeka tonight. We appreciate your—there's a large crowd there and all the questions that we've had. We also appreciate from Omaha. Unfortunately, we don't have time to return to them for one last question. But I think we've covered a lot of ground tonight. It's certainly been an interesting discussion. And I'm sure that all of our viewers have learned quite a bit from what they've heard tonight because a lot of ground has been covered.

Before we close, Mr. President, do you have some final words you'd like to say?

The President. Just that I hope that all of you who are listening tonight and all of you who asked questions and had questions that weren't asked, will agree with me that this is an issue we ought to deal with now, not that anybody has all the answers or that there aren't some tough decisions to be made. If there weren't some hard decisions to be made, this crisis would have been dealt with a long time ago. We've been trying to do this for 60 years.

But I would just urge you to urge your Members of Congress, without regard to party, to face this issue this year, to discuss these issues, to deal with the problems that have been raised tonight, the questions people have about my proposal, but to act this year to finally provide private guaranteed health insurance for all Americans. We will not solve a lot of the problems that were mentioned here tonight or bring costs in line with inflation or provide real security to working families, ever, until we do this. We will not do it.

It is important for our economy, but it's most important for who we are as a people and what kind of life we're going to have as families and as working people as we move into the next century. So please urge your Members of Congress, not necessarily to agree with me on every detail, but to seize this moment to do something profoundly important for the American people and guarantee health security to all of us and to our children.

Thank you.

Mr. Anschutz. I want to thank the President again. And we thank all of you who came, and we apologize to everyone who we couldn't work in to this small studio, this small amount of time, because so many people have questions about health care in our country. And I think the main thing is that they do have questions.

We asked President Clinton to come here this evening because he has a health plan. We didn't say it's the right plan. That wasn't the idea. The idea was to give him a forum so that he could tell us everything he could about his health plan in a fairly large amount of time so that you could get a grasp of it. Then we are asking you to go weigh what he has had to say and look at all of the other alternatives that are out there so that you can make an informed opinion when it comes time to express how you feel.

We invite you to send your questions and your opinions to your Congressmen, to your U.S. Senator, and make those opinions known. Right, Mr. President?

The President. If anybody has any questions that weren't answered tonight, write us, and we'll answer them.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 7:05 p.m. in the KCTV television studios.

Statement on the Attacks on Israeli Civilians
April 7, 1994

On behalf of the American people, I condemn in the strongest possible terms the murders of Israeli citizens on April 6 and 7 and offer condolences to their families. These brutal slayings of innocent civilians are, like the massacre in Hebron, acts of terrorism aimed at stopping the peace negotiations now underway. The enemies of peace have not hesitated to use violence to achieve their goal. They must not be allowed to succeed.

I call upon all those committed to the cause of peace to redouble their efforts and to condemn unequivocally these crimes. The negotiating process holds the promise of a better future for Israelis and Arabs alike. Prompt agreement and early implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles and progress on the bilateral negotiating tracks are the best means to realize this goal.

Statement on the Deaths of Leaders of Rwanda and Burundi
April 7, 1994

I was shocked and deeply saddened to learn of the tragic deaths of President Juvenal Habyarimana of Rwanda and President Cyprien Nyaryamira of Burundi last night in a plane crash outside Kigali, Rwanda. The two Presidents were returning from a regional summit in Arusha, Tanzania, intended to bring an end to the civil wars that have plagued their two countries for more than three decades.

Both Presidents were seeking means to end the bloodshed in their troubled countries and facilitate a movement toward peace and democracy. Their deaths are a tragic blow to the long-suffering Rwandan and Burundian people.

I am equally horrified that elements of the Rwandan security forces have sought out and murdered Rwandan officials, including the Prime Minister, Agathe Uwilingiyimana.

On behalf of the people of the United States, I extend my condolences to the families of the deceased Presidents and the Prime Minister as well as to the peoples of the two nations.

I strongly condemn these actions and I call on all parties to cease any such actions immediately. These tragedies must not derail Rwanda and Burundi from pursuing national reconciliation and democracy.

Statement on the District Court Decision on Chicago's "Operation Clean Sweep"
April 7, 1994

Just hours ago, a Federal District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, declared the Chicago Housing Authority's (CHA) search policy in violation of the fourth amendment.

I am ordering Attorney General Reno and Secretary Cisneros to develop promptly a search policy for public housing that is both constitutionally permissible and effective and that can be implemented on a nationwide basis. We must

not allow criminals to find shelter in the public housing community they terrorize.

I have also asked the Attorney General and Secretary Cisneros to explore what other resources we can provide for sweeps by localities and by Federal agencies.

During the last weekend in March, 13 people died violently in Chicago—3 of them in the Robert Taylor Homes—and more than 300 gun incidents were reported to local police. The people in the Robert Taylor Homes have asked us to help protect them, and within constitutional limits we will do so.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

April 7, 1994

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

It remains our judgment that the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have effectively disbanded the Iraqi nuclear weapons program at least for the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. The UNSCOM teams have reduced Iraq's ability to produce chemical weapons; inventorying and destroying chemical munitions. The United Nations has inspected, and is preparing to monitor, several facilities identified as capable of supporting a biological weapons program.

Iraq's formal acceptance of U.N. Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 715 (ongoing monitoring and verification) in November 1993 was long overdue. The next challenge for the international community is to ensure that Iraq does not break its promise on ongoing monitoring and verification as Iraq has repeatedly done so in the past on other commitments. Continued vigilance is necessary because we believe that Saddam Hussein is committed to rebuilding his weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capability.

We are seriously concerned about the many contradictions and unanswered questions remaining in regard to Iraq's WMD capability, especially in the chemical weapons area. It is therefore extremely important that the international community establish an effective, comprehensive, and sustainable ongoing monitoring and verification regime as required by UNSCR 715.

Rolf Ekeus, the Chairman of UNSCOM, has told Iraq that it must establish a clear track record of compliance before he can report favorably to the Security Council. However, Chairman Ekeus has said he does not expect to be able to report before the end of the year, at the earliest. We strongly endorse Chairman Ekeus' approach and reject any establishment of a timetable for determining whether Iraq has complied with UNSCR 715. There must be a sustained period of unquestionable, complete compliance with the monitoring and verification plans.

The "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq permit the monitoring of Iraq's compliance with UNSCRs 687 and 688. Over the last 2 years, the northern no-fly zone has deterred Iraq from a major military offensive in the region. Since the no-fly zone was established in southern Iraq, Iraq's use of aircraft against its population in the region has stopped. However, Iraqi forces have responded to the no-fly zone by stepping up their use of land-base artillery to shell marsh villages.

Indeed, the ongoing military campaign against the civilian population of the marsh villages intensified during the beginning of March. A large search-and-destroy operation is taking place. The offensive includes the razing of villages and large-scale burning operations, concentrated in the triangle bounded by An Nasiriya, Al Qurnah, and Basrah. The magnitude of the operation is causing civilian inhabitants to flee toward Iran,

as well as deeper into the marshes toward the outskirts of southern Iraqi cities.

In northern Iraq, in the vicinity of Mosul, there is both Iraqi troop movement and some increase in the number of troops. Iraqi intentions are not clear and we are watching this situation closely.

The Special Rapporteur of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, Max van der Stoel, presented a new report in February 1994 on the human rights situation in Iraq describing the Iraqi military's continuing repression against its civilian populations in the marshes. The Special Rapporteur asserts that the Government of Iraq has engaged in war crimes and crimes against humanity, and may have committed violations of the 1948 Genocide Convention. Regarding the Kurds, the Special Rapporteur has judged that the extent and gravity of reported violations places the survival of Kurds in jeopardy. The Special Rapporteur judged that there are essentially no freedoms of opinion, expression, or association in Iraq. Torture is widespread in Iraq and results from a system of state-terror successfully directed at subduing the population. The Special Rapporteur repeated his recommendation for the establishment of human rights monitors strategically located to improve the flow of information and to provide independent verification of reports.

The United States continues to work closely with the United Nations and other organizations to provide humanitarian relief to the people of northern Iraq. Iraqi government efforts to disrupt this assistance unfortunately persist. We continue to support U.N. efforts to mount a relief program for persons in Baghdad and the South, provided that supplies are not diverted by the Iraqi government. We have stepped up efforts to press for the placement of human rights monitors for Iraq as proposed by the U.N. Special Rapporteur. We also continue to support the establishment of a U.N. commission to investigate and publicize Iraqi war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other violations of international law.

The Security Council most recently addressed Iraqi sanctions at its March 18, 1994, regular 60-day review of Iraq's compliance with its obligations under relevant resolutions. At that meeting, Security Council members were in agreement that Iraq is not in compliance with resolutions of the Council, and that existing sanctions should remain in force, without change.

The sanctions regime exempts medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the U.N. Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The Sanctions Committee also continues to consider and, when appropriate, approve requests to send to Iraq materials and supplies for essential civilian needs. The Iraqi government, in contrast, has maintained a full embargo against its northern provinces and has acted to distribute humanitarian supplies only to its supporters and to the military.

The Iraqi government has so far refused to sell $1.6 billion in oil as previously authorized by the Security Council in UNSCRs 706 and 712. Talks between Iraq and the United Nations on implementing these resolutions ended unsuccessfully in October 1993. Iraq could use proceeds from such sales to purchase foodstuffs, medicines, materials, and supplies for essential civilian needs of its population, subject to U.N. monitoring of sales and the equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies (including to its northern provinces). Iraqi authorities bear full responsibility for any suffering in Iraq that results from their refusal to implement UNSCRs 706 and 712.

Proceeds from oil sales also would be used to compensate persons injured by Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has received about 2.3 million claims so far, with another 200,000 expected. The U.S. Government has now filed a total of eight sets of individual claims with the Commission, bringing U.S. claims filed to roughly 3,000 with a total asserted value of over $205 million. In addition, the U.S. Government intends to submit this summer numerous corporate claims filed by American corporations and is currently reviewing over 180 claims by U.S. businesses for possible submission to the UNCC. The asserted value of U.S. corporate claims received to date is about $1.6 billion.

During the week of March 21, 1994, the Commission's Governing Council adopted decisions on how to allocate future funds among different claimants and how to ensure that payments made to claimants through national governments would be made in a timely, fair, and efficient manner. Meanwhile, a panel of commissioners began to work on the first set of individual claims for serious personal injury or death. The panel is expected to report its find-

ings to the Governing Council in its spring meeting, scheduled for May 1994.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 778 permits the use of a portion of frozen Iraqi oil assets to fund crucial U.N. activities concerning Iraq, including humanitarian relief, UNSCOM, and the Compensation Commission. (The funds will be repaid, with interest, from Iraqi oil revenues as soon as Iraqi oil exports resume.) The United States is prepared to transfer to a U.N.-managed escrow account up to $200 million in frozen Iraqi oil assets held in U.S. financial institutions, provided that U.S. contributions do not exceed 50 percent of the total amount contributed by all countries. We have arranged a total of about $113 million in such matching contributions thus far.

Iraq still has not met its obligations concerning Kuwaitis and third-country nationals it detained during the war. Iraq has taken no substantive steps to cooperate fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), as required by UNSCR 687, although it has received more than 600 files on missing individuals. We continue to work for Iraqi compliance.

Examples of Iraqi noncooperation and noncompliance continue in other areas. For instance, reliable reports indicate that the Government of Iraq is offering reward money for terrorist acts against U.N. and humanitarian relief workers in Iraq. The offering of bounty for such acts, as well as the commission of such acts, in our view, constitute violations of UNSCRs 687 and 688. In the latest series of attacks on the international relief community, there were two incidents in which members of the U.N. Guard Contingent in Iraq were shot and seriously wounded in March 1994.

As I stated in my last report to you on this issue, Iraq can rejoin the community of civilized nations only through democratic processes, respect for human rights, equal treatment of its people, and adherence to basic norms of international behavior. Iraq's government should represent all Iraq's people and be committed to the territorial integrity and unity of Iraq. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) espouses these goals, the fulfillment of which would make Iraq a stabilizing force in the Gulf region.

I am grateful for the support by the Congress of our efforts.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Remarks at a Rally for Health Care Reform in Minneapolis, Minnesota
April 8, 1994

Wow! What a crowd. Thank you for coming this morning. Thank you for supporting health care. I want to thank Mary Ellen for that wonderful speech. She really left nothing for me to say. But she and the nurses of Minnesota have my undying gratitude for this wonderful rally and for their commitment to your health care and to the future of American health care. I want to thank Senator Wellstone and Congressman Sabo, who's done a wonderful job in his new leadership position, helping us to get a budget through that will drive down the deficit and still increase investment in the things that help America to grow and prosper. I thank you, Mayor Sayles, for being here. And I want to thank the others in the audience who are good friends and supporters of mine, especially Congressman Bruce Vento, who is also a strong supporter of health care reform; your secretary of state, Joan Crowe; your State treasurer, Mike McGrath; my good friend Skip Humphrey, your attorney general; and the Mayor of St. Paul, Norm Coleman. Thank you all for being here. I also couldn't come to Minneapolis today without saying a special word of gratitude for the extraordinary service being rendered to the United States of America under what you now know are difficult circumstances by our Ambassador to Japan, Vice President Fritz Mondale.

I am honored to be here today under the sponsorship of the nurses of Minnesota. I thank them for doing this. I also want to say that

I'm very grateful for the people from Heightman Properties, who made it possible for us to meet inside instead of outside today. At least for me, it's not springtime yet. The remarks that Mary Ellen made in introducing me speak more eloquently than I ever could to what millions of American nurses know are the facts of life in health care in this country.

I ran for President because I thought that Washington had become a place where there was too much rhetoric and too little reality, where every statement that every person made was automatically pushed to its ultimate extreme: "The Government can do nothing; you're on your own," or "The Government can do everything; there's nothing for you to do." But real people and real life want us to come together as a people and figure out how to deal with our problems and seize our opportunities. And we have done our best there, in other words, to give the care to America's public life that the nurses of Minnesota give to their patients every day.

If you look at what's happened in the last year, there has been a pretty big change in the way things work in Washington. For a dozen years people talked about the deficit, and the national debt tripled. Well, last year this Congress, working with me, adopted a budget that brought the deficits down, interest rates down, has helped to create 2.5 million new jobs in this economy, more than were created in the previous 4 years. We're on the way.

The Congress is on a record pace to adopt a new budget which, if it is adopted, will eliminate 100 Government programs, cut 200 others but increase spending in education, in Head Start, in defense conversion, in the new technologies for the 21st century, in educating and training our people, and give us the first 3 years of declining Government deficits since Harry S. Truman was the President of the United States of America.

Already this year, the Congress has passed an education bill called Goals 2000 which for the very first time in the history of this country establishes national standards for world-class education and promotes the kind of grassroots reforms that Minnesotans have been experimenting with for a decade to see that we meet those standards everywhere in the country for all of our children.

And when the Congress comes back, they will take up a bill designed to help all the young people who don't go to college to at least get a year or two of further training after high school so they, too, can have good jobs and good skills in the global economy. And they will take up a bill that will completely reorder the unemployment system to make it a reemployment system, because people often don't get the job they lose back anymore; they have to find new jobs. And now, from the first day an American is unemployed, he or she should be eligible from day one for new training and new job search and new opportunities. We're going to change that unemployment system this year.

The Congress will take up a crime bill designed to make us not only tough but smart, for a change, with crime. It puts another 100,000 police officers on the street in community policing in models that have proven—proven—effective at lowering the crime rate. It takes 28 kinds of assault weapons off the streets and out of the hands of gangs. And if we do it the right way instead of the wrong way, the Congress will pass a bill increasing penalties for violent offenders so that we recognize that a relatively small number of our fellow citizens create a very high percentage of the seriously violent crimes. We have more people behind bars, as a percentage of our population, than any country in the world, and yet we continue to let the wrong people out from time to time. It's time we found alternatives to imprisonment for young people and kept the people behind bars who should stay there. We can do that if we do it intelligently.

Now, why is this happening? It's happening partly because people like Paul Wellstone and Martin Sabo and Bruce Vento last year were willing to risk their political necks to make tough decisions, to stop talking about problems and start doing something about them. But it's happening also because the American people say, "Look, we are tired of gridlock. We are tired of paralysis. We are tired of rhetoric over reality. We want you all in Washington to conduct your business the way we conduct our business at home: identify the problems, identify the opportunities, seize the opportunities, and beat back the problems. Show up for work every day." It's pretty simple what our strategy is: get people together, get things done, move the country forward, give people the chance to live up to their potential.

And now we are being called upon to face one of the greatest challenges of this age. For

decades and decades, the American people have been denied something that every other advanced country provides to its citizens, the security of knowing that they have good health care that is always there. Every other country with which we compete with an advanced economy has solved this problem. Only the United States, time after time after time after time, has found it impossible to do. For 60 years, whenever we came to the point when it looked like we could deal with the health care problems, at times when it was much simpler than it is today, when the money at stake was much lower than is at stake today, always, always fear overcame hope, entrenched interest overcame the public interest. Today I can tell you that we are going to make 1994 different. We can provide health security for all Americans this year, and I believe that we will.

My fellow Americans, in Washington this may look like a partisan issue, but out here on Main Street it isn't. Democrats and Republicans and independents all get sick. They all lose their jobs. They all lose their health insurance. There are 39 million Americans who don't have any health insurance now for a whole year. In any given year there are 58 million Americans at some time during the year, more than one in 5 of us, who will be without health insurance.

There are 81 million of us, more than one in 4, who are in families where we've had someone with what the insurance companies call a preexisting condition, a child with diabetes, a mother with breast cancer, a father who had a premature heart attack, people who have to continue working but who either can't get insurance, pay more than they should, or can never change the job they're in because someone in their family has been sick.

There are 133 million Americans who have lifetime limits on their insurance policies, so if, God forbid, they should give birth to a child with a serious illness they could run out of health care at the very time they need it the most.

There are people who change jobs in an era when—look at all these young people in this audience today—the average 18-year-old will change work seven or eight times in a lifetime. And yet it is usual in America for people to have to wait months and months and months to get health insurance coverage.

The good people of Minnesota know we can do better. You know that if there is a Mayo Clinic which can provide world-class health care at lower cost than many Americans pay for something which at least you could say is not better and they wish were as good, we can do better. You know that there is no reason in the wide world to permit Americans to be in this condition, to permit most Americans—those who don't work for secure big companies or the Government, I don't care who they are, are just an illness or an economic failure away from losing their health care.

And we now have an economy in which we're desperately trying to preserve life in rural America, and more and more and more, there are no doctors in rural America. I was in rural North Carolina the other day, and I met a woman physician who told me she had worked for months on end over 100 hours a week. And she was now in her slow season where she was down to 80 hours a week because there are no doctors. We know we can do better than that. We know we can.

So the question is, why haven't we done it? Well, there are a lot of people who don't trust the Government in America to do anything. They think we'd mess up a one-car parade. [*Laughter*] And frankly, from time to time, I've been in that crowd, and so have you. We do not propose—there's not a single solitary proposal in the Congress that would have the Government take over the health care providers of this country. And don't you believe that. We've got the best doctors, the best nurses, the best health care providers, the best medical research, the best medical technology in the world. What we also have is the absolutely worst financing system for health care in the world. It is the way it is financed that is killing us.

For all the people who tell you that if we reform health care it will make it more bureaucratic, let me just ask you, go talk to one doctor and ask a doctor how much time the people in his or her clinic spend on the telephone to insurance companies talking to employees who don't know a lick about health care, trying to get approval for a procedure which is obvious and clear. Ask a nurse, ask any trained nurse who works in a clinic or a hospital how much time he or she spends filling out paper instead of taking care of patients because of the system we have.

It is conservatively estimated that we spend at least a dime on a dollar more on the administrative cost of health care than any other nation

in the world. That is $90 billion we spend, because we have 1,500 separate companies doing insurance plus the Government doing Medicare for the elderly and Medicaid for the poor, writing thousands and thousands of different policies, insuring zillions of small groups of people, finding out—with all these hundreds of thousands of paperworkers in insurance companies and hospitals and in clinics—who's not qualified, who's not covered, what you can and can't reimburse for. Nobody else does this.

So we can't figure out how to cover all of our people, how to give people job security through health care security when we know they're going to have to change jobs. But we can figure out how to spend $90 billion to hire people for the very frustrating work of second-guessing every decision the doctor and nurse makes and pushing paper around all day long. It is wrong, and we can do better.

You heard Senator Wellstone say so eloquently that what we have to do is provide coverage for all Americans. He favors a single-payer system; I favor guaranteed insurance. You can argue it flat around, depending on the experience of the two main models we have, Canada and Germany. But I'll tell you one thing, both of them have lower administrative costs, less paperwork, more freedom to practice medicine, more efficiency, and people have health care.

People should have insurance that they can never lose, not when they change jobs, not when they get sick, not when they're self-employed, and not when they get older. And they should have insurance that provides the right to choose their health care providers. I get tickled when these people attack all of us that are trying to change the health care system. They say, "Oh, they're going to ration health care." "Oh, they're going to take your choices away." My fellow Americans, more than half the people in America today who are insured in the workplace don't have a choice about their health care plan or their doctor. Ninety percent of the businesses that are providing health insurance who have 25 employees or less have no choice. And to be fair to them and to the insurance companies, they can't afford it under the present system. They're doing the very best they can under the present system. It is not a bunch of evildoers out there trying to keep people sick and insecure; it is a badly broken system. That is what is wrong, and we can do better.

Under our proposal, every American family, every year—every year—would have access to at least three choices. You could have access to an HMO of your choice or a professional provider organization of your choice or the right to choose your own doctor and continue fee-for-service medicine or the right to have a guaranteed health managed plan and still have the right to opt out when you want it for a specialist of your choice or your own doctor. Everybody would have those choices. And they would all be more affordable for most Americans than what they're stuck with now. We can do that if we had a system that was rational.

Choice is important, but you can't get there unless you change the rules of health care finance. If you want to have a system that works, you can't have people denied coverage or charged more because of preexisting conditions. What difference does it make? I have a stake as an American citizen in seeing you as a successful, effective worker, able to change jobs, able to grow in your job even if, God forbid, your spouse should get cancer or your kid should have a serious illness. That is my interest in your future. We all share that.

Insurance used to be that way. Everybody threw in; everybody paid; the risk was broadly spread. We can't have waiting periods anymore before there's coverage. We shouldn't have lifetime limits. We shouldn't deny coverage to people who need it most. And we shouldn't deny coverage by charging more for older people rather than younger people.

Let me tell you, we live in a world today where people are going to be losing their jobs well into their fifties and sixties and still have to find new jobs. I met a 59-year-old man the other day who worked for over 30 years in the defense industry, and because of the end of the cold war and the reduction of defense spending—which virtually all of us support and thank God for the opportunity to have a more peaceful world—this good man lost his job. He had to find a new job; he needed retraining. He was, thankfully, hired by a hospital for a rewarding job. But there are lots of people like him who will not be hired because the small businesses who could hire them, who know they're reliable workers because they're older, they're settled, they're experienced, also know that they will drive up their health insurance premiums because of their age. We do not need that; we cannot afford that.

We have a bizarre system in this country when, because of certain training and other problems, a lot of young people are discriminated against in the job market. They're told, "Well, you've got to have experience before we hire you." How do you ever get experience if you don't get a job? And then you have a lot of older people who don't get hired because even though they've got worlds of experience, their insurance is too high. We can overcome both of those things.

Another big problem for insurance is that small businesses and self-employed people pay, on average, 35 percent more than larger businesses and governments do because they have no bargaining power. So we have to reform that, too. We have to go back to what is called community rating, old-fashioned insurance, put people in big pools, spread the risk broadly, let us all share that. And then small businesses and self-employed people have to have the right to band together in buying co-ops so that they can get the same deal that those of us who work for the Federal Government do. I want for you what I've got and what we take for granted in Washington.

Now, there are a lot of people who say it's not fair to require all employers and employees to contribute to their own health care if they don't do it now. They say they can't afford it. But let me just remind you of this: When people in this country get real sick, they do get health care. It's too late; it's too expensive; they show up at the emergency room, then they pass the cost along to all the rest of us and our health care bills go up. What about the small businesses all over this country who are in competition with other small businesses? They cover their employees, and their competitors don't.

Nine of ten Americans who have health insurance that is private get it at work. Eight in ten Americans who don't have any health insurance at all are in working families. I think everybody should do their part, and I know we can do it without hurting small business. Our plan has discounts for small businesses, recognizing that not all can afford to pay as much as others. We know that that happens. Our plan gives 100 percent deductibility for self-employed people. Did you know that if you're self-employed in this country today, you can't deduct the entire cost of your health policy, but if you work for somebody else, you can? That's crazy. We fix that. We are not going to hurt small business; we're going to help small business by controlling the exploding cost of health care and giving people a chance to get affordable health insurance.

And finally, let me say, I saw this up here on the—one of the wonderful signs. Our plan protects and preserves Medicare, but it also provides a prescription drug benefit and long-term care benefits to elderly people. And that is also very important. Let me tell you, folks, the fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. Many of them are bright, active, and vigorous. They don't want to be forced into a nursing home just because they may not be able to get along all on their own. We ought to reward their children who are willing to care for them at home and help them to get some respite care, help them to deal with these crises. We ought to reward the community providers who are willing to help elderly people stay in their communities.

And there is ample evidence that providing help for prescription medicine will save money immediately in the health care system by reducing hospitalization, especially for elderly people but also for the nonelderly, and strong evidence based on population trends that over the long run we are going to have to do something to help people deal with this long-term care crisis within the family and within the community. We cannot afford only to have nursing homes as an option, even though we need them where they are appropriate. We have to think of other things as well.

Now, I have been, in the last week, in North Carolina doing a health care forum in which I talked to people about health care and crime and other issues in Virginia and Tennessee and in Texas. Then yesterday I was down in Kansas City, and we talked to people in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma. And I'm here tonight to do one of these. Let me tell you what I find. I find that people really would like to know more about all these programs. They'd like to know honestly what the problems are. They know that there are tough decisions to be made. If this were an easy issue, somebody would have done it already and said, "Hey, vote for me. I solved this problem." This is a hard problem. That's why it's been pushed to the back.

But I think you hired me to deal with the hard problems. So we're trying to deal with them. And what I want to ask you today, all

of you here, these fine nurses who have endorsed what we're trying to do and all the rest of you, tell the Members of your congressional delegation to tone down the rhetoric and open their hearts and their eyes and their ears and listen and talk and explain this thing and work through the problems. And don't use this as yet another opportunity to take a proposal and push it to the ideological extremes, forgetting all about the reality of the tens of millions of people's lives that are at stake here. I plead with you.

Your wonderful State has been very good to me, from the time I came here in the primary when I just had a handful of friends, all the way through the general election. You've been wonderful to my wife when she's been out here on her health care crusade. You have been good to us, and I thank you for that.

But I ask you, tell the Members of your congressional delegation, without regard to their party, that you want this dealt with and you want it done now. We know enough; we know as much as we're ever going to know. And the longer we put it off, the worse it's going to be. It's going to be like an ingrown toenail. [*Laughter*] It will not get better. This is a part of our growing and maturing as a nation, deal with the problems while we can deal with them, don't just let them get worse and worse and worse.

This is an opportunity for us to come together across regional and racial and income and party lines to do something that is good for America. All of our jobs are at stake, all of our health care at stake, our children are at stake, our parents are at stake. This need not be an issue that divides us.

But we are going to have to have a clear message from the American people that it will not be tolerated to do nothing, to walk away, to be divided, to have hot air, to turn it into a political issue. Tell the American people. Tell the Congress you want us to act and act now.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:25 p.m. in the Crystal Courtyard at the IDS Tower. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Ellen Imdieke, president, Minnesota Nurses Association, and Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton of Minneapolis.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Minneapolis
April 8, 1994

Japan and Rwanda

The President. I wanted to mention a couple of things today. First, this morning, pretty early, I had a conversation with Prime Minister Hosokawa in which he told me that he was going to resign and that he hoped it would help the cause of political reform. He said he was very proud of the work that he had done in his term as Prime Minister in trying to promote reform within Japan and in trying to reform Japan's relationships with the United States and that he intended to keep working on that and that he hoped that I would continue to work on the Japanese-U.S. relationship with his successor.

I told him that I was personally very sorry to see him step down, that I thought he had provided amazing leadership to the people of Japan, and that he had made them believe in the possibility of change and that it could help the people. And I thanked him specifically not only for his work in political reform but for opening the Japanese rice market for the first time in history and for engaging us on a lot of other issues and for his support in Korea and in a number of other areas. It was a good conversation, and I'm very grateful to him for that, for what he did.

Let me just mention one other thing, if I might. I called today the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and my National Security Adviser and had extended conversations with all three of them about the situation in Rwanda. And I want to mention it only because there are a sizable number of Americans there, and it is a very tense situation. And I just want to assure the families of those who are there that we are doing everything we possibly can to be on top of the situation, to take all appropriate steps to try to assure the safety of our

citizens there. But it is a difficult situation, and we should all know that.

Japan-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, there are some people, even within the administration, who feel that this really marks a very bad turn for U.S.-Japanese trade talks and economic policy. There's been little progress until now, and now there is even less hope that it can be concluded successfully.

The President. I'm just not sure. We certainly don't intend to change our economic policy or our trade policy. But one of the problems that the Prime Minister had was that the coalition that he heads, as presently constituted, contains a small minority that can, in effect, veto what a majority of the coalition might want on economic reform. So while I think clearly he was as committed to the kinds of changes in the modernization of Japan's economic policy as any person who has ever headed that government, I think what he hopes is that in the end there will be a realization, without him, that there must be a majority coalition for change.

So I think what we're going to have to do, frankly, is to stick with our policy and then see how it shakes out in Japan, how it works itself out. They're going to have to work that out.

Q. But Mr. President, in the past we've been pretty hard on Japan. In the last year or so we've been very rough on them. When the talks broke down, you said you didn't want to paper over differences with rhetoric. Do you think there's a chance maybe we were a little too hard on Japan and it might be a time to kind of step back and let this kind of settle?

The President. Well, I don't—those two things are not inconsistent. I think we should stick with our policy and be firm about it. We also tried to support Japan in many ways. And as I said on my trip there, I think that our policy is in the best interest of the Japanese. A more open Japanese market means that the Japanese citizens won't have to pay almost 40 percent more for their consumer goods than they otherwise would. And I think it means more jobs and a more prosperous economy in Japan, and I think we should keep pushing for that. But I think plainly the Japanese are going to need a little bit of time to constitute a new government.

The United States-Japanese relationship is a complicated one in the sense that it has many legs. It has a security aspect, a political aspect, an economic aspect. But I do not expect there to be a marked deterioration in our relationships with that country. We're too important to each other and to the rest of the world.

Q. With Prime Minister Hosokawa stepping down, is there a sense in your White House that the administration is going to have to start from scratch with Japan on trade? It's a whole new picture now.

The President. I don't think so. I don't think so. We started, interestingly enough—it's easy to forget now, but the agreement itself, the framework agreement was negotiated with Mr. Miyazawa before he left office, with the concurrence of at least a sufficient number of the people in his government in the LDP, which would normally be thought of as more resistant to these sorts of changes. And we have kept up—we have had a good relationship, our administration has, with a number of the Japanese political leaders in this coalition. And we'll just have to see what comes out of it.

But I would not assume that the cause of economic and political reform will suffer an irrevocable setback. If you listen to the Prime Minister carefully in his public statement, he made it clear that while there were these personal questions which were raised which he took, I think, to use his words, personal and moral responsibility for, he also talked about the importance of having an effective governing coalition and the need for the reform movement to come to grips with its internal contradictions.

So I wouldn't write the epitaph of change too quickly here. I think Mr. Hosokawa believes that he may be able to continue to push for it and be a force for it, and I think he believes that we may wind up with a Japanese government with a little more capacity to change in some areas than perhaps the present coalition does. We'll just have to wait and see.

Q. Might it complicate the situation with North Korea and with China? You've got some big decisions regarding Asia in the next 2 months.

The President. Well, we do. My belief is that any successor government will keep working closely with us on North Korea and keep in close touch with us on China and keep working with us with China on North Korea. I believe

that will happen. I would be surprised if that did not happen.

Bosnia

Q. Which way are we going on Bosnia right now?

Q. The Perry way or the Christopher way?

The President. We're going—no. Let me just say, I think that's a great overstatement. I talked to both of them in each of the last few days about a number of other issues. But I don't think that there ever was a real difference between them. And our Government position is clear, and we'll keep trying to work for peace in Bosnia. We'll make our air forces available as part of the NATO strategy, as part of the UNPROFOR strategy to protect the forces that are there.

They were both trying to say in different ways that we might—we certainly wouldn't rule out the use of our efforts around Gorazde but that there is a process that triggers those efforts, which you know well and which has to be followed before we can bring our force into play. So I do not believe there is a difference between the two of them and I—frankly, my instinct, having talked to both of them at some length, is that there never was a difference between the two of them. So we are together. We have the same policy we always had, and we're going to keep trying to make it work.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:36 p.m. at the Marquette Hotel.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Resignation of Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan

April 8, 1994

The President spoke with Prime Minister Hosokawa of Japan today at 9:40 a.m. for approximately 12 minutes. The President conveyed his regret at the Prime Minister's decision to resign and commended him for his commitment to political and economic reform in Japan. The President expressed his hope that the process of reform would continue in Japan. The President stated that he is confident that our strong bilateral relations with Japan will continue.

The President told Prime Minister Hosokawa, "I am confident that you will always be viewed as an historic Prime Minister who made great strides in helping Japan in a period of transition. You gave your people the courage to change."

The President intends to work closely with the new Prime Minister to improve the economic relationship with Japan and to implement fully the framework agreement, which remains a high priority and is very much in the interests of both countries.

Remarks in a Town Meeting on Health Care Reform in St. Paul, Minnesota

April 8, 1994

Angela Astore. Welcome to the Twin Cities and our town hall meeting. And thank you for this unique opportunity to answer questions about your health care program.

The President. Well, thank you for giving me the chance to do it. And I want to thank the people who are joining us from Milwaukee and Detroit and Sioux Falls, too.

Ms. Astore. We'd like you to start off the program perhaps with some opening remarks.

The President. I'll do that.

Randy Meier. We turn it over to you.

The President. Thank you.

First, let me say, I came here to Minneapolis late last night, and I started the day off with a rally for health care sponsored by the Nurses

Association of Minnesota. Over 2 million nurses in the American Nurses Association have endorsed our health care plan. And that's especially important to me because I started out my interest in health care because my mother was a nurse. And then many years ago when I started out in public life, I was an attorney general, and one of my jobs was to try to ensure good care within our nursing home system in my State. Then as a Governor, I had to worry about health care for the poor through the Medicaid program, something Minnesota and every other State has wrestled with.

About 4 years ago, a long time before I even thought I'd be running for President, I agreed to take a look at the health care system for the Nation's Governors to see what we could do about it. And at that time, I talked to literally 900 health care providers, doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, paramedical workers of all kinds, and a lot of business people and health care consumers, people in every kind of medical problem you can imagine. I became convinced then that unless we had a national solution to a lot of our health care problems, we wouldn't be able to solve them; that no State, even the most progressive State, could solve all the problems of the health care system without a national solution.

And let me just briefly say what I think the issues are, and a lot of them will be represented by people who are in our four audiences tonight. First of all, 39 million Americans don't have health insurance at all, ever, during the year. And about another 100,000 a month are losing their health insurance permanently. Secondly, at any given time in this Nation of about 260 million people, 58 million people won't have health insurance at some time during the year. Third—and it gets worse as we go along here—about 81 million of us live in families with so-called preexisting conditions, a child with diabetes, a mother with cancer, a father who had a heart attack early but still had to go back to work. Those families either can't get insurance, pay very high rates, or can never change their jobs because if they change jobs, they won't be able to get insurance in their new jobs. Fourth, small business people and self-employed people who have health insurance pay on the average 35 percent more than those of us who are insured who are government workers or who work for bigger business. And 133 million of us have health insurance policies with lifetime limits, which means that if someone in our family should get real sick, we could run out of our insurance just at the time we need it the most.

In addition to that, we're spending 40 to 50 percent more of our national income on health care than any other country in the world. The cost of health care to State government and to the Federal Government is exploding at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. All the things I'd like to do for you as President, in terms of investing more in education and training and new technologies for the 21st century, are limited by how much we have to put into health care every year to pay more for the same health care.

There are lots of other problems. We have tens of millions of Americans with disabilities—some of them are here—who could work, who could be self-supporting, who get no help for long-term care in their homes, and who can't get health insurance if they go to work. We have older people on Medicare who need help with their medical bills. And if they could get medicine, they could stay out of hospitals and save us money and have a better quality of life, but that's not covered. So the question is, what are we going to do about this? Let me very briefly tell you what I think we should do; then we'll open the floor to questions.

First of all, I'm convinced that we can't solve any of our problems until we deal with the basic one. We can no longer be the only advanced country in the world that doesn't provide health care security to all of our citizens all of the time. If you want to do that, there are only two ways to do it. You either have to have a system where you get rid of insurance all together and have the Government fund it, the way Canada does, or you have to have a system of guaranteed insurance, the way Germany does and several other countries. I advocate—and I'll explain why later—I think we should have a system of guaranteed private insurance with comprehensive benefits, including primary and preventive care which saves a lot of money in the long run, with no lifetime limits, and insurance that you can't lose.

I believe that our system should maintain something that's very important to Americans, which is the choice of doctors and health care plans. More and more Americans are insured in plans that deprive them of any choice of their doctors, and that can be a serious problem. I believe there are ways to control costs and

protect choice. Our plan would guarantee you at least three choices every year.

Third, we have to change insurance practices. We have to make it illegal for people to have their coverage dropped or benefits cut, for rates to be increased just because there's someone in the family with a preexisting condition who's been sick, for lifetime limits to cut off benefits, or for people who are older to be charged more. This is a big deal. The average person's going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime. A lot of people are losing their jobs in their fifties and sixties and have to get new jobs and can't get jobs because no one will give them insurance because their rates are higher.

Fourth, I want to preserve Medicare, which keeps the choice of doctors. But I also want to have Medicare begin to cover prescription drugs, which it doesn't now, and phase in a long-term care program not only for the elderly but for Americans with disabilities.

Finally, I think these health benefits should be guaranteed in private insurance at work. Why? Because it's the simplest way to get to universal coverage from where we are now. Nine out of ten Americans with private health insurance are insured through the workplace. Eight out of ten Americans who don't have any insurance at all are in working families. So the simplest way to cover this is to say the employed uninsured should have their insurance paid for by the employers and the employees. The Government should pay for the unemployed uninsured and should raise a pool of money to provide discounts to small businesses who otherwise couldn't afford health insurance. That's essentially our plan: guarantee private insurance, choice of the doctor, reform insurance procedures, preserve Medicare, have health benefits guaranteed at work.

One last thing—you have to find a way if you want to reform the insurance practices to make it possible for insurance companies to do these things, which means they have to insure all of us in very large pools. And we have to let small business people and self-employed people band together in co-ops so they can bargain for the same good prices that those of us who are insured through big businesses or Government get. That's essentially what we're trying to do in the Congress this year.

Ms. Astore. Mr. President, we're going to start with a couple of questions from our Twin Cities audience.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked for the philosophical arguments in support of the President's plan.*]

The President. Well, compassion is part of my philosophy. But anyway, philosophically, I don't believe the Government can solve all the problems for people, and I don't think you should rob people of their personal responsibilities or their personal choice. That's why I don't have a Government-run plan. It's private insurance. And people who don't have insurance have the responsibility to provide it for themselves.

But I believe philosophically it is wrong for people not to assume responsibilities for themselves and let other people do it. And what's happening today—let me just give you two examples. Self-employed person X decides, "Well, I'm not going to have any insurance." Then they get in a wreck; they show up at the emergency room; they can't pay. They could have had insurance, but they didn't do it. That's fine for them, except they get the care—nobody lets them die, and nobody thinks they should—and then the rest of us pay for it. And that is irresponsible. Another example: Restaurant X and restaurant Y, next together. One covers the employees; the other doesn't. One is fulfilling a responsibility not only to himself and the employees but to the rest of society by not asking us to bear the risk of anybody getting sick; the other isn't. The other has a competitive advantage in business. I don't think that's right.

And the system we have is not an individual responsibility system, it's an irresponsibility system. I don't plan to take over the health care system. I don't want the Government to run it. I think the Government should help to organize the markets so that small business people and self-employed people can afford to have insurance and so that they are not disadvantaged as compared with big business and Government. And I think it is irresponsible for people not to provide for their own health care and irresponsible for the Government not to make it possible for people to do it no matter what their station in life.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if the plan was really about control of health care rather than better service.*]

The President. Well, let me try to answer 2 or 3 of those questions; you asked me 10 at once so—[*laughter*]. The only real tax we have

in this plan—we have to raise funds to pay for the unemployed uninsured, which we're all paying for anyway, folks. When they get sick, they wait until it's too late, it's too expensive. They show up at the emergency room, and we pay. Under our plan we would raise a fund to pay for them and to pay for the discounts on small business from two sources, one, a tax on cigarettes, and the other, a modest assessment on the biggest American companies that will get the biggest windfall from this. That is, most big companies are paying way too much in insurance now to subsidize the rest of us. They'll get a windfall. We ask for a portion of that back to create a fund for discounts for small business and for the unemployed uninsured.

There will be more choice under our plan. This idea that every American today has a choice of doctors is a myth. More than half the American people who are insured in the workplace today don't have a choice. They get one plan and that's it. Ninety percent of the American people who are insured in small businesses with 25 or fewer employees have no choice. Under our plan there will be more choices. That's one of the reasons why so many medical groups have endorsed this plan, not just the nurses but the family practitioners, the pediatricians. Any number of other medical groups have endorsed our plan because they know it guarantees more choice.

Now, if you have a plan today that is better than the one in our bill, you can keep it. In other words, if you have a plan today where your employer pays 100 percent of your health insurance, not 80 percent, and you continue to do that, that's perfectly alright. We don't change that at all.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—individual when you go for universal coverage. If I already have a policy, isn't it true that it will cost people that now pay for insurance more?

The President. No, if you don't pay your premium, if your employer pays all of your insurance now——

Q. They don't pay all of my insurance; I carry family coverage.

The President. Well, the question is whether it will cost you more. It depends on a lot of factors. In all probability, you won't. Not our studies but all the nonpartisan studies that have been done show that more than half the people will get the same or better insurance for the same or lower cost.

By and large, the people who will pay more are people who aren't paying anything now, people who have only very bare-bones coverage now. And young single workers will pay more so that older people can pay less and we can have a large community rating. Otherwise, most other people will pay the same or less.

But if you have a better plan than we require, what this does is put a floor under you. We've got—keep in mind—I don't know where—you know, I understand; I saw those ads putting out all that propaganda, "This is just politics. This is just a power play," and all that. Tell that to these people who are disabled who can't get insurance. Tell that to these old people who choose between medicine and food every month. Tell that to the 100,000 Americans a month who lose their health insurance. Tell that to the farmers and the small business people who insure at 35 and 40 percent higher rates. I mean, this is a bunch of hooey. If people don't agree with me, let them come forward and contest me with their ideas. But I am sick and I think a lot of you must be sick of all this hot air rhetoric and all these pay television ads and all these hit jobs from people who are making a killing from the insurance business that we have today. It is wrong, and we should change it.

Let me just tell you something, I don't go around—I don't mind doing this; I'll do this all night. But it never gets—one of the things I've learned in 20 years of public life is you don't get very far questioning other people's motives. Contrary to what you read, most of the people I've met in public life are honest, well-meaning. They're not crooks, and they're trying to do the right thing. We have differences of opinion. But this health care debate, in my judgment, has really been retarded, in more ways than one—[*laughter*]—by all this motive throwing around we've had. If I had wanted to take on a tough issue, I could have found something else to do with my time. I believe we have to do this. And if we don't do it, you're going to have more people without insurance, more people that can't afford what they've got, and a terrible situation in this country. And that's why I did it. That doesn't mean I'm right, but let's argue about what should or shouldn't be done and not talk about other people's motives. I've even tried to convince the insurance indus-

try I don't want to attack their motives. I just want us to argue about what we should do.

Mr. Meier. Mr. President, I want to direct you to this side of the floor where you can look at that large monitor. I want to give our live satellite audiences a chance to join in. Let's go first to WDIV–TV in Detroit and Carmen Harlan.

Carmen Harlan. Thank you, Randy. They were living the American dream. The Bertolones had two healthy children, a nice home, and their own business. But in a matter of months, their dream life changed.

[*At this point, a videotape was shown about the family's efforts to obtain their insurance company's approval for treatment for Mrs. Bertolone's breast cancer. Ms. Harlan made comments during the film and then introduced Mr. Bertolone.*]

Q. My wife had advanced breast cancer. She was told by a leading bone marrow transplant unit in the country that they had a 25 percent chance of prolonged life extension if she would receive the transplant. Our insurance company deemed the procedure experimental and would not cover the expense. Would women in a similar situation be told the same under your health care plan?

The President. It's an issue I'm very familiar with. As you may know, my mother had breast cancer, and so I've learned a lot about this issue. What we would cover under this health care plan—transplants of all kinds as long as the doctors thought it was an appropriate procedure.

Now, there are some people who still believe bone marrow transplants for breast cancer are experimental, although there's a lot of evidence that it can prolong life among younger women, especially women 50 and under. And the truth is that it will depend upon the doctor's belief that it should be the appropriate course of medical care. But what we're trying to do is to give these decisions back to doctors and their patients who believe it's an appropriate course of medical care. And I think that it is clear that we're moving to the point where most physicians believe that there are circumstances under which it is an appropriate thing to do to give women with breast cancer bone marrow transplants.

But I'm not trying to give you an evasive answer, I'm trying to give you the standard that will be used in the insurance policy: Is it appropriate medical care? Will the doctor believe that? I think that more and more doctors do believe that, so in most cases I think you can look forward to that kind of procedure being covered.

Thank you.

Ms. Astore. Let's bring the audience in Milwaukee into the discussion now.

[*The Milwaukee, WI, moderator introduced a participant who asked about premium increases and the cost effectiveness of requiring a referral for coverage of a visit to a specialist.*]

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that a lot of that referral business is probably because of requirements that the insurance companies have put on the doctors treating this lady. If you talk to any doctor, they'll tell you that more and more and more, they're having to call insurance companies and get permission to practice medicine in advance of doing what they think has to be done anyway. Last night I was down in Kansas City, and I had three doctors in our group there, and that's all they talked about was how much time they were spending getting the approval of insurance companies to do what they knew to do anyway.

You talked about how much your insurance had gone up. Let me say, one of the best things about having a national reform is that you can charge people the same price for an individual policy and a higher price for a family policy, but you would pay that price even if you had to use the doctor enough. That's what insurance used to be. I mean, when Blue Cross first got organized, everybody was lumped in a great big pool, everybody paid the same amount. Some people got sick, and the rest of us paid for that as well, as a hedge against ourselves getting sick. Now we have 1,500 separate insurance companies, thousands of different policies, hundreds of thousands of people working in doctors' offices and hospitals and insurance offices figuring out who's not covered for what. So if you're in a little pool—and this lady, you heard what she said, she has an illness—your rates can go way up. If we're all insured in large pools, then your rates would not go up unduly—just more or less at the rate of inflation—just because you had an illness. That's one of the—this woman would be dramatically advantaged if we had national insurance reform—health care reform.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who suggested combining the best parts of the Canadian and German health care systems.*]

The President. Well, that's kind of what we're trying to do. The Canadian system—in Minnesota, for example, where you're close to Canada, or in Michigan or any of the States that are in our program tonight, there are a lot of people who would like to see the single-payer system that the Canadians have.

The problem is twofold. One is, it would be very difficult to get Congress to agree, in effect, to put all the health insurance business in America out of business and substitute it with a tax. And a lot of people like the lady who asked the second question here would wonder what that would do to their health care plans. Secondly, the Canadian system, in my judgment, has not had quite as much success at controlling costs as the German system has, where all the people pay something, assume some responsibility directly for their health care, and therefore negotiate more vigorously on an ongoing basis to try to hold down the costs of health care.

But let me say from my point of view, sir, to you, there are lots of people in America who are HIV positive who could be working, who could be making a contribution and paying taxes, who have difficulty doing that because they can't get health insurance. But if they were insured in very large pools, they would be able to do so. So I think that one of the most important beneficiaries of this policy will be people who have very serious illnesses that still may permit them to work for long periods of time and be active if they can provide for their own health care needs.

Ms. Astore. Thank you, Milwaukee. We have one more live location to bring into our town hall meeting tonight on health care.

[*The Sioux Falls, SD, moderator introduced a participant who asked about coverage for services by nontraditional medical practitioners.*]

The President. Well, what we do in the health care plan is to require certain kinds of care to be covered. And then that care can be provided in a variety of different ways by anybody who is qualified to provide it. What will happen is that the people who band together in these purchasing alliances will be given any number of choices from which the consumers of health care can choose what kind of health care plan they want. So all consumers will have the option, if they wish, to choose plans that have different kinds of providers, including alternative providers, as you mentioned, to provide various health services. We have to have—everybody by law has a right to have three different kinds of plans, kinds of plans. But what you'll have in most places is the kind of choices that now, for example, Federal employees have. You know, a lot of Federal employees can choose between two dozen different plans. It's amazing. And as a consequence of that you have all different kinds of options, and a lot of providers, including chiropractors, have a chance to provide services to people. That's the way ours would be set up.

Let me go right to the heart of the question because I've got a lot of friends who are chiropractors who have asked me this. We do not specify in the bill as it is presently drawn the services of chiropractors, osteopaths, nurse practitioners, or neurosurgeons for that matter. What we do instead is say, here are the kinds of health care services that have to be offered, let people organize themselves and offer them to the consumers of America.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked how the plan would address increased costs related to malpractice.*]

The President. Our plan does that in two ways. Let me also mention, since we're talking to South Dakota and you've got a lot of rural population, although we do here in Minnesota, too, and in Michigan, the other States that are represented and in Wisconsin, another big problem that we have in my rural State where I'm from is that more and more general practitioners out in the country are reluctant to do things like deliver babies and set simple fractures because of the malpractice problems.

Our bill does two things. One is it sets a limit on the percentage of a malpractice judgment that can be taken by a lawyer, a percentage of the contingency fee. The second thing it does, which I am convinced will have a far more positive impact on insurance rates, is it sets up a system in which the professional associations set up medical practice guidelines for various kinds of cases. And then if the physicians can demonstrate that they follow the guidelines, there is a presumption that the physician was not negligent.

Now, that presumption can be overcome, but it is much harder. And if that happens, we believe that there will be a substantial reduction in the number of frivolous cases in the malpractice area and therefore malpractice insurance rates will go down.

That's been tried in a rural State, Maine, with some considerable success. And I think that it's the best way to go to guarantee lower malpractice fees and still give people a right to go into court when they've genuinely got a gripe.

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

Ms. Astore. Welcome back everyone to "Health Care in the Heartland," our town hall meeting in the Twin Cities with the President.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a videotape about a person's loss of health insurance. A participant then asked about insurance portability and the effect of economic changes and profitability of companies on the funding of the plan.*]

The President. Thank you very much. You know, this is so interesting. Of all these forums that I've done, you're the first person that's asked me that question. And let me try to explain how it would work.

First of all, under our plan, companies would be free to self-insure if they were above a certain size. We now have 5,000 and above. There are some in Congress who think it should be smaller. But what we have is complete portability of benefits so that no family can ever be without benefits. So that if your company goes down and you don't have another job, you just carry your benefits. And for the period in which you're between jobs, this reserve fund that I talked about that we'll set up—the Government basically would provide the reserve to guarantee that your coverage would continue just as if you were still working at the other company. So you would not have been put in the position that you're in now. And it's very important. In addition to people who are in the position that you're in, where your company went broke and you got left with all those bills, there are an awful lot of people who just want to change jobs, but they have to wait for months and months and months, even after they change jobs, before they actually get coverage. So this is a big issue. We need to guarantee—the term of art is portability—complete portability of policies through jobs and through employers. And our system would provide that.

Thank you.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about health benefits for immigrants.*]

The President. Most of those folks, even with very limited English capacity, have jobs. So they would get at the job site a card, a health care card, just like everyone else, which they then would be able to present to their doctor. They would have the opportunity either at work or at a local health clinic to have explained to them what their choices are of the health care plan, and then they would just—they wouldn't have to keep up with a lot of paper or anything, just one card for the family that they could present at the health care clinic when they needed it or at the hospital. So I think that's the way it will work.

Now, in many places where there are a very large number of people whose first language is not English, we will have to expand the outreach activities of the public health clinics for people who are not employed and where there's no one in the family who is employed. And we understand that we're going to have to do that and make some provision for doing that.

Thank you.

Mr. Meier. Mr. President, we're going to join our satellite audience one more time in Detroit and station WDIV.

[*The Detroit, MI, moderator introduced a participant who asked about prescription drug coverage outside of Medicare.*]

The President. Under our plan, every health policy would have to have a prescription drug component which would have the following characteristics. There would be a $250 deductible. In other words, you have to spend up to $250 of your own money on medicine before it would trigger in. And then after that, every prescription would require a 20 percent copay. But there would be a ceiling beyond which you could not spend; it's about $1,000. If your expenditures were over $1,000 a year, then the insurance policy would cover all the prescription drugs that your doctor would require and that your health would require.

So it's a pretty good policy because—now, if you have a better policy now, you can keep it. Keep in mind, if the coverage is better now, you can keep it. But almost no one has coverage

that good today in their health care policy for prescription drugs. And there are a lot of national studies which show that the adequate provision of prescription medicine can actually save money by reducing hospital stays and emergency room visits.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if the President knew about the community health center system in Ontario, Canada.*]

The President. I think that one of the things that will happen if we pass this bill is that you will have more and more health care provided in that way by community-based clinics or comprehensive health centers that have salaried professionals, including doctors. Interestingly enough, we're here in Minneapolis; that's what you have at the Mayo Clinic, right? Everybody concedes that there is no finer health care in the world. And yet I have many people who have been patients at the Mayo Clinic tell me that it is less expensive than what they paid back home for other kinds of care.

So I think that you will see a lot more of that in this country once the health insurance market is organized so that people know they will always be reimbursed for the services they provide. That then permits people to organize these kinds of associations and know that they'll be able to run them without going broke, because they know they'll always have reimbursement.

[*The Milwaukee moderator introduced a doctor and showed a videotape about his clinic. The doctor then asked if the President supported community health centers.*]

The President. Yes, I do, not only for the reasons we just saw in the fine practice that you have but because the community health centers are increasingly providing services to large numbers of people who used to not use them at all. For example, in many of the Southern States of this country, including mine, over 80 percent of all the children in the States get their immunizations through community health centers, because a lot of regular doctor's offices don't do it anymore because of the malpractice problems that were mentioned earlier. So I think it's very important. And our plan has a special provision for funding community health centers at a higher level to try to make sure that these kind of comprehensive services can be provided.

And let me emphasize, too, that in the inner city and in rural areas—we've got South Dakota here, remember, on this television program—if it weren't for community health centers there would be no access to health care, so that people might have insurance but they still wouldn't have any place to go with their insurance. So it's very important.

Thank you for practicing there.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who questioned the cigarette tax.*]

The President. Well, as I said, first of all, let me say if I could figure out how to get enough savings out of this program to pay for it without any tax, that's what I would do. We are going to get dramatic savings out of this program, mostly by having a single form, simpler administration, which will save the taxpayers a lot of money, and those of you who aren't taxpayers who have private insurance, by drastically cutting the amount of administrative overhead in the system.

We cannot, however, provide enough money to do the things that we've been discussing without raising some money. Obviously, I think it is fair to ask the companies that will have the biggest drop in their insurance premiums to give a small portion of that to the fund for small business discounts and for unemployed people.

The reason I think that the cigarette tax is a legitimate place to get funds is that cigarette smoking is the only activity we know of in our society that there is no known safe margin for doing. That is, it's not like alcoholic consumption where, if you're not prone to be an alcoholic, there are safe margins of consumption. We know of no safe measure of smoking. And we also know that several thousand people a year get lung cancer from subsidiary exposure to smoke, when they don't do it themselves. We also know that our society bears a health care burden and cost as a result of the health care consequences of smoking far in excess of the money raised from the cigarette tax. So for all those reasons, I thought since we had to raise some money, that was the fairest way to do it.

[*Following a commercial break, the Sioux Falls, SD, moderator presented a videotape on rural health issues and then introduced a farmer who asked about organ transplants.*]

The President. Yes, sir. We support transplants, as I said, let me restate—particularly organ transplants. We support transplants when they are the recommended medical procedure, and we try to provide ways to make sure that we facilitate that.

Now, let me also say to you since you were introduced in a slightly different way—as a farmer who's self-employed, who has already had a medical problem, who has folks working for you on the farm—farmers, in my opinion, may be the biggest winner in the proposed reform we have because today, believe it or not, self-employed people who buy health insurance, number one, pay exorbitant rates anyway because they're not in big pools. If they've been sick, they pay lots more. And if you're self-employed, you can only deduct 25 percent of your cost of the premium from your income taxes, whereas a business can deduct 100 percent.

Under our plan, you'd be able to buy on an equal basis with others in a much bigger pool, and you would be able to deduct 100 percent of your self-employed premium; which means in almost every case in the country, farmers would be able to insure their farm hands for the time they work for them and their families for less than they're paying just for family insurance today. And you certainly would, because of your preexisting condition.

But let me just say this, I will try to get some more information on the specific question you asked me about encouraging and organizing the whole market for transplants. And I will make sure that we get back to you in the next day or two with a more specific answer to your question.

[*The Sioux Falls moderator introduced a participant who asked about the development of health care infrastructure in small towns.*]

The President. Yes, I'd like to talk about that a little bit. And I'd like to say, first of all, my wife had a wonderful time out there. And I want to thank Senator Daschle for doing such a good job and working on this rural health care issue.

Let me try to explain how this would work, and let me say for the rest of you, a lot of people who live in small towns in rural areas don't even have a doctor in their town anymore. I met in rural North Carolina earlier this week a doctor who told me she was working 110 hours a week and had been for several weeks, but she had just come to her slow season when she could work 80 hours a week. Now, that's a doctor who's going to need a doctor pretty soon, right? [*Laughter*]

Here's what we try to do. Let me briefly run through the things that are in this plan for rural areas: Number one, revive the National Health Service Corps where young doctors can pay for their medical education, which normally leaves them with a big debt, by serving in underserved areas; 7,000 doctors over the next few years doing that. Number two, give doctors and other health care providers who go into underserved areas significant income tax credits as incentives to do it, $1,000 a month for doctors, $500 a month for nurses and other medical professionals for up to 5 years; that's a huge incentive. Number three, give doctors faster writeoffs, tax writeoffs, when they buy modern equipment to put into their clinics in rural areas. And number four, make sure that we've got the technology, the computer technology to connect rural clinics with urban medical centers, so doctors can feel good about the quality of their practice when they're out there and feel like they're giving their patients the kind of care they need. Those are the things that we think will get a lot more doctors and nurses and others into rural America and make a big difference.

[*The Sioux Falls moderator introduced a participant who asked about reimbursement for rural providers under Medicare and Medicaid.*]

The President. Well, for one thing, Medicare and Medicaid are going up right now at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, by far more than inflation and population growth, because primarily of the way the Medicaid program is organized. Under our plan, Medicaid recipients would be put into big insurance pools along with small business people, self-employed people, and larger business people. In other words, they'd be put in these big community pools. And doctors, for the first time, would be reimbursed at the same rate, whether or not they had a Medicaid patient or someone who was privately insured. It would be exactly the same reimbursement. And that would make a huge difference to the physicians. And how would we do that and still save money? Because you'll have competition, you'll have managed competition, which we've seen already in Minnesota

with the work that's been done here. You've had dramatic drop-off in the increase in medical costs here as people have organized themselves into larger groups.

Secondly, under Medicare, we leave it the way it is because so many of the people that I have talked to at AARP and the other groups believe Medicare works and want it left alone. But we do add a prescription drug benefit, and we add a long-term care benefit.

How will rural doctors be able to deal with this? They won't have any more uncompensated care. One of the things that makes Medicare and Medicaid a bigger burden in rural areas is there are an awful lot of uncompensated care in rural areas. Now doctors will be paid something by everybody they treat. And I believe that that will make a big difference to the quality and rewards of the practice of medicine in rural areas.

We can save this money, to go back to your question, by the way we organize the health care markets and by making sure that everybody is reimbursed for all the services that are provided. Then we'll be able to lower the rate of inflation.

Keep in mind, we don't propose to cut Medicare and Medicaid, ma'am. Medicare and Medicaid under our proposal would go up at twice the rate of inflation, instead of 3 times the rate of inflation, which it's going to do if we don't pass national health care reform.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about coverage for mental health care.*]

The President. Yes, it is a very important part of health care reform. Under our plan, some mental health benefits would be included from the beginning of national health reform. That is, whenever—all the States would have until the end of '97 to provide universal coverage. Each State would have that time. From the beginning of the time everybody was covered, there would be significant mental health benefits, much more than most people have under their policies today, both inpatient and outpatient care.

There would not, however, be complete parity, and if you're interested in mental health, you know—parity between the mental health benefits and the physical health benefits until the year 2000, and that's because we don't have accurate cost estimates on how much it will cost, and we have to phase it in. To go back to what some other people had said earlier, we have to know that when we put these things in, that we can pay for them and we're not going to cost the Treasury more than we have.

But there will be quite a significant mental health benefit from the very beginning and much more than most people have today. I think it's very important. I think it's one of the best things about our plan, and I personally believe it will make us a healthier country and will cut down on long-term medical costs if we have the proper kind of mental health.

[*Mr. Meier introduced a participant who asked about the plan's effect on the present Minnesota Care health plan.*]

The President. No, you won't lose money because—and I commend what you've done; I think it's important. But you won't lose money. We estimate that both private insurers and the Government will save money if we go on with national health care reform. And what will happen is if we have the national plan, we'll be able to do some things that at least you're not now doing.

First, everybody will be able to be insured. And secondly, in addition to holding costs down, we'll be able to hold costs down with more choices for health care consumers than you're going to be able to provide unless we have a national plan which reorganizes the insurance markets. So my judgment is you'd be—I would urge you to keep going with your reforms here, to do the best you can and go full out until the Congress acts. But I believe you'd be much better off when the Congress acts.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about coverage for substance abuse treatment.*]

The President. I don't know if I can do a better job of defending it. Some days I don't think I do such a hot job. [*Laughter*] I did my best when we started tonight, but I'm going to try. Let me say—I think you may know this, but I have a brother who is an addict, who is a recovering addict. I know the treatment works. And we have done two things in our administration. One is to require that drug treatment be a part of the benefits, as a part of a general approach to preventive health care. I believe in preventive health care, folks. We spend a ton of money after the cow's already out of the barn door in our health care system. And I like—I mean, I like the fact that we

have the best technology in the world. I like the fact that we can get it. But we can save so much money if we just invest in prevention generally, whether it's mammograms for women or cholesterol tests for people or substance abuse treatment.

In addition to that, although I just presented a budget to the Congress that cuts defense and cuts discretionary domestic spending—that is, not Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security—for the first time since 1969, we increase in our regular budget drug treatment funds by, oh, about 8 or 10 percent, just because I think it is so important. And I will fight very hard for it. I think it would be a big mistake for us to back off of this. There's still an awful lot of people who have alcohol and drug abuse, substance abuse problems in this country. And we can save a bunch of money and a lot of people, more importantly, if we stay with it.

[*The Detroit moderator introduced a participant who asked about prescription drug coverage for senior citizens.*]

The President. Yes, ma'am. Let me explain this again for the benefit of all of our participants here. Older people who are at or below the poverty line are eligible for coverage under the Medicaid program, the Government's program for poor folks. If you're under Medicaid, then you have a prescription drug benefit. But if you're a senior citizen eligible for Medicare, that is, the regular elderly person's health care program, and you haven't spent yourself in poverty, you don't get any prescription drug benefit. But we know that older people are 4 times as likely to use medicine as younger people. And we also know that we save money in our health care system if people who need medicine get it and can therefore stay out of hospitals. I mean, you can spend a year's worth of medicine in 3 days in a hospital.

So what our plan does is to add to Medicare a prescription drug benefit which has a $250 deductible, a 20 percent copay, and I think, a $1,000 ceiling; it has a ceiling, and I think it's $1,000. That is, after you spend $1,000 out of pocket, your insurance then will cover all your medicine from then on.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked about maintaining competition in the health insurance market.*]

The President. First, let me say, I think there has to be some consolidation of the insurance market. To be fair, I've tried to say this over and over again, and sometimes not so well, but I don't think there are any bad people in this drama. We have the best health care in the world. We have the best doctors, the best nurses, the best medical technology, the best medical research. We have the worst health care financing system in the world. It is the world's most expensive. It's estimated by nearly everybody that studies it that we spend about $90 billion a year, which is pretty good money, in clerical work, simply because of the way we're organized.

I think there should be and will be, inevitably, some sort of insurance consolidation. How do we guarantee competition? By requiring that in every group of buyers, every consumer in America have access to at least three different kinds of plans, a fee-for-service plan, a health maintenance organization, a professional provider organization.

They may have access to 24 different specific plans—as I said, the way the Federal Government employees often do today—but we will guarantee that every person always has access to at least three different kinds of plans, including fee-for-service medicine in the old-fashioned way. When you do that, you're going to ensure that there will be more competition than there will be. If we do nothing, the move toward competition, in my judgment, will be just exactly what you say, there will be more and more concentration, more and more managed care but less choice, less quality, and less competition.

[*Ms. Astore introduced a participant who asked if choice of physicians would be limited.*]

The President. No. But let me answer your question directly. First of all, one option you will always have, ma'am, is to continue to pay your doctors as you would now, on a fee-for-service basis. Your premiums might be slightly higher, but they probably still would be as low, if not lower, than they are today because of the way the markets are organized.

In addition to that, you can also join a certain plan, like a certain health plan, and maybe all your doctors aren't members of it; let's say three are, but one of your specialists aren't. You can buy a small premium, which would not be very expensive, which would give you the right also to use that doctor, who would then get reim-

bursed from your plan at the same rate other doctors in the same specialty or the same area would.

So you would be able to keep all your doctors. That would be one of the things you'd have to do. You might have to pay slightly more to do it than you would otherwise pay, but you could keep them all. And in all probability, based on our studies, it would be for the same or less money than you're paying now, if you have a comprehensive plan.

[*Ms. Astore called on the Milwaukee moderator, who introduced a participant who asked about increasing employment opportunity for welfare recipients, listing her education and job skills.*]

The President. My guess is we've already done it. I'll bet you'll have four job offers tomorrow since you've been on television. [*Laughter*] I imagine we probably solved your problem. But let me give you a more general answer. I hope somebody who's watching you will call you and offer a job tomorrow.

First of all, quite apart from welfare, we have to create more jobs in this country. In the last 15 months, our economy has produced 2½ million new jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than in the previous 4 years. So we're creating more jobs. That's the first thing.

Secondly, with regard to welfare, how do you move people from welfare to work? You have to make work more attractive. We, this year, starting in this calendar year, we are lowering income taxes for 16.6 percent, one-sixth, of American workers who make lower wages, to make sure that work will always be more attractive than welfare by saying if you work for modest wages, you'll get an income tax cut.

The third thing we are trying to do is to reform the welfare system itself by helping to create jobs ultimately for people who have training and are able to go to work, if necessary, with some sort of public funding. But let me say, it doesn't apply to you.

But the biggest problem we've got with welfare for a lot of people is that—remember, if you're poor, on Medicaid and on welfare, your children get health care. If you take a minimum-wage job in a business that doesn't have health insurance, you have to give up your kid's health care to go to work. Then you work for a minimum wage and you pay taxes so people on welfare can have health care. It doesn't make any sense. So, the health care issue is an important part of welfare reform.

The answer to this lady's question is she should be able to get a job in a healthy market economy. So we have to create more jobs. Ultimately, for people on welfare who are willing to go to work, if they can't find jobs within a certain specific time, in my judgment, the Government is going to have to work with the private sector to give extra incentives for people to go to work. It's better to have work than be on welfare even if you have to give extra incentives to create the jobs.

[*The Milwaukee moderator introduced a participant who asked about the plan's effect on the Nation's free enterprise system.*]

The President. I think it will do much more good than harm. There will be some job loss in some areas, and there will be some job gain in some areas. And let me explain how and why I think it's the right thing to do.

First of all, the system is entirely private. We require people to purchase insurance. We keep private insurance. We do not abolish insurance and substitute taxes. Secondly, all the health care providers that are now private will continue to be private. So we leave that alone. But if you go to a comprehensive benefit program where you have a single form that the doctor has to fill out, a single form that a hospital has to fill out, a single form that a patient has to fill out, and everybody is clearly covered by producing a card, then all those people who are busily at work trying to figure out who's not covered under what health insurance policy or why the health insurance policy needs to be cut off or why a small pool can't anymore support a person who's got a sick child, those jobs will go down in number dramatically. But we'll have a big increase in jobs in health care providers, people who work in home health, for example.

Some small businesses will pay more because they don't pay anything now or they have very limited policies now. But on average, it will add one to 2 percent to their cost of doing business, and all their competitors will have to do the same thing. And within a few years they'll all be saving so much more because medical inflation will be less.

The Congressional Budget Office is a nonpartisan group that did a study on this. They estimate that on average, within 5 years we'll

be creating many jobs in the small business sector because we'll lower medical inflation and all small business people will be on equal competitive terms.

So I think there will be some job loss, more job gain in the short run in health care, and big job gains over the long run by bringing health costs in line with inflation.

[*Mr. Meier called on the Sioux Falls moderator, who introduced a participant who asked if businesses would still provide health insurance to retirees under the new plan.*]

The President. It would relieve them of some of their responsibilities for paying for the early retirees. And they would be in the retiree pool in our health care program. But I still believe it's good economics because a lot of these companies are paying now 15, 16, 17, 18 percent of their payroll, as compared with the national average of 8 to 8.5 percent of payroll, for health care. And that is undermining their ability to reinvest money and to create more jobs and to make our economy stronger.

Most of those companies that are severely affected by this are companies like automobiles and steel, which had to have huge layoffs through early retirement all during the 1980's to be competitive. In other words, it wasn't a decision they made; it was necessity. And they had contracts which required them to carry these health burdens.

We believe for relatively modest cost we can generate a huge amount of money in these sectors, which are now prospering, to create more jobs and help strengthen the American economy. So we think that it'll be about a wash that we can well afford.

Let me say, sir, that we have had the cost of our plan evaluated by any number of people, including groups that are composed largely of folks that were active in the previous two Republican administrations. And all of them say more or less the same thing, that over the 10-year period our numbers are right. They differ from year to year sometimes, but I think that the cost figures in my plan are good because we've bent over backwards, we've contacted 10 different medical actuarial firms and also had a lot of outsiders look at it. I think the numbers are right.

Ms. Astore. Thank you, Sioux Falls. Mr. President, we have time for one final question here in the Twin Cities. And we'd like you to pick a member of the audience to ask that final question.

The President. Go ahead.

Mr. Meier. Wait, wait, wait, wait. I've got to pull a Donahue here and get up there. [*Laughter*]

The President. Maybe we'll do two if you can do it real quick.

Mr. Meier. Tell us your name and what your question is.

[*A participant asked if the plan would include dental coverage.*]

The President. Yes—we're running out of time. I can't give you the whole details. But the short answer is yes. You'll have to pay some of it, and I'll get you the details.

Go ahead, what's your question? Thank you.

Ms. Astore. Hurry, Randy.

The President. We can do it. We can do it.

Mr. Meier. I'm getting there. Here we go. Your name and what your question is.

[*A participant asked about coverage for his adult handicapped daughter.*]

The President. What's her handicap?

Q. Right now it's a form of scoliosis. She's got a severe curvature; she's had a back spinal fusion amongst other things.

The President. Your daughter would be able to buy insurance as an individual once she becomes an adult, on the same terms as anybody else.

Now, the only way we can do that is if we organize the insurance markets and the buyers so that there are big insurance pools and large numbers of buyers so we can spread the risk of some future illness or problem of hers across a large number of people.

I do want to make full disclosure, because one of the first questions I got was who would pay more under this plan. We would ask young single workers to pay a little more per month than they would otherwise pay so that we'd be able to insure people like your daughter and older workers on affordable terms. I think, again, that's a fair thing because young, single workers want to be older some day, number one, and they're going to be married, they're going to have children, and they might have children that have health problems.

So I think it's a fair thing to do. But that's the way it would work. That's the way, by the

way, other countries do it. And your daughter would be able to get insurance.

Ms. Astore. President Clinton, we're coming to the end of our town hall meeting. We'd like to give you this opportunity to offer some closing remarks.

The President. I just want to make two points after I say thank you to all of you. Thank you to those of you who asked questions and those who couldn't get your questions asked. For those of you in the other sites, if you had a question that didn't get answered, send it to us, and we'll answer it. And those of you that are here, I'll just gather them up while I'm here.

I want to make two points if I might. We can differ about the details of this, but the one thing we have to decide on as a people is, are we going to continue to be the only advanced economy in the entire world that can't figure out how to provide health insurance for all of its people, so that we insure people and pay for them if they are on welfare but we punish working people? Or are we going to solve this problem after talking about it for 60 years now?

The second thing I want to say is this, to go back to a point I made at the beginning. This is a complicated issue. I've tried to shoot straight with you and tell you what the problems are with it. I respect people who have differences of opinion with me on exactly how we should do it.

But what I want to ask you to do is to try to communicate to your Members of Congress, without regard to party, that Republicans and independents and Democrats all get sick, all have kids, all have parents, all have hopes, all have fears, and that it's okay for us to disagree about this in terms of the details, but it is not okay to let another year go by and not deal with it.

And what I ask you to do is not so much to say, "Bill Clinton's right about everything," but to say, "This is a serious problem; we have to deal with it. Please act now." We will not know any more about this next year than we do this year. It's just going to be like an ingrown toenail. It will get worse, not better, if we don't move. So that is what I plead with you to do. Ask your Members of Congress to act now and to work in the spirit of humanity, bipartisanship, and common sense, and let's get this done.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 7 p.m. at the KSTP–TV studio.

The President's Radio Address
April 9, 1994

Good morning. This past week, I traveled across our country because I wanted the American people to hear directly from me about the progress we're making on their behalf and what we still have to do. Last month, our Nation gained 456,000 new jobs, the largest jump in 6 years. That brings the total number of private sector jobs created in this economy during our recovery to 2.3 million. That's twice as many new jobs in the past 14 months than we saw in the previous 4 years. I'm determined to keep building on that strength. Our job is to fix the economy and to give our people tools, like world-class education and health care security, so that they can compete and we can strengthen the great American middle class as we move toward the 21st century.

In my travels this week, people made it clear to me they expect us here in Washington to take care of one job immediately: to confront the crime and violence that are tearing our communities apart. None of our efforts to tackle other problems will work if we fail to address the overwhelming force of crime. It is reducing the sense of freedom the American people have.

If we can't stop people from hurting one another, we can never reduce the burden on our health care system and the fact that we have too much crime, too much violence, and too many people showing up in our emergency rooms. If we can't make our classrooms safe, we can't teach our children. If we don't replace drug money with good jobs and a steady paycheck, our people will never lose their fear and gain hope.

I'm convinced the American people want a crime policy that works without gimmicks and they want our leaders to make it possible for them to take back their streets, their homes, their schools, and their lives. That's why this week I ordered Attorney General Janet Reno and the Housing and Urban Development Secretary, Henry Cisneros, to promptly develop a policy allowing police to sweep public housing so that criminals cannot find shelter in the places they terrorize.

I took this action just hours after a Federal district judge in Chicago declared the Chicago Housing Authority's search policy a violation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution. We have to take some action to permit appropriate law enforcement work to go on in these projects. I have been in the Chicago housing projects, and I know the difference between those that have been swept free of illegal weapons and criminals and those which have not. Just last weekend, 13 people died violently in Chicago, 3 of them in the Robert Taylor Public Housing Project.

All Americans, rich and poor alike, deserve leaders they can rely on to protect their safety. Congress will have a chance to provide that kind of leadership when it comes back into session this Tuesday. The crime bill will be item number one on its agenda. Next week, police officers, mayors, and other community leaders all across our America will come here to Washington to join me at the White House to urge Congress to pass the crime bill. For 6 long years, we've waited for a comprehensive crime law. We shouldn't have to wait any longer.

The crime bill I have proposed to the Congress is both tough and smart. Right now, a small number of dangerous criminals commit a large proportion of the violent crimes because our system doesn't put them away. The crime bill sends a simple message, "three strikes and you're out"; commit three violent crimes, and you go to prison for life. The crime bill will help States build 33,000 more prison cells, along with boot camps for first-time offenders. It will help us to lock the revolving door that swings too freely on serious criminals and give young people a chance to avoid a life of crime.

The bill also will help us put another 100,000 police officers on our streets. More police in community policing settings means not only that more criminals will be caught, it means that there will be less crime. When police walk the streets, know their neighbors, win the respect of local young people, focus on high crime areas, and work with parents and business people, they can actually reduce crime. I have seen it in city after city after city.

Preventing violence from occurring in the first place is also an important part of our crime bill. It encourages young people to stay off the streets, offering employment opportunities, afterschool activities, and good role models who teach strong values. These boot camps and other similar operations will give us a chance to send first-time offenders to a disciplinary setting who might otherwise go free. But they'll also give these young people a second chance to avoid a lifetime of trouble, a chance to learn new discipline and how to behave responsibly.

We're doing more to make the schools safe and to get hard-core drug users into the treatment they need. But telling our kids to say no to drugs is only half the battle. If we want children to grow up to become law-abiding members of society, we have to help them find a place in tomorrow's economy to give them something to say yes to.

You and I both know Government can't do this job alone, nor should it. The most law-abiding societies are not those with the most jails. They're the ones with good jobs, strong families, and strong communities, where the rights of the community are respected, with strong values about helping, not hurting, one's neighbors. Let's face it: In a lot of places in this country, crime, drugs, and violence now fill the spaces where work and family and community used to be. So the job of all Americans is urgent. That's why I'm calling on everyone in Washington to put their partisanship aside. The American people don't want politics or gimmicks; they want us to do something that will work. Well, this crime bill will work. Next week, it's time for Congress to be tough and smart by passing the crime bill when it comes back into session. I hope you'll do your part by asking your Congressmen and Senators to see that the crime bill becomes law.

Finally, let me say just a brief word about a very tragic situation in the African nation of Rwanda. I'm deeply concerned about the continuing violence following the assassination of the President, the Prime Minister, and other officials as well as some of our United Nations peacekeepers. There are about 250 Americans there. I'm very concerned about their safety,

and I want you to know that we're doing all we can to ensure their safety. I ask you to join together this morning in praying for their safety and for a return to peace in Rwanda.

Thanks for your help, and thanks for listening.

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

Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters
April 10, 1994

The President. Today, while negotiations were being held on a cease-fire in Bosnia, the Serbs launched a new attack on Gorazde. These attacks have resulted in heavy casualties and have put United Nations personnel there at risk.

UNPROFOR Commander General Rose requested and received authorization from U.N. civilian authorities to receive NATO close air support. Under existing authority and policy, NATO forces promptly responded. U.S. F–16 aircraft under NATO command attacked at least one target identified by UNPROFOR. French aircraft under NATO are now conducting a damage assessment.

We have said we would act if we were requested to do so. We have now done so, and we will do so again if we are requested. The Serbs should cease their attacks on Gorazde and should pull back. The talks on cessation of hostilities in Bosnia should resume. We were at quite an important point in these discussions when these attacks interrupted the progress of the discussions. And I very much hope that now the attacks will cease, that the Serbs will pull back, that the talks will resume on cessation of hostilities. I have a great deal of confidence in General Rose's determination. We strongly supported his decision, and I applaud the rapid response of the U.N. civilian authorities.

Bosnia

Q. What about Serb retaliation, sir?

The President. Well, I have no reason to believe there will be any. We were retaliating. We—the United Nations made it absolutely clear that there were U.N. personnel in Gorazde, that an attack on the town would be interpreted as a clear violation of the rules. And it happened anyway. General Rose asked for the air support, and civilian authorities approved it in a prompt fashion, and then we supported it.

Q. After the bombing raid, we had reports that there were antiaircraft missiles fired into the suburbs. Do you know——

The President. I can't—excuse me?

Q. ——at the houses.

The President. I can't confirm that at this time.

Q. Mr. President, did you know about the bombing raid before it took place?

The President. We knew that General Rose had asked for it before it took place, yes. With only—it all happened in fairly rapid succession. There was not a long time delay now between when he asked for the support from the civilian authorities and when they gave it. But we've been keeping on top of this, you know. On 2 successive days, Thursday and Friday, I talked with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and National Security Adviser about this. I was kept informed yesterday, and then we talked again this morning. It became clear to me that General Rose would probably ask. And when he asked, I was told, and we were told as soon as Mr. Akashi approved it.

Rwanda

Q. So what do you think is going to happen next, sir? Do you think this is the end of it, or are you fearful that NATO will have to strike again?

The President. I don't know. I think we have to be firm. We have seen in the past that when we have been firm in support of the United Nations mission, that it has tended to further negotiations. That's all we're trying to do, is to further negotiations.

Let me make one other comment, if I might. As you all know, we've been very concerned about the safety of Americans in Rwanda. As far as we know now, the last of the convoys containing all Americans who wish to leave has either passed into Burundi or is about to pass into Burundi.

And I just want to say a special word of thanks and gratitude on behalf of our entire Nation to our Ambassador, Ambassador Rawson, for the remarkable way in which he has handled himself and in which he went about guaranteeing the security and safety of American citizens during this very difficult situation. There may be more to say about that tomorrow. But for now, I just think we all ought to be grateful to him for the role he played in getting our people out to safety.

Bosnia

Q. Do you think this is a one time only attack in Bosnia? Do you think we'll have to use our air power again there?

The President. I think we have to be prepared to do it. But I don't have any reason to believe one way or the other. I'm not hopeful; I'm not skeptical. I just think that—you know, sometimes the command and control is not very tight there, the communications aren't all that tight. This may have been something that happened that was not authorized by any central authority on the part of the Bosnian Serbs. So I just think this is a clear expression of the will of NATO and the will of the United Nations and the UNPROFOR operation there. And it's a clear call to the Serbs to pull back from Gorazde and resume the negotiations.

Thank you very much.

Legalization of Drugs

Q. Do you have a response to the minister who wants to legalize drugs, Mr. President?

The President. I disagree.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in the South Portico at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to U.N. Special Envoy Yasushi Akashi.

Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
April 11, 1994

Q. What can you tell us about the latest air strikes in Bosnia?

The President. That the latest strikes were a direct response to General Rose's request for close air support, that the continued Serb shelling of Gorazde put the U.N. personnel there in danger, and that the air strikes were conducted in strict accordance of existing U.N. policy.

Q. Can you tell us how many aircraft, what type, and what kinds of targets they hit?

The President. They did hit some targets, and you'll be briefed about the details.

Q. Is the U.N. going to defend the people of Gorazde—however you pronounce?

The President. The United Nations is carrying out its mission there, and when they—they're attempting to reassert Gorazde as a safe area, which it has agreed to do. They're encouraging the Serbs to withdraw from the safe area and to resume negotiations and to stop the shelling. And if they are put at risk in the course of doing that mission, they can ask for NATO close air support. That's what they have done, and we have done our best to provide it.

Q. Only the U.N. personnel is our concern?

The President. The U.N. resolution gives NATO the authority to act. We are acting solely under the existing U.N. resolution which has been approved by the Security Council.

Q. Would it be—setting up an exclusion zone around Gorazde like—in Sarajevo?

The President. Well, what the United Nations wants is for the Serbs to stop the shelling and to withdraw and to resume the negotiations. I don't want to compare it exactly to Sarajevo; there are some tactical and factual differences. But that's what they want, and NATO simply responded to the request for air support in carrying out the U.N. mission.

Q. Did you talk to Mr. Yeltsin about this latest——

The President. No, I talked to him last evening, and he was going to be out of pocket today. So we had quite a long talk last night. And I told him that—I explained that this was different from what happened at Sarajevo. There was a clearly existing U.N. policy, the same policy under which we acted when the planes were shot down, you remember, a few weeks ago, but that I thought we ought to have close coordination with the Russians. After all, the Russians are a part of the UNPROFOR delegation

there. They have soldiers on the ground in Bosnia. And we had a good talk. And I think there have been further communications today between the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister and between the Secretary of Defense and the Defense Minister. So we are trying to work very closely with the Russians. They have a critical role to play if we are going to get these peace talks going again. And I hope we can.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. We had quite a good talk, I thought. I explained to him what happened. I think in the beginning he was concerned that he didn't know about it in advance. I explained clearly what happened, that the United Nations asked for this, that Boutros-Ghali the day before had put out a press release supporting this action if the shelling didn't stop, that General Rose had received the appropriate approval from the civilian authority in Bosnia, and that it was an action taken under existing authority, and that indeed I thought that the U.N. had notified all the UNPROFOR members that it would be taken, but that it was not any kind of new or different thing. And when these things occur, there is often not a lot of time. There was just, you know, somewhere between 30 minutes and an hour and a half, I think, the decisionmaking time. I don't know the exact time, but we responded in an entirely appropriate way, I think, under the circumstances.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:19 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a foreign policy meeting. In his remarks, the President referred to U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation on Public Housing
April 11, 1994

Secretary Henry Cisneros. Mr. President, this is Henry Cisneros in Chicago.

The President. Hello, Henry, how are you?

Secretary Cisneros. Good, sir. I'm here with Senator Carol Moseley-Braun and Congressman Bobby Rush and Vince Lane of the housing authority, who's a good friend of yours, and about 200 folks at Progressive Community Church. And we are gathered together to talk about how to deal with the violence that's plagued the Chicago Housing Authority, Robert Taylor, Stateway, and other developments, over the last couple of days.

We're sitting at a table with about 20 guns that were picked up last night in police actions, a very violent weekend that resulted in about 15 shootings and 5 deaths. One 16-year-old was killed last night at Washington Park Homes, here in the area. We're looking at about 20 or so rifles, pistols, automatic weapons that were picked up in police action last night. So this is a very serious circumstance, and the group is very appreciative for your call, sir.

The President. Well, I'm very concerned that—all the efforts that have been made there over the last several years, and I'm glad Senator Moseley-Braun's there; I'm glad Bobby Rush is there; I know you're in his district. And I know Vince Lane remembers the trip that we took into Robert Taylor Homes back in 1991, before I even started running for President. And I'm so worried that all the progress that's been made will be undermined by the court decision. I wonder if some of this violence has not been almost aggravated by the decision. And I'm hoping that you'll be able to find a constitutional solution to this working with the Attorney General.

I know that this bike team effort last night did net a significant amount of guns and other things, and I'm encouraged by what you say. I want to encourage all the citizens who are there that we're going to do everything we can to support them and enable them to have control over their lives and not allow criminals to find shelter in the very public housing communities that they're terrorizing. I think it's very important. I just want to say, you tell me what you think we have to do, and I'll do it. I've seen what can be done there when people can take control of their own destinies. And I think

we owe it to them to do everything we can to give them their homes back.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, we're looking at a strategy that is essentially four elements. And I'll prepare a report for you with the Attorney General and have something on your desk, hopefully, by tomorrow or the next day. But obviously the first piece is to focus on the sweeps and the legality of what can be done to get the sweeps constitutional; secondly, to focus on other security measures, other measures we can take, such as Operation Safe Home and other things we can do; thirdly, to focus on such things as recreational programs this summer, recreational activity, midnight basketball, ballparks, antigang things, youth mentorship—critically important, and the community recognizes that's so; and then finally to focus on the long-term-vision remake of public housing in Chicago. And we've got some ideas about that. And I'll get it all to you in writing. But I just wanted to give you kind of the strategy.

I'm going to ask Senator Moseley-Braun to say a word, if I may, Mr. President.

Senator Carol Moseley-Braun. Good morning, Mr. President.

The President. Good morning, Senator.

[*Senator Moseley-Braun suggested that the public housing problem be addressed by investing money in securing buildings, providing security forces, and creating jobs and opportunity.*]

The President. Thank you. You know, there's some money in the—some significant money, especially in the House version of the crime bill, that would provide for some jobs for young people in high crime areas.

Senator Moseley-Braun. Right.

The President. And that's one of the things that we tried to do in rewriting it over on the House side, was to get some money in there so that we could determine the impact on the crime rate of providing jobs for people. I think—of course, I know you agree with me, what we're going to find is if we can go into some of these neighborhoods and put people to work, the crime rate will go way down.

[*Senator Moseley-Braun voiced support for the legislation and reiterated the need for initiatives to reverse the history of neglect.*]

The President. Thank you.

Senator Moseley-Braun. Thank you again, sir.

The President. Thank you so much.

Representative Bobby Rush. Mr. President?

The President. Yes.

Representative Bobby Rush. Bobby Rush. How are you doing?

The President. Hi, Bobby. Nice to hear your voice, Congressman.

[*Representative Rush thanked the President and called on Congress to assist in finding resources to improve public housing. He then introduced a community leader who listed problems facing residents of public housing and encouraged the President to take a stand.*]

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you for what you said.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, thank you very much.

The President. I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks. As I said, I once came to Chicago and visited the projects with Vince Lane shortly before I declared for President. And I would like to come again. And I do care a lot about what's going on there. And I'm encouraged by this meeting. And I want to thank Secretary Cisneros for so promptly responding to my request and going over there and spending the night and getting in closer touch with the situation. I feel better about it. And I hope we can do some things to help. I believe we can.

Secretary Cisneros. Mr. President, thank you for calling. I'm going to sign off with Vince Lane saying a couple of words to you, and we'll close out. We appreciate your time very much. We know there's things swirling in the world and you've got a busy schedule, so we deeply appreciate your call.

The President. Thanks.

Mr. Vince Lane. Mr. President?

The President. Yes. Hi, Vince.

Mr. Lane. How are you?

The President. Great.

[*Mr. Lane, Chicago Housing Authority chairman, thanked the President for his leadership in sending Secretary Cisneros and involving Attorney General Reno to address the problems in Chicago public housing.*]

The President. Well, thank you, Vince, and thanks for blazing away for us and making people believe that we could actually do something to improve life in public housing. You showed me that it could be done years ago, and I'm

convinced that maybe we can use this court decision as a spur to even do a better job, a more comprehensive job. We're going to do everything we possibly can.

Mr. Lane. God bless you.

The President. Thanks. It's nice to hear your voice.

Goodbye, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you.

NOTE: The telephone conversation began at 10:27 a.m. The President spoke from the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks to Law Enforcement Officers
April 11, 1994

Thank you very much, Officer Williams, if you just keep doing your work, and I'll be glad to carry your notebook anytime. There are a lot of days when you do more than we do up here anyway. [*Laughter*] I want to thank you, and thank you, Earline Williams, for your commitment and your remarkable statement and the work you and your husband are doing. Thank you, Eddie, for reminding us that we have an obligation to fight for your future. Thanks for bringing your friends, and thank you, officers, for giving him something to look up to and believe in. I want to welcome the new officers from Albany, Georgia, and thank them for their commitment to law enforcement and thank all the other people in law enforcement who are here at the local and State and Federal level.

In the last congressional recess, like the Attorney General, I got out around the country and listened to people, talked to them about a lot of issues. And I found that all over the country in every region, among people from all walks of life, all races and income groups and political parties, there is a deep concern about the tide of crime and violence in this country and about the underlying strains on our fabric as a common people that these have imposed.

We have simply got to do everything we can to move forward in helping the American people to reduce crime, to say no to those things which they ought to say no to, and to give our young people some more things to say yes to.

I came here today to emphasize how terribly important it is that the House of Representatives consider the crime bill immediately on its return. The Speaker has agreed to do that. I then want the Senate and the House to get together and resolve their differences and send me the crime bill as soon as possible. The American people have waited long enough. We don't need to waste their time with frivolous or political amendments and delay. We don't need to take months on a task that can be done in a couple of weeks. If the bill is on my desk in weeks, I will only take a minute to sign it, and then the American people will begin to have the tools they need to solve so many of their problems.

This has been a good year for us in this country. Our deficit is going down, and our economy is going up. Twice as many private sector jobs have come into this economy in the last 14 months than in the previous 4 years. After 7 years of gridlock, the Brady bill became the Brady law and is already working to stop felons and fugitives from purchasing handguns. And I'm proud that it was passed with the help of America's law enforcement officers.

But everything that we are trying to do to move this country forward and to bring this country together will be undermined unless we can give the American people a greater sense that they are secure in their homes, on their streets, and in their schools. The number of murders has tripled since 1960; so has the number of crimes per uniformed police officer. Death by gunfire will soon surpass death by car accidents. Almost a third of all of our families have had someone victimized by crime. Today, one in 20 American children carry a weapon to school, and over 150,000 stay home every day because they're afraid of what might happen to them in school.

We know the crime bill cannot solve all these problems. We know many of them will have to be solved by those people who are here today in uniform and people like them and the friends and neighbors they have, like Mrs. Williams. We know that. We know that unless there are

young people like Eddie and his friends who are willing to work and be role models themselves and make something of their own lives, that everything we do here in Washington will be limited. But we know, too, that we have to take the lead, we have to take the initiative, and that we can give people like these people the tools they need to seize control of their lives and make their communities safer and better places to learn, to work, and to grow.

The crime bill provides funding for another 100,000 police officers over 5 years for community policing because it works. It will make a difference. You already heard what Officer Williams said about 12 officers in Albany, Georgia. The mayor of Houston put 655 more police officers on the beat. In 15 months, crime dropped 22 percent; murders went down 27 percent.

This can be done everywhere. This bill with community policing will help the police officers of our country not only to catch more criminals and put them behind bars but to reduce crime and to connect with more young people before it's too late. I was very moved by what Eddie said about his attitude about the police, because of the work of these two fine police officers. We know that crime can be reduced and that lives can be enhanced. So as the Attorney General said, policing is a big part of this crime bill.

If Congress passes the bill soon to give the American people more police officers, I'll make this commitment to you: I'll cut through the bureaucracy and the redtape in Washington so that within a year, 20,000 of these new officers will actually be hired and trained and working to make our streets safer. If they'll send me the bill, we'll cut the redtape. No more politics in Congress; no more redtape in the bureaucracy. Let's give the police to the American people, and let's do it this year.

The second thing this bill is about is punishment. And I want to emphasize, if I might, three things. There's been a great deal of debate and much honest disagreement about whether we ought to have some sort of "three strikes and you're out" bill. I would like to make two points about that, as someone who started my public career as a State attorney general almost two decades ago now. First of all, an overwhelming percentage of the really serious violent crimes are committed by a relatively few people. Even a small percentage of the criminals in our country commit an overwhelming percentage of the really serious violent crimes. Secondly, this law is designed to be directed, if it's properly drawn, against a narrow class of people, those who do not commit crimes for which it's already "one strike and you're out." Keep in mind, many of our crimes today can get you a life sentence or a very long sentence just by doing it one time. But there are people that are clearly and demonstrably highly likely to take life or to commit serious, horrible crimes—we know them by their profiles—who do things which clearly indicate this, and still they can wind up being paroled after relatively modest sentences.

This bill is designed, if properly drawn—and the Attorney General has done a fine job of working on the bill that is coming through the House—to be directed against that narrow class of people. I do think those folks, you can say, "If you do this three times, we do not think you should be paroled." And I believe it will enable us, for those who think this is too harsh, to create more enlightened attitudes about other people who may be put in prison for too long a period of time or who may need alternative rehabilitation strategies. But these police officers are out there putting their lives on the line, oftentimes in the face of people who are back on the street that they know are highly likely to do something that is life-threatening.

So respectfully, I dispute those who believe that we can't have a "three strikes and you're out" law that is good, that is properly drawn, and that makes a difference. We shouldn't let a small percentage of even the criminal population terrorize the country if we can find a way to stop it. And this is our best effort.

The second point I want to make is that this bill does some other things about punishment, too. This bill encourages States and localities to find alternative punishments for first-time, nonviolent offenders, for young people, boot camps or other kinds of community-based programs which may reconnect people to their communities before it is too late and which will give them a chance not only to be punished but to learn something while they're doing their respective sentences. So this is a smart punishment bill.

The third thing this bill is about is prevention. We know these programs work, too, especially for young people. And I want to say a special word of thanks here to the Attorney General.

When I appointed her, I wanted someone who had actual experience on the front lines fighting crime and who understood that you have to be both tough and smart. And her relentless, constant, compassionate but tough-minded advocacy for a sensible prevention strategy is critical to the fact that we now have about a billion dollars in this plan for jobs for young people in high crime neighborhoods and recreation programs and summer programs and opportunities for young people to bond with caring, concerned adults who care about their future. I thank her for that. And that's a very important part of this bill. It will make a huge difference to the young people of America.

A big part of that is making the schools safe and drug-free and free of violence again. If our children can't be safe in school and going to and from school, they're going to have a very hard time. After all, a lot of the young people most at risk of being victims of crime, as well as at risk of becoming criminals at a young age, live in communities very different from those that most of us grew up in, communities where the family structure has been weakened, communities where other organizations are weaker than they once were, and communities in which there is almost no work for people to do. When you take work and community and family out of a neighborhood, you create an awful vacuum in which only bad things, only bad things, can occur unless someone moves in to fill the vacuum.

Our schools are trying. But we are asking them to do in many of our communities today, we are asking them to do things that no one ever thought the schools could do alone. And we have got to continue to support them through these safe school initiatives and the other prevention plans. So that's what we're trying to do in this crime bill: more police, more punishment, more prevention.

In this time of budgetary constraints, the very idea that we're about to pass a program that will involve over $20 billion in new money is an astonishing thing. It's a lot more money for State and local initiatives, but we have to do it. And I am proud of the fact that it is going to be paid for, not with a tax increase but with the phase-down of the Federal Government. We are reducing over a 5-year period the size of the Federal bureaucracy by about 250,000 people. And all the savings are going to go on into a trust fund to pay for this crime bill, so that at the end of 5 years we will have a Federal Government that is as small as it was when President Kennedy was in office. And the money saved from that downsizing will be giving our communities a chance to give our kids a future and our people a chance to be safe on the streets. I think that's a pretty good switch, and I appreciate the initiative in doing it.

Let me say again in closing, there is not a moment to lose. People are trying everywhere to do something about this, and everywhere they are being frustrated. The case of the Chicago Housing Authority has been in the news because just a few days ago, a Federal district court declared that the housing authority's own policy of sweeping their units for guns, for ineligible people living there, and for drugs was unconstitutional. As soon as I heard about that, I asked the Attorney General and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, to develop another policy that is constitutional and effective, because I have been to the Chicago housing projects. And I have been in the places where the sweeps occurred and where the housing units were cleaned up and where the people who were living in the housing units were hired to work with the police to ride up in the elevator and walk down the stairs and keep the places clean. And I saw children pouring out of housing units, pouring out, to run up to the head of the Chicago Housing Authority, Vince Lane, as if he were their savior because he simply gave them a safe place to live.

So does this administration want to follow the Constitution of the United States? You bet we do. But I can't believe that we can't find a way to have a constitutional search of places that we know are full of victims of crime because they harbor criminals. We are going to find a way to solve this problem.

Thirteen people died in Chicago violently last weekend, three of them in the Robert Taylor Homes project. Last night Secretary Cisneros spent the night in that project, and he called me today from there, and we had a conversation about this. He and the Attorney General are working on it. But I say this just to make this point: Those folks living out there in that housing project, most of them are not criminals; most of them are good people. They obey the law. They're doing the best they can to raise their children. They deserve our best and our quickest efforts.

So I say to you again in closing, I thank you for coming here, but we know we're all preaching to the saved today. Tomorrow when the Congress comes back, there are many other things that will claim their attention. I will ask them to think about many other things. You must say, "Pass the crime bill now."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:36 p.m. at the Department of Justice. In his remarks, he referred to Ernest Williams, veteran police lieutenant, Albany, GA; Earline Williams, longtime volunteer for the Trenton, NJ, police department; and Eddie Cutanda, 15-year-old beneficiary of Boston, MA, community policing programs.

Remarks at the Thomas Jefferson Dinner
April 11, 1994

Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention, please? We thought of how we might best honor Mr. Jefferson on this evening. And I did a little research and discovered that in addition to this being the end of our observation of the 250th anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth, it is also the 200th anniversary of the birth of Edward Everett, who, like Thomas Jefferson and Warren Christopher, served as Secretary of State and whom you will all remember was supposed to be the person who delivered the real Gettysburg Address, at least according to Garry Wills. [*Laughter*] And so I thought I could follow Edward Everett's lead and speak for 2 hours tonight. [*Laughter*] And then I decided I wouldn't do that, that tonight should belong to Thomas Jefferson.

Let me say that any person who is fortunate enough to be Secretary of State or Ambassador to France or Vice President or President feels immediately, in many ways, a great debt to Thomas Jefferson. But in a larger sense, every citizen who ever benefited from the powerful ideas of the Declaration of Independence, the devotion to education embodied in the founding of the University of Virginia, the belief in the first amendment enshrined in the statutes of religious liberty, all of us are in his debt.

Tonight, I ask you to think of only one or two things as we begin this fine evening. Jefferson had the right tensions and balances in his life, and that is why he seems so new to us today. He believed that life had to be driven by fixed principles—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness—but that we all had to be willing to be constantly changing. Life belongs to the living.

He believed that we all had a right to a radical amount of freedom, in return for which we had to assume a dramatic amount of responsibility. He always was trying to accomplish very big things, but the richness and texture of his life, and the reason it seems so relevant to us today, is that he took such great joy in all the little things of daily life. And it was those things that enabled him to be not just a philosopher and a politician and a lawyer but also an architect and a scientist, a person who enjoyed the large and the small, who believed that life should be driven by eternal principles in constant change, who would gladly have given his life for freedom and who exercised that freedom so responsibly. Oh, if only we could do as well.

On this 200th anniversary of his beginning, at the end of a wonderful year which included, for me and Hillary and our administration, the fact that we got to start our Inaugural at Monticello, let us raise our glasses in a toast not to the memory of Thomas Jefferson but to the vitality of his spirit and his ideas in our own lives and those of our country men and women for all time to come.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room at the Department of State. In his remarks, he referred to Garry Wills, author and adjunct professor, Northwestern University.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Rhinoceros and Tiger Trade by China and Taiwan

April 11, 1994

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

On November 8, 1993, I reported pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (Pelly Amendment) (22 U.S.C. 1978(b)), on the issue of ongoing illegal trade by the People's Republic of China (PRC) and Taiwan in rhinoceros and tiger parts and products. My report followed the certification by the Secretary of the Interior on September 7, 1993, that this trade was diminishing the effectiveness of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Five rhinoceros species and the tiger are listed in Appendix I of CITES, which means that the species are threatened with extinction and no trade for commercial purposes is allowed. The report suggested actions that the PRC and Taiwan could take that would demonstrate their commitment to the elimination of the trade, and stated that the United States is prepared, through close dialogue and technical aid, to assist them in their efforts. However, the report concluded that, if measurable, verifiable, and substantial progress were not made by March 1994, import prohibitions will be necessary, as recommended by the CITES Standing Committee. This letter provides an update of the situation since November 1993.

The world's tiger and rhinoceros populations remain gravely endangered and will likely be extinct in the next 2–5 years if the trade in their parts and products, fueled by market demand in consuming countries, is not eliminated. The suggested actions in my November 8 report, based on criteria established by CITES for adequate legislative measures and enforcement in the PRC and Taiwan that effectively eliminates the trade, were further amplified in letters dated December 21, 1993, from the Secretary of the Interior, and by three CITES and U.S. delegation visits to the PRC and Taiwan from November 1993 to March 1994. However, at its most recent meeting last week, the CITES Standing Committee did not revoke its earlier recommendation that parties consider stricter domestic measures up to and including prohibition in trade in wildlife species now against the PRC and Taiwan. The Committee also noted "with satisfaction the progress demonstrated by China" but "that further actions are still needed," and expressed "concern that the actions agreed by the authorities in Taiwan . . . towards meeting the minimum requirements have not yet been implemented." Taking these factors into account, I have made the following assessment and decision for action by the United States.

The PRC has consolidated much of its stocks of rhinoceros and tiger parts and products. The PRC has used radio, television, newspaper, and poster announcements—as well as burnings of rhino horn and tiger bone—to educate its population on new laws and the need to protect wildlife. In addition, large enforcement efforts were made, netting many prosecutions and seizures.

However, more still needs to be done. Both the CITES and U.S. delegations that visited the PRC since November concluded that an investigative unit in addition to existing Ministry of Forestry Police and Public Security Forces would be unnecessary, but that better training in enforcement and forensics are crucial to effectively eliminate the trade in endangered species in the PRC. In addition, further efforts are needed to develop cooperation on a regional basis. Accordingly I have instructed the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Departments of State, Justice, and the Treasury (Customs Service), to further explore with the PRC possibilities for U.S. technical and law enforcement assistance.

As a result of the PRC's progress in the key areas identified in my November 8 report, I have decided that import prohibitions are not warranted at this time. At the same time, since progress has not been sufficient to warrant the lifting of the Pelly Amendment certification, the Secretaries of State and the Interior, in consultation with the Departments of Justice and the Treasury (Customs Service), will continue discussions with PRC officials and jointly seek to identify next steps to assure continued progress and opportunities for international cooperation that will help eliminate the trade. I have also directed the Interagency Rhino/Tiger Task

Force to continue to monitor progress in the PRC so that a review of the situation and an appropriate response can be made in December 1994.

Because Taiwan's constitutional provisions are understood to prevent the consolidation of stocks of tiger and rhinoceros parts and products, Taiwan made an effort to identify, register, and mark these stocks on a voluntary basis. However, this effort has only located one-third of the stocks voluntarily registered in a 1990 initiative. Draft amendments to Taiwan's Wildlife Conservation Law making registration of stocks mandatory and enforceable—including limited penalties for noncompliance—were transmitted to Taiwan's legislative body, but have not yet been enacted. An investigative unit was recently funded and equipped, and training sessions have been held for the relevant officers on part-time assignment. These units have made some arrests of people caught selling rhinoceros and tiger parts. However, prosecutions resulting from enforcement actions have been limited by concerns regarding the use of undercover investigations.

The most pressing outstanding action is final enactment of adequate amendments to Taiwan's Wildlife Conservation Law. It is not yet clear whether the current proposed amendments will satisfactorily address the illegal trade in wildlife specimens and products. Furthermore while enacting amendments is necessary, such enactments alone are not sufficient. Enforcement efforts must effectively accomplish major reductions in the illegal trade in endangered species. Accordingly I instructed the Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Departments of State, Justice, and the Treasury (Customs Service) and the American Institute in Taiwan, to continue to explore with Taiwan possible U.S. technical and law enforcement assistance. I have also directed the Interagency Rhino/Tiger Task Force to continue to monitor progress in Taiwan so that a review of the situation and an appropriate response can be made in December 1994.

As a result of Taiwan's lack of progress in the key areas identified in my November 8 report, I have decided to follow the recommendation of the CITES Standing Committee and direct that imports of wildlife specimens and products from Taiwan be prohibited, in accordance with appropriate public notice and comment procedures. While the Pelly Amendment provides the authority to impose a greater level of import prohibitions, I believe that this level is appropriate at this time. Depending on future progress, these import prohibitions could be adjusted as appropriate. The enactment of adequate legislation coupled with enforcement actions that result in reductions in the illegal trade in rhinoceros and tiger parts would be grounds for an immediate reconsideration of the decision.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Statement on Trade Sanctions Against Taiwan

April 11, 1994

This is the first time any country has acted on the international call for trade sanctions to protect endangered species, but if the illegal trade in rhinos and tigers is not eliminated, these species could be extinct in 5 years. This administration recognizes that threats to endangered species are of critical importance. The world must know that the United States will take strong actions to protect the Earth's natural heritage.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on the institution of trade sanctions against Taiwan.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

April 12, 1994

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the press. This is our first bipartisan leadership meeting on the resumption of the Congress, and we have a lot of things to discuss today.

I want to begin with a discussion of the crime bill and the importance of proceeding deliberately and quickly to pass it, to reiterate my commitment yesterday that we will do whatever we can to get the first 20,000 police officers on the streets this year if the crime bill is passed in an expeditious fashion. Then we'll move on to some other issues where I hope we can have a good bipartisan discussion in support of domestic issues like the budget and health care, and also we'll talk a little about Bosnia today and some other foreign policy issues.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you have some concern—there's more shelling today. I mean, there's some suspicion that the Muslims may be trying to provoke the Serbs. Have we started something with air strikes that will make matters worse rather than better?

The President. We certainly haven't started anything. We have done exactly what we said we would do under the U.N. policy, that if the U.N. forces there were put at risk, as they were in the shelling of Gorazde, we would offer close air support if the General asked and the civilian authorities agreed. We went through all the procedural requirements, and we did exactly what I think we should have done.

Q. Well, the Serbian——

Q. What about——

The President. We have talked—let me answer Andrea's [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News] question. We have cautioned the Bosnian Government forces not to try to take advantage of this in violation of the understandings themselves. And General Rose has been very firm on that this morning.

Q. Are you considering expanding this to other safe havens if the Serbs persist and don't get the message?

The President. Well, I wouldn't rule anything out. We're working very closely with General Rose, and he's got a very aggressive view of his role there, which I think is good.

Q. The Serbian leader has threatened against the U.N. forces. They've kidnaped some. They're holding some in house arrest. They've escalated the military action.

The President. Well, every time we have been firm, though, in the end it's been a winner for the peace process. And I think it will be here. And I'm very encouraged by the position taken by the Russians, that they want the Serbs to withdraw from the safe area in Gorazde, and they want to return to the negotiating table.

Before this last incident, I thought we were getting pretty close to—not just to a cease-fire but to an absolute cessation of hostilities and a real serious bargaining position so we could get back there in a hurry, and I wish the Russians well in working with the Serbs. I've assured President Yeltsin that we have no interest in using NATO's air power to affect the outcome of the war. But we do want to protect the U.N. mandate. And we do want a negotiation, and I think we're going to get one.

Q. Have you seen or heard anything from the Serbs that would indicate a response to the air strike, sir?

The President. I don't know how to answer that, Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio]. The Russians—Mr. Churkin is over there now, and we're working on trying to get this thing back on track, and I hope we can do it. But we have to be firm in our reaction to the plain violations of the United Nations resolutions and in what we set our policy to do.

The good thing that we've seen since the terrible incident in Sarajevo in the market is that both the U.N. and NATO have been able to follow what they said their policy would be all along, and I think that's what we have to do. We have to be firm in pursuing the policy that we say we have. It's our only chance of success.

Supreme Court Nomination

Q. Will it be more difficult to—[*inaudible*]—your domestic agenda with George Mitchell nominated to the—will it be harder, once he's nominated?

Q. Do you have the name of a Supreme Court Justice on your left?

The President. You think the next Supreme Court Justice should be to my left, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]? [*Laughter*]

Q. I said, is he?

Q. Unless you're considering Mr. Foley.

The President. He'd be a good one.

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

Remarks at a Reception for Representatives of Nonprofit Organizations
April 12, 1994

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, Secretary Shalala, Secretary Cisneros, and the many other people in our administration who are here who have long supported the nonprofit sector of this country and worked in it.

I suppose no one qualifies in that regard more than the First Lady. Since I first met her, I've seen Hillary serve on children's advocacy boards, legal services boards, hospital boards, foundation boards. I was counting outside; I haven't checked with her, but I know that she's helped to form three nonprofit organizations and been associated with at least a dozen others. I appreciate the fact that she found a little time for me over the years. [*Laughter*]

I say that because I have learned, not only as a Governor and a public official and now as President but also in my own family, the incredible importance of the work that all of you do and those whom you represent.

When I ran for President, I said as clearly as I could that I thought the National Government had a responsibility to do many things that we were not then doing but that there were many things we could not do and that in the absence of a partnership with people in community organizations all across this country, we would surely never become the Nation we ought to be.

I'd like to make a few remarks about that, but I think it is appropriate, since we're talking about citizenship in its best form, that I also make a couple of comments at the outset about a subject very much in the press today.

Since Justice Blackmun announced his retirement last week, I have been working to find an able replacement. Last night, Senator George Mitchell, who was my leading candidate for the Court, came to see me and asked me what I wanted him to do. And I said, "Well, I want to talk to you about it. I'd like to appoint you to the Supreme Court if you think we can do our work here for the country this year in pursuing health care reform and the other things we have to do."

And he looked at me and said, "You know, I've always wanted to be on the Supreme Court, and no one can predict what it would be like if I were nominated and then confirmed, while sitting in the Senate and leading this fight, what the impact would be. I have thought of all the ways we could do it and all the various scenarios, and I'm only sure of one thing: I cannot imagine that the impact would be good in terms of our ability to pass health care, welfare reform, or any of the other things we want to do." But his special concern was with regard to health care reform. And so he said, "I believe I should stay in the Senate and serve my term out and try to lead this country to health care reform. That's, after all, the job I was given, and it's my job until next January, and I'm sorry that the timing is not good, but I think it's the right thing to do."

I said, "Well, why don't we sleep on it and see if we can think of a way to do it?" This morning early I called him on the phone, and he said, "I still see it the same way." And I said, "Well, I haven't had any thunderbolts of insight about how your analysis is wrong." So he said, "I still think I ought to do not what I want to do but what I should do." And he seemed as comfortable with that decision as any one that I've ever seen him make. I say that because this country needs more people who devote themselves not only to what they would like to do but what they think the country needs. He has dedicated himself to doing some-

thing that, if successful, this health care reform, would be the work of a generation in America. His leadership role is crucial. I value it, and I'm grateful for it.

And so, I would like to begin by thanking him on behalf of his country for his willingness to forego a great personal opportunity in anticipation of an enormous struggle with an uncertain result for a goal that is worth the careers of many of us. I thank him very much.

The interesting thing as I look out at this crowd and I see so many of you whom I've known for so many years, I think of all the struggles that you have been in with an uncertain result, determined to make life better for people in any number of ways.

In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville said, "If Americans want to proclaim a truth or propagate some feeling by the encouragement of an example, they form an association." Well, today, at the dawn of a new century, we're full of associations. Every now and then I hear from one I don't like all that much. [*Laughter*] Sometimes I hear from those I like very much things that I wish I didn't have to hear. That is a part of what makes America a special place.

Every item, as I said earlier, of the national agenda I have sought to pursue so vigorously, ultimately depends upon people in their private capacities doing things differently. Much of what I try to do here is designed to empower people to live up to the fullest of their own capacities and to face their problems in their own ways most effectively.

Whether that's true in health care reform or education reform or crime prevention or using national service through the sterling work that Eli Segal has done to permit people to solve their problems at the grassroots level, you can see it in every initiative. The whole notion that the Government has to empower people to take control of their own lives depends upon the ability of people to organize effectively, to lobby their Government, to influence our policies, and also to tell us what they know is the truth.

Just today we received what I have seen year after year is one of the best examples of that kind of action with the release of yet another report from the Carnegie Corporation, and this one I think is one of the best that I have ever read on how we can better meet the needs of our youngest children. This report is nearly 3 years in the making, and I think now, it's fair to say, is the most comprehensive analysis of the condition of American children aged 0 to 3. It awakens us to the fact that millions of our infants and toddlers are living in shameful conditions, but also and even more importantly, offers a coherent set of solutions about what we ought to do about it.

In an attempt to be a better partner with all of you in what you are doing, we are establishing today a nonprofit liaison network of 26 different liaisons in every important Government Department and agency to work with all of you to emphasize in an organized way how much we value your good work, your input into our policies, your advocacies of things that still need to be done.

One of the most important things in this complicated age of zillions of problems is that I identify what it is as President I can do and what it is I need someone else's help to do; of all the things that we can spend our time on here in the White House and in this Government, which things are most important and which things will spark the largest release of energy in a positive and constructive way around the country. You have to help us make that decision for, in truth, that's a decision that we make anew here constantly as we deal with the difficulties as well as the opportunities that come to this place.

I hope this is the beginning of an even better partnership. I thank you very, very much for what you do, and I want to say again, I cannot succeed as President unless you succeed and unless you succeed in mobilizing millions of our countrymen and women for the important tasks that face us. I honestly believe that we may be at the dawn of a new American renaissance—a period when we are able to face, with greater energy and greater hope and a greater sense of community and common purpose, the challenges before us than has been the case in a generation.

If we do it, we will make the beginning of the 21st century the most exciting time in American history to be young, to grow, to come to maturity, and to make a life. If we don't, we will have squandered a great legacy. The only way we can do it is if somehow there is a role for all of us, not just those of us in high office. You provide that role for all of us, and

I will do my best to help you play it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:56 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Statement on the Nonprofit Liaison Network
April 12, 1994

I have long advocated the role of the nonprofit sector. Throughout our history, the nonprofit community has helped our Nation adapt to a changing world by strengthening the core values that shape American life. Today, that role has never been more important. The nonprofit liaison network will create better collaboration between the administration and advocacy and service groups in a mutual effort to solve the problems of crime, housing, health care, and other pressing national needs.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House press release announcing the nonprofit liaison network.

Remarks at the Radio and Television Correspondents Dinner
April 12, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Lockman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I cannot tell you how happy I am to be here tonight on the 50th anniversary of the TV dinner. I was a little disappointed that the entree wasn't Salisbury steak or chicken pot pie. [*Laughter*] But I really am delighted to be here. If you believe that, I've got some land in northwest Arkansas I'd like to show you. [*Laughter*]

I want to congratulate you on 50 years of TV and radio coverage of our national politics, 50 dinners, all the way back to 1945. I thank you for letting us know that Helen Thomas was at the first one. [*Laughter*] I don't know if she thanks you for letting us know that. But tonight I want to play the journalist. I'd like to ask you, Helen: After 50 of these dinners, why? Why? [*Laughter*] I love Helen Thomas. How would you like to start every morning jogging with Helen in your ear? The other day, after we had the incident in Bosnia, she said to me as I was running, trying to wake up, fighting off the allergies of the springtime, "Yeltsin's mad at you." [*Laughter*]

Well, anyway, I'm delighted to be here with you, Brian, and I appreciate your inviting Garrison Keillor to join us this evening, because, as he described in the fabled Lake Wobegon, we also like to think that all the kids who work at the White House are slightly above average. [*Laughter*]

I'm really glad to see, also, that in spite of the dominance of C–SPAN, that Cokie Roberts is sitting with us tonight at the head table. At least it looks like the head table. Actually, I know it's the head table; Rick Kaplan told me it was. [*Laughter*]

You know, since this is your 50th dinner, we should acknowledge that over these last 50 years, radio and television has witnessed some of the greatest moments in American political history. And if you believe that, I've got some land in northwest Arkansas I'd like to sell you. [*Laughter*] But just think of the highlights you've seen.

Remember this: Your impact actually goes back before your 50 dinners, going back to radio, in 1922, when President Warren Harding utters the first words ever spoken by a President on the radio, "Gergen, come here. I need you." [*Laughter*] In your association's first year, 1944, Franklin Roosevelt delivers more of his fireside chats over the radio. It's not much different today, except today you insist that the President sit directly on the logs. [*Laughter*]

Following a reliable source, just hours after the polls closed in 1948, network news airs the very first televised interview with President-elect

Thomas Dewey. In 1952, Eisenhower says he will go to Korea, and the first question from the press is about the seating arrangements on the plane. [*Laughter*] In 1960, researchers discover that people who watched the Kennedy-Nixon debate on television thought Kennedy won. People who listened to the debate on radio thought, "When in the hell am I going to get a television?" [*Laughter*]

In 1972, Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern concedes a 49-State, 23-point landslide election. The press demands to see records of his losses. [*Laughter*] In 1974, two crusading young journalists take on a President for abuse of office. And to this very day, Evans and Novak still have not forgiven Richard Nixon for price controls. [*Laughter*]

In 1981, Dan Rather replaces Walter Cronkite. Soon after, an impressionable Jim Leach purchases his first sweater. [*Laughter*] In 1982, the introduction of the first Saturday morning political cartoon, "The McLaughlin Group." [*Laughter*] In 1988, a well-meaning network news producer whispers in the ear of a Dukakis advance person, "Why use a Jeep when you can put him in a tank?" [*Laughter*]

In 1994, Senator George Mitchell goes live on CNN to withdraw his name from consideration for the United States Supreme Court, fueling speculation that he would rather argue with George Steinbrenner than Justice Scalia. [*Laughter*]

I can only imagine how wonderful your future will be when there are 500 channels to fill all the airwaves. [*Laughter*] Anyway, you do have a proud history.

Now, my history with you is another matter altogether. [*Laughter*] Some say my relations with the press have been marked by self-pity. I like to think of it as the outer limits of my empathy. I feel my pain. [*Laughter*] People say to me, "Remember Harry Truman, 'If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.'" It's the only room in the house I never want to leave. [*Laughter*] In fact, I've been trying to get Kathleen Sullivan interested in Whitewater.

I think history, actually, despite what all of you think, I think history will show I had a very good relationship with the press. And if it doesn't, I'll complain like hell to the historians.

I do want to say something about my strong views on the question of privacy: They're none of your business. [*Laughter*]

I do think you're entitled some inside information tonight, however. After the dinner—we had this wonderful dinner—Hillary consulted with Speaker Foley about the spawning prospects in Washington, and she has recommended that all of you purchase salmon futures tomorrow. [*Laughter*]

I do want to remind you of one thing. It's 3 days before April 15th, and most of you have spent a lot more time on my taxes than your own. [*Laughter*] Many happy returns. [*Laughter*]

I do want to complain that, amid all this disgusting media frenzy, the many terribly important accomplishments of this administration have gone unnoticed or grossly underreported. For example, just since I have been your President, the United States Government has raised $21 million in back taxes from people with nannies. [*Laughter*] And we're not even through with audits in the West Wing yet. [*Laughter*] Consider this, millions of Americans now feel better about how they look in jogging shorts. [*Laughter*] And there is a hugely increased awareness of the information superhighway. Today, 72 percent of all Americans are in favor of it, provided the rest stops are clean. [*Laughter*] Not only does our administration look more like America, it changes jobs at the same rate other Americans do. [*Laughter*] We have the first administration to have the same senior adviser make the cover of both Time magazine and Teen Beat. [*Laughter*] We've got the first smoke-free back room in American political history. And my Vice President has made enormous strides in his first and most daunting assignment, reinventing Al Gore. [*Laughter*]

We've created 2.3 million new jobs, almost 50 percent of them in the health insurance lobby. [*Laughter*] You can see more things like this in the years to come. This administration doesn't know the meaning of the word "surrender." We don't know the meaning of the word "timidity." And with such limited vocabulary and self-awareness, I think we've done right well. [*Laughter*]

I was asked tonight before I left for this august dinner, "Why do you keep going to these things? They still keep beating your brains out." And I said, "Because I still believe in a place called "Help." [*Laughter*] I also came because I love radio and TV. I've been called the first President to grow up in the television age. I guess that's true. We got our first TV when I was 9 or 10. Before that, I listened to the

radio, doing my homework to baseball games. Then I saw the radio news. I got our television in time to watch the '56 Democratic and Republican Conventions from gavel to gavel. I've watched the debates, the election returns, all the news since then. The fact is, the electronic media has changed my life and changed how we all see the world and how the world sees us.

The media's changed, too. You have more information and more programs and more channels, more competition and more time to fill than ever before. Last night, we celebrated the last day of the year celebrating the 250th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, the man whom all of you know said if he had to choose between a Government without a press or the press without Government, he would unhesitatingly choose the latter. I might point out that he said that before he became President of the United States. [*Laughter*]

But if you think about what Jefferson and the other Founders did, they had this uncanny sense of what it would take to preserve a republic, a democracy: To permit government enough power so that its exercise could keep us together and moving forward, but to limit its abuse and to keep it accountable to the people. The power was limited by the Bill of Rights and divided—executive, legislative, and judicial; national, State, and local—in a brilliant way.

And if you think about the fabric of our national life, there are only two places where power is arguably unaccountable: one, in the Supreme Court and its lower courts, where people have lifetime appointments, where they have a limited unaccountable power because there are some great questions on which someone must have the final say in order to permit us to go on with our lives; and the second, in the area of the press, because there is no practical way to limit the free expression of ideas and opinions, painful though those of us in authority might find them from time to time.

Mr. Jefferson understood so long ago these things that carry us through to the present day. But I must say tonight as we come here, Hillary and I, to pay tribute to you in this business, your business is more difficult, more challenging, more daunting than ever before. And the burden of carrying the responsibility that goes with that sort of unlimited freedom is greater than ever before. I appreciate it, and I'm glad, at least on occasion, we all have the chance to laugh together about our common efforts to advance the common good.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Brian Lockman, C-SPAN correspondent and chairman, Radio and Television Correspondents Association; correspondents Helen Thomas, United Press International, and Cokie Roberts, ABC News; humorist Garrison Keillor; Rick Kaplan, executive producer, "ABC World News Tonight"; and journalist Kathleen Sullivan.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Angola

April 12, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of that date. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia,* of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibits the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related

materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibits such sale or supply to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"). United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against UNITA. A copy of the Regulations is attached for reference.

The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft relating to transportation to Angola or to UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has initially designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: Airports: Luanda, and Katumbela, Benguela Province; Ports: Luanda, Lobito, Benguela Province, and Namibe, Namibe Province; and Entry Points: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 26, 1993, through March 25, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to UNITA are reported at about $85,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the FAC, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs and the Office of the Legal Adviser).

I shall continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 12, 1994.

Message to the Congress on the Panama Canal Commission
April 12, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 3522 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 22 U.S.C. 3611 note), I transmit herewith the recommendations for changes to the Panama Canal Commission. I have determined that the adoption of these recommendations would facilitate and encourage

the operation of the Canal through an autonomous entity under the Government of Panama after the transfer of the waterway on December 31, 1999, pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements.

In accordance with the law cited above, an extensive study of the governance and financial management structure of the Panama Canal Commission was conducted. The study and its recommendations were then considered and discussed among representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Treasury, Commerce, Transportation, and Justice, as well as the Panama Canal Commission. The study, and the process that followed it, formed the basis for my recommendations, which are contained in the attached document.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 12, 1994.

Nomination for Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation
April 12, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Dr. Anne C. Petersen as Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation. She will be the first woman to serve in one of the two top management posts at the Foundation in its 44-year history.

"I am pleased today to name a leading scientist and administrator to our experienced team of science and technology leaders," the President said. "Anne Petersen has impeccable scientific standing as a social scientist with strong research capabilities in mathematics and statistics. She also is an outstanding administrator with a significant track record as a dean at two major universities, Penn State and the University of Minnesota."

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

Nomination for a District of Columbia Superior Court Associate Judge
April 12, 1994

The President has nominated Rhonda Reid Winston to serve on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

"Rhonda Winston's solid legal background and dedication to justice will be a great asset to the DC Superior Court and the Nation's Capital," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for Alabama
April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Redding Pitt, a veteran of the Alabama attorney general's office, to be U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama.

"Redding Pitt's extensive experience in the field of law and his knowledge of Alabama will make an inestimable contribution to the State and to the country's judicial system," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for Delaware
April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Gregory Moneta Sleet as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Delaware.

"Gregory Moneta Sleet's extensive legal background and experience in the State of Delaware make him an excellent choice for this most important judicial position," the President said.

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

Nomination for U.S. Attorney for New Jersey
April 12, 1994

The President today nominated Faith S. Hochberg as the U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey.

"Faith Hochberg's legal skills and dedication to law enforcement make her an excellent candidate for this position and will serve the State of New Jersey well," the President said.

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

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Evacuation of United States Citizens From Rwanda and Burundi
April 12, 1994

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

On April 6, 1994, the private plane of Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana crashed under suspicious circumstances on approach to Rwanda's capital, Kigali, killing the President and others, including the President of neighboring Burundi. Following the crash, some members of the Rwandan military began killing opposition leaders and civilians. General fighting broke out, including fighting between government forces and forces of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RFP), encamped in Kigali under a peace agreement. As violence in the capital escalated, the State Department ordered the departure of U.S. Government employees and dependents. Combat-equipped U.S. military forces began deploying to Burundi to be in a position to conduct possible noncombatant evacuation operations of U.S. citizens and designated third-country nationals.

During April 9–10, 275 Marines were airlifted via C–130 aircraft to Bujumbura, Burundi. (A total of 328 U.S. Armed Forces personnel deployed to Burundi, including aircrews.) Their mission was to be in position to link up with American citizens moving from Rwanda to Burundi via overland convoy and to be prepared to proceed to the Rwandan capital of Kigali to assist with their departure, if necessary. On April 9–10, American citizens proceeded to leave Rwanda by several overland convoys to Bujumbura and by other routes. Approximately 240 U.S. citizens were evacuated from Rwanda. Most were then flown by U.S. C–141 aircraft to Nairobi, Kenya. Approximately 21 citizens chose to remain in Rwanda for various reasons. It did not become necessary for U.S. forces to enter Rwanda. (United States C–5 aircraft also airlifted Belgian military forces and equipment into Nairobi to assist Belgian efforts in support of their citizens.)

I am pleased to report that these operations were successful, that no hostilities were encountered, and that no casualties were suffered by U.S. forces in this operation.

I took these actions pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief. I am providing this

information as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress for these actions to protect American citizens.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 13.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Protection of United Nations Personnel in Bosnia-Herzegovina

April 12, 1994

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

One year ago, I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia-Herzegovina. I provided you with follow-on reports on October 13, 1993, February 17, 1994, and March 1, 1994. I am reporting today on the use of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft on April 10–11 to provide protection for U.N. personnel who came under attack in Gorazde, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Since the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 713 on September 25, 1991, the United Nations has actively sought solutions to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Under Security Council Resolution 824 (May 6, 1993), certain parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina have been established as "safe areas." Gorazde is specifically included as a location that should be treated as a safe area "by all the parties concerned and should be free from armed attacks and from any other hostile acts." In addition, Security Council Resolutions 836 and 844 (June 4 and 18, 1993) authorize Member States, acting nationally or through regional organizations, to use air power in the safe areas to help protect the United Nations Protection Forces (UNPROFOR).

Recent heavy weapons (tank and artillery) fire in the Gorazde area has resulted in a serious threat to the citizens remaining in Gorazde and to UNPROFOR and U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) personnel operating there. On April 10, the city was subjected to sustained Bosnian-Serb tank and artillery fire. The UNPROFOR and UNHCR personnel in Gorazde were placed in great danger. Based on the threat to UNPROFOR, as reported by U.N. observers in the city, the UNPROFOR commander requested the U.N. Special Representative for Bosnia-Herzegovina to authorize close air support (CAS) strikes on the Bosnian-Serb firing positions. The U.N. Special Representative approved the request. Consistent with approved procedures and rules of engagement, two U.S. aircraft from NATO Allied Force Southern Europe (AFSOUTH) engaged Bosnian-Serb targets after receiving targeting orders from the Commander in Chief, AFSOUTH.

On April 11, 1994, U.N. personnel in Gorazde requested NATO air support after again coming under attack by Bosnian-Serb gunners. United States F/A–18 aircraft from AFSOUTH were successful in neutralizing Bosnian-Serb targets that had been firing on the city.

There were no NATO or U.N. casualties as a result of the operations on April 10 and 11, 1994.

It is my hope that the clear resolve of the United Nations and NATO as shown by these actions will encourage the parties to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia to respect the decisions of the Security Council concerning the protection of U.N. personnel and of the declared safe areas. United States forces will continue to serve as part of this important NATO enforcement effort and will remain prepared to respond to U.N. and NATO requests for further action against those who violate these decisions.

These actions are being taken in Bosnia-Herzegovina in conjunction with our allies to implement the decision of the Security Council and the North Atlantic Council and to assist the parties to reach a negotiated settlement to the conflict. It is not now possible to determine

the duration of this operation. I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in this effort pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I am providing this report as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I remain grateful for the continuing support the Congress has provided and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in this endeavor. I shall communicate with you further regarding our efforts for peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 13.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the American Society of Newspaper Editors

April 13, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Bill, for the introduction. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the invitation to come by again.

I can't help noting some satisfaction that the president of this organization is not only the editor of the Oregonian, which endorsed my candidacy in 1992, the first time it ever endorsed a Democrat for President—I hope they haven't had second thoughts—[*laughter*]—he also spent the first 8 years of his life in Arkansas, which didn't seem to do him too much harm.

I am delighted to be here. I want to make a few remarks and then open the floor to questions. We probably have some things in common. Both of us battle from time to time with reporters. [*Laughter*] And I recently did some light editing on my mother's autobiography, so I appreciate the difficulty of editing things. It was a little easier for me; my mother, when she got very ill, I said, "What are we going to do if you don't finish your book?" She said, "You finish it, don't touch anything I said about you." [*Laughter*] "Check the facts. Don't let me be too hard on the living." So it was easier for me than it was for you.

But let me say I've been thinking about it a lot lately because it gave me a chance to relive a period in American history that spanned my mother's life as well as my own, starting in the Depression. In many ways, like everybody's family, her life was unique. But it was in many ways like that of so many people who grew up in the Depression and World War II and exemplified and made possible the rise of the American middle class. Most of those people were obsessed with working hard and taking care of their families and building a better future for their children, and they never doubted they could do it. There's a reason, I think, we ought to think about that today, and that is that there are a lot of people who doubt that we can continue to do it. Our mission at this moment in history, I believe, is to ensure the American dream for the next generation, to bring the American people together, to move our country forward, to make sure the middle class grows and survives well into the 21st century.

My mother's generation knew what we are learning, and that is that the preservation of these kinds of dreams is not as simple as just talking about it. She had to leave home after she was widowed to further her education so she could make a good living. And my earliest memory as a child is of my grandmother taking me to see my mother in New Orleans when she was in school and then seeing her cry when I left the train station as a little child.

But our generation is full of parental stories about the sacrifices that were made for us so that we could do better. And all of us in this room have been exceedingly fortunate in that regard. The generation that our parents were a part of built the houses, the schools, educated the children that built the explosion of American energy and industry after the Second World War.

Underneath the magnificent material mileposts, which left us with only 6 percent of the world's population then and 40 percent of the world's economic output, was a set of values. They believed we had to work hard, that we had a duty to do right by our community and our neighbors, that we were obliged to take responsibility for ourselves and our families. Without those values, the successes would not have occurred, and nothing else passed on to us would amount to much for we would quickly squander whatever material benefits we had.

Most of my mother's generation, at least that I knew, would never have put it this way, but they lived by a creed that I was taught by a professor of Western civilization at Georgetown, who told me that the great secret of Western civilization in general and the United States of America specifically was that always, at every moment in time, a majority of us had believed that the future could be better than the present and that each of us had a personal, moral responsibility to make it so. In pursuit of that dream, the Americans in this century have made a solemn bargain with their Government: Government should work to help those who help themselves.

Forty-nine years ago today, Harry Truman spent his first full day as President of the United States. No one ever did more to honor that solemn bargain. After World War II, our country chose the course of confidence, not cynicism, building a stable world economy in which we could flourish with the Marshall Plan and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which we have just concluded of the Uruguay round.

We lifted a majority of our people into the middle class not by giving them something for nothing but by giving them the opportunity to work hard and succeed. In just 2 months, we'll celebrate the 50th anniversary of the G.I. bill of rights, which helped more than 20 million American veterans to get an education and millions more to build businesses and homes.

These great achievements did not belong to any particular party. They were American decisions. They were not the reflection of a country pulled to the right or to the left but a country always pushing forward. They reflected the vision and the values of leaders of both parties. After Truman, Eisenhower continued the tradition by building the Interstate Highway System and by investing in the space program and science and technology and in education. The tradition continued in the next administrations, all working toward greater prosperity but rooted in certain values that enabled us to go forward.

But the seeds of our new difficulties, that we face in such stark reality today, were sown beginning three decades ago in changes in our social fabric and two decades ago in changes in our general economic condition. We have seen the weakening slowly of the institutions and the values which built the middle class and the economic underpinnings which made it possible, in theory at least, for all Americans to achieve it.

Three decades ago, in 1960, births outside of marriage were 5.3 percent of total children born. In 1980, the rate had risen to 18.4 percent; in 1990, to 28 percent. There are many of those who say, "Well, Mr. President, you're overstating the case because the birth rate among married couples has dropped so much." It may be. All I know is that those kids are our future, and the trends are inescapable and disturbing. And the rates for teen mothers in poverty and for all mothers without a high school education of out-of-wedlock birth rates are far, far higher than the 28 percent that I just said.

The fear of violent crime has made neighbors seem like strangers. And as Senator Pat Moynihan of New York has said, Americans have begun to "define deviancy down." We're simply getting used to things that we never would have considered acceptable just a few years ago.

In the postwar economy, a high school diploma meant security. By the time of the 1990 census, it was clear that a high school diploma meant you'd probably be in a job where your income would not even keep up with inflation. Most middle class families have to work longer hours to stay even. The average working family in 1992 was spending more hours on the job than it did in 1969. And in too many neighborhoods, the vacuum that has been created by the absence of work and community and family has been filled by crime and violence and drugs.

In the 1980's, the world continued to change dramatically economically. And I would argue that, in general, our collective response to it was wrong, even though many of our best companies made dramatic productivity gains which are benefiting us today. We reduced taxes for some Americans, mostly the wealthy Americans, and we increased the deficit. But increases in Social Security taxes and State and local taxes

put further strains on middle class incomes. From 1981 to 1993, our Nation's debt quadrupled, while job creation and the general living standard of the wage-earning middle class stagnated or declined.

So we have these problems that, let's face it, brought me to the Presidency in 1992, the abjective conditions that Americans were groping to come to grips with. You can be proud that so many newspapers have done so much to not only call attention to these problems to make them really real in the lives of people and to cry out for new thinking.

In its remarkable series, "America: What Went Wrong?", the Philadelphia Inquirer showed how the National Government's policies had undermined the middle class already under stress by a global economy. Of all the facts cited by Donald Bartlett and James Steele, one stood out to me. In 1952 it took the average worker a day of work to pay the closing costs on a home in the Philadelphia suburbs. In the 1990's, it took 18 weeks.

The Chicago Tribune on its front page underscored the epidemic of violence killing so many of our children and robbing so many others of their childhood. The Los Angeles Times explored the loss of a sense of community that prompted the riots there 2 years ago. Recently when I was in Detroit for the jobs conference, the papers there talked about the changing job market and the State that was the automobile capital of the world, the good and the bad dislocations that have occurred and what was working.

Recently, in the Pulitzer Prizes, which were awarded yesterday, I noted that Bill Raspberry got a well-deserved Pulitzer for his commentaries on social and political subjects. And Isabel Wilkerson's report on children growing up in the inner city in New York—the New York Times won.

Our administration owes a special debt to Eileen Welsome's series in the Albuquerque Tribune exposing secret governmental radiation experiments conducted decades ago which have consequences today. And I'm proud of the openness that the Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, has brought to the Energy Department in dealing with this.

There are lots of other things I could mention: The Akron Beacon Journal's examination of race relations there; the Minneapolis Star Tribune's editorial board hosted me the other day, and I had one of the most searching and rewarding discussions of the health care conditions in our country that I have had in a long time.

Every day, you are challenging us to think and to care through your newspapers. My job is to act. As I travel the country, I see that that is basically what people want us to do. Oh, they want us to be careful. They know we live in a cynical age, and they're skeptical that the Government would even mess up a one-car parade. But they want us to act.

The future of our American leadership depends upon what we do at home, but also what we do abroad. Last year among the most important developments were the trade agreements, the NAFTA agreement, the GATT agreement, the historic meeting we had with the leaders of the Asian-Pacific communities. But we have a lot of problems, too. By attempting to come to grips with them in a world increasingly disorderly, we hope to preserve an environment in which America can grow and Americans can flourish, whether it is in addressing North Korea's nuclear program, which protects not only our troops on the Peninsula but ultimately the interests of all Americans, or supporting reforms in the Soviet Union, which helps to destroy missiles once aimed at us and to create new market opportunities for the future, or by harnessing NATO's power and the service of diplomacy in troubled Bosnia, which will help to prevent a wider war and contain a flood of refugees. Our efforts to stop the shelling of Sarajevo and the attacks on Gorazde, to bring the Serbs back to the negotiating table, to build on the agreement made by the Croats and the Bosnian Muslims, enhanced both Europe's security and our own.

Here at home, for the past 15 months, we have focused on starting the engines of upward mobility to try to make sure we can remember the values of the so-called forgotten middle class with an economic plan that is fair, with cuts that are real, investments that are smart, a declining deficit, and growing jobs.

Last year, our budget cut 340 programs, including most major entitlements. This year, the budget calls for cutting 379 programs, including the outright elimination of a hundred of them. As we cut unneeded programs, we're investing more in education, in medical research, in the technologies of tomorrow that create jobs now, whether in defense conversion or in environ-

mental sciences. We're fighting for a revitalized Clean Water Act, a safe drinking water act, a reformed Superfund program. All of them will clean the environment, but they will also create the jobs of tomorrow, everybody from engineers to pipefitters.

As April 15th approaches, people will see that I did tell the truth last year about our economic program: 1.2 percent of Americans will pay more in income taxes, including me and some others in this room. All that money will go to reduce the deficit. One-sixth of America's workers will get an income tax cut this year because they are working hard and raising children but hovering around the poverty line. And we are attempting to reward work over welfare and to prove that people even in this tough, competitive environment can be successful workers and successful parents. That's why the earned-income tax credit was expanded so much. I believe it was the right thing to do.

The economic plan creates new opportunities to send people to college by lowering the interest rates and broadening the eligibility for college loans and then changing the terms of repayment so that young people can pay them back as a percentage of their earnings regardless of how much they borrow.

There is in this economic plan a new business capital gains tax, rewarding investments for the long term. People who make new investments for 5 years or more will get a 50-percent tax cut in the tax rate and a 70-percent increase in the small business expensing provision—something that's been almost entirely overlooked—which makes 90 percent of the small businesses in the United States of America, those with taxable incomes of under $100,000, eligible for an income tax cut.

The economy has generated a 20-percent increase in auto sales and 2.5 million new jobs; 90 percent of these new jobs are in the private sector. That's a far higher percentage than the new jobs of the eighties.

The combination of declining deficits, which will amount to 3 years in a row—if this budget is adopted, we'll have 3 years of declining deficits in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States. And it has produced steady growth and low inflation, leading many of our most respected economists, from the Fed Chairman, Alan Greenspan, to Allen Sinai, to say that our economy and its fundamentals has the best prospects it's had in two to three decades. Inflation is projected to be lower this year than last year.

We've come a long way, but there's a long way to go. There's still too many people out of work, too many people working for low wages, too many people who know that they can work harder and harder and harder and they still won't have the opportunity of doing better. And there are too many people who are left out altogether, living in environments that are, at worst, downright dangerous.

Our country is more than an economy; it is a community of shared values, values which have to be strengthened. This year, we are working on things that will both strengthen the economy and strengthen our community. We're working on a welfare system which will continue to reward work and family and encourage people and, in some cases, require people to move from welfare to work through welfare reform.

We are working on lobbying and campaign reforms which, if the Congress will pass them, and I believe they will, will help us to change the culture of Washington in a very positive way. The national service program this year will have 20,000 young people earning money for their college educations by solving the problems of this country in a grassroots fashion in their communities or in others all across America. And the year after next we'll have 100,000 young people doing that.

The Vice President's reinventing Government program has been a dramatic example of giving us a Government that will work better for less by slashing paperwork and regulations and again, if this budget is adopted—thanks to the work already done by the Congress—will lead us in a 5-year period to a reduction of the Federal Government by 252,000 workers, in a 6-year period by 272,000 workers; so that in the end of 5 years, we will have the smallest Federal Government since the 1960's, the early sixties. I'll tell you what we're going to do with the money in a minute.

But we are moving in the right direction. The health care reform debate is a big part of that. I know there's a lot of good in our health care system. We don't want to mess with it. We want to fix what's wrong. But nobody who has seriously analyzed it can doubt that we have the worst and the most inefficient system of financing health care of any of the advanced countries. No other country spends more than 10 percent of its economy on health care.

We spend 14.5 percent of our income. Part of that's because we're more violent; part of it's because we have high rates of AIDS; part of it's for good reasons: We spend more on medical research and technology, and we wish to continue to do that. No one would give up that premium. It's an important part of our world leadership and our global economy. Indeed, we need to find ways to do more in some of these areas, in biotechnology, for example.

But a part of it stems from the fact that we have a system which is plainly inefficient and which, in paperwork burdens alone, may cost as much as a dime on the dollar more than any other system in the world. We are also the only advanced country in the world that has not figured out how to provide health care to all its citizens. Everybody else has figured out how to do it. The result of that is that almost all of you work for companies that pay too much for your health care, because when people who don't have health insurance get real sick, they tend to get health care when it's too late, too expensive, at the emergency room, and they pass the cost on to the rest of you in higher premiums. If you live in rural areas where the costs can't be passed along, the cost is passed along in another way, in lower quality of health care when the hospital closes or the clinic closes or the last doctor moves away.

Eighty-one million Americans live in families with someone with a preexisting condition, who's been sick before, so that they pay too much for insurance, can't get it, or can never change jobs. This is an important part of rebuilding a faith in the middle class. It's no accident that the First Lady and I have received a million letters that people—telling us their personal stories. They aren't pikers. They're people who have paid their dues, who work hard, who want to make something of themselves in this country. And because of the way we finance health care, they haven't been able to do it.

The education initiatives of our administration are important in this regard. The Goals 2000 bill I just signed for the first time in American history sets national standards of world class excellence in education and encourages schools to use grassroots reforms to achieve them. The student loan reforms will open college education to more young people than ever before.

And finally this year we're going to try to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system. All of you as employers pay unemployment taxes into a system that is fundamentally broken. The average person when laid off was called back after a period to his or her old job when the unemployment system was created. And the unemployment system was just sort of a fair way for the employer to contribute to the maintenance of that person at a lower wage level while on unemployment. But today, most people don't get called back to their old jobs. Instead they have to find new ones. And we should no longer ask people to pay for a system that leaves people idle for a period of months after which they're out of work with no training, no skill, and not a good prospect for the future. So we believe from the day a person is unemployed, he or she should be involved in a retraining and a new job placement program immediately. It will cut the period of unemployment. It will increase the national income, and it will certainly honor the values of the American middle class if we change this system.

For all of this, there are still a lot of things, maybe the most important things about America, that Government can't do. Nothing has reminded me more of that than the headlines in today's Washington Post. I'm sure you saw the story. Two 10-year-old boys were taken into custody yesterday in an elementary school not far from here, just across the line in Maryland. They were charged with planning to sell crack cocaine found in one of their school bags. Even in this jaded age most everybody, including the school officials at the school, were shocked .

We can do a lot of things to put this country back where it belongs. We can and must pass the crime bill to deal with a lot of these problems. It's a good crime bill: 100,000 more police officers; a ban on 28 kinds of assault weapons; the most innovative prevention programs we have ever supported at the national level to try to keep young kids out of trouble and give them something to say yes to as well as things to say no to; tougher punishment in what I think are sensible ways. And how are we going to pay for it, $22 billion over 5 years? With a 250,000 reduction in the Federal work force, not with a tax increase.

But even if you do that, we cannot live the lives of children for them. So every one of us, every parent, every teacher, every person, has to somehow find a way to reach these kids before it's too late. Somehow the young people

who make it know that they're important. They understand that their lives matter. They understand that there can be a future. They think about the future in terms of what happens 5 or 10 years or 20 years from now instead of what happens 5 or 10 minutes from now. They understand that they have to fight to find ways other than violence to solve their problems or deal with their frustrations. They have to come to understand that children having children is just wrong and can't lead to anything good for them, that drugs will ruin their lives. We've got a lot of kids now who are beginning to creep back into drug use just because they think it's hopeless out there. We have to change that, and we have to help them change that. And a Government program, alone, cannot do it. We have to do it with the kinds of things you do with these special reportings in your newspaper and galvanizing and organizing people all over this country, community by community.

Finally, let me just say this. A couple of nights ago, we marked the end of the year honoring the 250th birthday of Thomas Jefferson. For you as journalists, of course, his commitment to freedom of expression was his greatest gift to us. I don't know how many journalists I've had quote Jefferson's famous line that if he had to choose a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, he would unhesitatingly choose the latter. My response is always, he said that before he became President. [*Laughter*]

But there's a line, or a lesson, that we often overlook. Jefferson was also a slaveholder, even though he wrote three or four times in various places attempts to limit slavery or do away with it. If you go to the Jefferson Memorial, you find that wonderful quote when he says, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just and his justice cannot sleep forever." He knew it was wrong, but he couldn't change it.

But Jefferson's great legacy, in some ways, was the advocacy of relentless change. He said that we'd have to change our whole way of doing things once every generation or so. He said the Earth belongs to the living. In other words, the great power of the idea that change and progress is possible if rooted in fixed principles is really the idea we need to bring to American life today.

We all share the responsibility in achieving that kind of change and progress. I think we have got to get together. We've got to go on with the work before us. We cannot afford to be diverted or divided in this town. We cannot afford to ignore the urgent tasks at hand. And we cannot afford to ignore the possibility that we can really make a difference, that we can ensure for the next generation of children the values and the life that were given to us by the generation which preceded us. And that, I submit to you, is the job of the President and the job of the American people in 1994.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the moderator announced that the President would take questions. The first participant suggested that delinquency and crime among children were symptoms of the disease of adult delinquency.*]

The President. Well, in some ways I think it is a symptom. I think it is the outgrowth—if you think about what makes all societies work, basically what makes societies work, what makes them function, what guarantees a healthy environment, it is basically a devotion to the family unit, a devotion to the idea that everybody ought to have some useful work to perform, and an understanding that while the rights of individuals are important, the interests of the community at large are important, too, and that all of us find most personal fulfillment when we live in a community that itself is succeeding. So we have obligations to a larger community. If you go to the places that are in the worst trouble in America today, all three of those things are in deep distress, not very much sense of community, not very much work, and families in ruins.

And what I'm trying to do, sir, is to try to create an environment in which we support family, work, and community, both with incentives for people to do the right thing, like giving a tax break to working people so they won't feel that they'd be better off on welfare—they're hovering at the poverty line—to dealing with the kinds of things that Secretary Cisneros dealt with when he spent the night in the Robert Taylor Homes Project of Chicago the other night, trying to find ways for the people who live in public housing to be secure, to build their own communities, take control of their own destiny, and to be safe from that.

But I agree with you, I think a lot of these problems we identify are the consequences of the fundamental stress on those three things: work, family, and community.

[*A participant cited the watchdog role of the press and asked what could be done to make Government more open to the press in terms of access to electronic information and Presidential materials and Pentagon policy regarding coverage of military action overseas.*]

The President. Well, first of all, I think I mentioned one example in my opening remarks. And that is, I think that the Energy Department is doing quite a good job in dealing with the whole radiation issue. We also have under the review all the sort of, the secrecy rules of Government, and we expect to change them and make available a lot more records than have been available in the past.

You made a specific comment about technology and whether technology can be used to facilitate this. And we do have a couple of people at the White House—and unfortunately, I'm not one of them—who know a whole lot about this. And we've tried to use things like E-mail more and things like that. But that's one of the things that I've asked our people to study, is how we can use this so-called information superhighway to hook the news media of the country into the Government more for things that are plainly available anyway and whether that could be facilitated. Just the technological transfers, I think, would make a big difference.

On the fourth question, I can't give you a satisfactory answer because I haven't made up my own mind yet, and I don't think I know enough to make a decision, and that is, the relationship of the press to our military operations in time of combat. I'm not rebuffing you, I'm just telling you I have not thought it through, and I don't know what my options are.

But on the other three things, I think we're in accord, and I will try to do a little more work on the whole issue of technology transfer and interconnection. And I think we are moving forward to open more records.

[*A participant asked if the President still believed intervention in the labor dispute involving Caterpillar, Inc., would be appropriate.*]

The President. Well, we have worked hard through the executive branch to resolve other labor disputes, as you know, including the one involving the airlines recently. So I am not averse to that. But if you'll remember, at the time I said that there was an actual strike in place that was of significant duration for a company, Caterpillar, that is very important to this whole country. A lot of you may not know this: Caterpillar has as much as 80 percent of the Japanese market for some of its products. It's a very, very important company.

And so, I guess what I have to tell you is if the strike occurs and if it is of significant duration and if there is something that I think we can do about it, I would be glad to look into that. But what I have tried to do on all labor disputes is not to prematurely intervene—there is no strike at this moment—not to prematurely intervene and to take it on a case by case basis depending on what the national interest is and whether or not there is a positive role we could play. In the case of the airlines, there was; and one or two other cases—a railroad issue, and several others—there has been something we could do. And if it happens, you can be sure that I will look into very closely.

[*A participant asked the President to grade the performance of columnists and editorial writers in covering his administration and Whitewater.*]

The President. Well, let me first of all say, the grade that they gave me is not as important to me as the grade, sort of objective criteria, that many of the journals here went through: just how much did we get done last year as compared with previous first-year Presidencies. And all the objective analysis concluded that we had the best first year in a generation, in 30 years or more, just in terms of the volume and significance and the difficulty of legislative achievements and advances. So I felt quite good about that, and that's how I measured my own.

Secondly, if I could grade the press, I wouldn't, especially not now. [*Laughter*] But let me just say—let me make three points very quickly about it, either in general or on Whitewater. If you have any doubts about it, then that's good because you ought to be having doubts about things like this. But I want to make three points. One is, you can't generalize about the press today. You probably never could generalize about the press. But believe me, it is far harder to generalize about it than ever before. There is no way you can do that.

Secondly, I think it is—the press, at least in this town, is very different from most of the press outside this town in terms of how they work and what's important and all of that. But they are under more competitive and other pressures today than ever before. I said last night

at the radio and TV correspondents dinner that the Founding Fathers had two points of untrammeled freedom in our set-up. One was given to the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts; that is, they had lifetime jobs. And they got that because somebody had to make a final decision. They have limited power but ultimate freedom. So they have to be careful not to abuse their freedom. The other was the press, because nobody could think of any practical way to limit the press. And in fact, the limits have become less, not more, with the weakening of the libel laws over time.

And I just think that always, any kind of unrestricted freedom imposes great responsibility on people. And what happens here is, when you've got, for example, you've got all these different new outlets; you've got all these channels; you've got all this time to fill; you have all this competition now from the tabloids; you have the highly politically motivated outlets posing as news media, but not really, trying to affect what the news media do. It is more difficult to be responsible now than ever before. It is a bigger challenge than ever before.

The third thing I would say is, while I am in no position to comment on this, you ought to read what Garrison Keillor said last night at the radio and television correspondents dinner. It was a stunning speech. I have never heard anyone speak that way to a group of media people. He obviously was from the heart, and he said some very thoughtful things. And if you really care about the issue, I would urge you to read what he said. I could not add anything to what he said last night.

Q. That's an A-plus answer.

The President. Thanks.

[*A participant asked for a response to the claim that the Veterans Administration hospital system was an example of why the Government should not run the health care system.*]

The President. That's why we don't recommend a Government run the health care system. I have two responses to that. First of all, our plan does not provide for Government-run health care. In fact, that's very rare in the world. The British system is the only one where the government actually delivers the health care, just about. There are some other systems, like the Canadian system, where the government finances it all. We have Government-financed health care through the Medicare program. Most people think it's pretty good who are on it. But it's all—you know, if you are on Medicare, you get to choose your own doctor; it's all private care, all private.

The veterans hospital system worked quite well, sir, for a while, but it doesn't work now because the Government can't run it without its being able to compete. I mean, what basically happened is, there are fewer and fewer veterans who choose to use the veterans hospital network. They have other options for pay—they're eligible for Medicare; they have private insurance or whatever. The veterans hospital can't take that kind of pay, so it becomes more underfunded while the population it's treating goes down, and those difficulties feed on itself.

I think we've got a—basically, we have proposed to give the veterans hospital network the chance to compete and do well, but when those veterans hospitals are in trouble, that's why they're in trouble. What I proposed to do instead is to have guaranteed private insurance, and all I want the Government to do is to require guaranteed private insurance for the employed uninsured, organize approval to give discounts to small businesses so they won't go broke providing the insurance, and then organize buyers co-ops so small business, farmers, and self-employed people can buy insurance on the same terms that big business employees and Government employees can. And I don't want the Federal Government to do that, I just want it set up so that can be done at the State level.

But I certainly don't think we ought to have a Government-run health care system. I think the Government could create an environment in which everybody can get health insurance; we can bring cost in line with inflation—the right economic incentives for managed care are there—and the little folks have the same chance as the big folks to get affordable care. That's all I want to do.

[*A participant asked for a response to his daughter's comment on the President's explanation of events that occurred 15 years ago: "He sounds just like me when I'm trying to explain why I don't have my homework."*]

The President. Well, let me tell you, let me give you an example. I'll just say one thing. Garrison Keillor said last night, he said, "You know, all I know about Whitewater is what I read in the papers, so I don't understand it." [*Laughter*] He made two statements; I'm just

repeating what he said. He said, "I really wasn't going to talk about Whitewater tonight, but I was afraid if I didn't say anything, you'd think I know something about it." [*Laughter*] Then he said, "I suppose I ought to tell you that I've never been to Arkansas. But," he said, "I'm reluctant to tell you that because then you will attack me for not telling you that 30 days ago." [*Laughter*]

All I can tell you, sir, is I have done my best to answer the questions asked of me. Maybe you have total and complete recollection of every question that might be—not is—might be asked of you at any moment of things that happened to you 12, 13, 14 years ago. Maybe you could give your tax records up for 17 years and, at the moment, answer any question. Or maybe, instead, you want to go back to the homework question: You think I should have shut the whole Federal Government down and done nothing but study these things for the last 2 months?

I would remind you that I was asked early on by the press and the Republicans to have a Special Counsel look into this, on the grounds that then everyone could forget about it and let the Special Counsel do his job and I could go on and be President. I could give all the records up, and then when he had a question in his document search, he could ask me, we could work it out, and the issue could be resolved. So I said, "Sure," even though the criteria for appointing a Special Counsel weren't met. No one had accused me of any wrongdoing, certainly nothing connected with my Presidency or my campaign for the Presidency. I said, "Let's do it so I can go back to work." And that is what I have tried to do.

Since then, the same people who asked for the Special Counsel, so that these issues could be resolved in an appropriate and disciplined way and I could go back to work, have decided they were kidding and they wanted to continue for us to deal with this. Well, I'm sorry, I'm doing the best I can while I do the job I was hired by the American people to do.

I have been as candid and as forthright as possible. Sam Dash, the Watergate special prosecutor, said, "This is a very different administration than previous ones. These people have resisted no subpoenas. They have claimed no executive privilege. They have cooperated. They have turned all the documents over." I have done everything I know to do.

But can I answer every question that anybody might ever ask me about something that happened 10, 15, 17 years ago on the spur of the moment and have total recall of all of that while trying to be President? No, sir, I cannot. But the Special Counsel has a process for dealing with that which would permit us to focus on the truly relevant questions and deal with it. And I have cooperated very well. I will continue to do that.

I will also do my best to give information to the press. But I would just like to point out that the people who asked for the Special Counsel asked for it and said, "The President ought to do this so we can clear the air and he can go on and be President." Now the suggestion is, the implication of your remark, sir, is that instead of that, I should stop being President and do my homework on this issue.

Q. All I was asking is what I should tell my daughter for her response. And I think the response was wonderful, and I thank you very much for it.

The President. Thank you.

Q. We have time for one more question right here.

Q. Mr. President, I'm Tom Dearmore, retired from the San Francisco Examiner and a native of your home State——

The President. Mountain Home, Arkansas.

Q. ——who used to long ago stir up lots of trouble in Arkansas.

The President. You're still legendary down there, Mr. Dearmore. [*Laughter*]

Q. My father helped run your campaign for Congress 20 years ago——

The President. He sure did. And I'm grateful to him.

[*The participant then asked if the President favored any limitation on the use of U.S. foreign aid funds for abortion.*]

The President. Yes, I do. I do, and let me say first of all, I have asked—I did about 2 days ago—I saw a story on this, and I received a couple of letters about it. And I have asked to see the language that we are advocating and the language that is in the present draft so that I can personally review it.

My position on this, I think, is pretty clear. I think at a minimum that we should not fund abortions when the child is capable of living outside the mother's womb. That's what we permit to be criminalized in America today under

Roe against Wade. And secondly, we should not, in any way, shape, or form fund abortions if they are enforced on citizens by the government, if they're against people's will.

There may be other restrictions I would favor, but I can just tell you that on the front end, I think that those are the two places where I would not support our funding going in. And so I think that we ought to be very careful in how we do this.

On the other hand, I don't necessarily think that we ought to write the Hyde amendment into international law, because there are a lot of countries who have a very different view of this and whose religious traditions treat it differently.

So I think that there is some room between the original draft and where—it appears, from the news reports, some folks in the State Department may be going to write a policy that most Americans could support. But I'm glad you brought it up.

I, myself, did not know about this until just a few days ago. And I have asked for a report, and I've asked to see the documents myself so I can get involved in it and at least try to have some influence on what happens. Of course, it's an international conference. We don't know exactly how it will come out in the end, and there will be countries and cultures that have widely clashing views on this.

But anyway, I've answered you what I think.

Q. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, thank you very much. We're looking forward to a more informal gathering with you Friday night.

The President. I'm looking forward to it, too. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:31 p.m. at the J.W. Marriott Hotel.

Remarks Honoring the United States Winter Olympic Athletes

April 13, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, the First Lady, thank you for coming out here, in this case not warming up but trying to cool down the crowd—[*laughter*]—while I was trying to get out of the Oval Office; to all of our distinguished guests, and especially to the Olympians.

Let me say, first of all, that the Olympics for me, like most Americans, is primarily a personal experience, not something I experience as President but something—I'm just another American cheering for our teams. I'm proud of the fact that we brought home more medals than any U.S. Winter Olympic team in history. I'm proud of the astonishing achievements of this Paraolympic team and the fact that at least two of the athletes won four gold medals.

I was elated and a little resentful, frankly, when my wife and daughter were able to go to Lillehammer, and I couldn't. But you can bet your last nickel that all of us will be in Atlanta—[*applause*]—to our friends from Georgia there.

There's not much I can add to what the First Lady and the Vice President have said, except to first say how terribly impressed I was at the reports I got from Hillary and Chelsea about their contacts with the Olympians from the United States, about what kind of young people we sent over there and what kind of courage they had and the efforts that they made. It made an incredible impression on me.

And second, to tell you what I said when I started, I experience the Olympics primarily as a citizen. As a matter of fact, I may have endangered the national security, because I stayed up every night until you went off the air. [*Laughter*] I saw every last event. I saw every last interview. I heard "The Star-Spangled Banner" played every time it was played. I did it first when I was alone, and then when Hillary and Chelsea came back, we did it together. And I want to say something very personal about it.

What you did there, just by getting there, I hope with all my heart was communicated to the children that you visited when you went to the schools. And I thank you for that. And if I could ask you just for one thing, it would be to try to take some of your time—and I

saw from the television portraits of some of you that a lot of you have done this already—but to try to take some of your time for as long as you can just to find some way to expose yourselves to the young people of this country. Because so many of them have so many troubles, they have so many difficulties; they have no one to cheer them on or spur them on or get them up at 4 o'clock in the morning the way some of you had to to become what you wanted to be. And yet, by seeing you they can imagine themselves in the light of your life.

And I can tell you that I work hard up here every day, all of us do, trying to find ways to pull this country together and push this country forward and give our people the opportunities to live up to their God-given capacities. But in the end, this country is great because of what happens inside people's spirits and in families and in communities. And there are many of those young people whom you could reach better than I ever could. And because of what you have done, they will see that there are things that they could do; because of what you became, there are things that they can become.

I thank my friends Florence Griffith Joyner and Tom McMillen for their leadership of our Council on Athletics and Physical Fitness and all the others who have never forgotten the power of example in a positive way. Just never forget that. All of us as Americans are elated at just the very thought that we could send people to the Olympic games and what you had to do. You will probably never know and most of you will probably never see the results of the people you may have influenced just by visiting these schools in the last day. But I plead with you to keep doing it, because there are a lot of young people out there that we need for America's future. There are a lot of young people out there who will be making decisions about their lives in the next couple of years who literally may be profoundly affected just by seeing you standing in their classrooms or walking their halls or having a simple conversation with them.

You are the embodiment of what the rest of us try to create every day. I hope you'll never forget it and always give a little of it back to the next generation of young Americans.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, the President was presented with a team jacket and a luge.*]

The President. I don't know if I have the courage to get on this. [*Laughter*]

When I got this jacket, the Vice President, never one to pass up an opportunity to keep me humble, said, "They also have a luge suit for you." [*Laughter*] Nothing he says ever has one meaning. The other meaning was, "Think how much thinner you would look in it." [*Laughter*]

This is wonderful. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:34 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring the United States Winter Olympic Athletes
April 13, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President and Dr. Walker and—what am I supposed to call Hillary in public?—[*laughter*]—Madam First Lady.

You know, one of the things these Olympians learn is a whole lot of discipline and, along with that, sort of good conduct and good manners. But I think we're about to test it. They've already heard all of us give one set of speeches today, and now they're having to sit through a second or stand through a second, as the case may be. It was wonderful for us to have all of them at the White House today. And I want to thank them for coming, for giving all of us who work in the White House a big thrill at having the opportunity to meet them and congratulate them and express our great pride in their achievements.

One potentially unfortunate thing occurred at the White House today. Several of them invited me to jog in the morning. [*Laughter*] So there's a whole bunch of them coming, and now that I've announced it, doubtless more will come as well. And so I'm going to have to go home

early and get some extra sleep tonight. The Vice President would come, too—and he's a better runner than I am—but he's on his way to Marrakesh tonight. He's really taking a marathon—going to the meeting which will finalize the understanding among all of our nations for a new worldwide trade agreement and reminding the other countries that they promised that the next time we make a worldwide trade agreement, it will be a green round, one devoted to protecting the global environment and proving that that, too, can be good for our common economic destiny. So I thank him for that.

A few moments before he ran and won the 100-meter final and captured the gold medal in an Olympics a long time ago, one of the heroes of my youth, Jesse Owens, said, "A lifetime of training for just 10 seconds." Dr. Walker and I were talking out here before we came out to visit one more time and stand with the Olympians, and we were speculating about what the longest Winter Olympic event is, maybe the cross-country skiing, maybe the biathlon. But even the longest one is just the flash of an eye compared to all the training. Think of how many of these young athletes have worked their lifetimes to compete for a minute, sometimes slightly less, sometimes slightly more; a long event, an exhausting event in some of these encounters is 2 or 3 or 4 minutes. But really, it isn't a lifetime of effort for 10 seconds or 2 minutes or 2 hours. It's a lifetime of effort for a lifetime of reward. The reward of knowing that you have done your best with your God-given abilities, the reward of knowing you have lived a good life and stand out as a good model.

I asked all these young people today to continue to visit schools and see the children of America, as they did today. So many of our children today don't have parents or coaches or teachers who can get them up early in the morning, encourage them to great heights, provide the opportunities that so many of the rest of us take for granted. And yet I think these young Olympians, simply by talking to disadvantaged kids who may have no hope, who may have no opportunity in their own mind, who may not even be able to imagine what it is like to make a commitment for a year, much less 5 or 10 years or 20 years, the incredible impact that they can have on the young people of America is something that we must never underestimate and something that I hope and pray they will never underestimate.

I'd also like to say, to echo what the Vice President said, that we are doing our best through the President's Council on Sports and Physical Fitness to try to spread opportunities for participating in athletics to all of our people. And I have to tell you that one of the real tragedies of the economic hardships our country endured in the 1980's is that many of our schools and many of our cities cut back on recreational facilities. Here in the Nation's Capital, I am told that there are only three functioning ballparks that are open to kids who want to start teams. We have kids growing up on streets in America today who get all the way through their teen years without ever holding a baseball bat in their hand or having a mitt on their hand. We have whole cities where there are no Olympic-size swimming pools for children to swim in.

And so the second thing I ask of you all is to try to remind the city fathers and the State officials and the Federal officials, too, that body and mind go hand in hand, and we've got to bring recreational opportunities back to kids. We have to give them the spirit of teamwork and possibility even those who can never be Olympic athletes.

And finally, let me remind you that when the Olympics started, I mean, really started a long time ago, it gave all the warring Greek city states an excuse to quit fighting with one another and find a way to compete in peace and harmony and to forge bonds of understanding among people who literally were at war one with the other. We saw that in a gripping way in these Winter Olympics when the courageous Olympians from Bosnia somehow made their way to Lillehammer.

And so I ask all of you who have had the experience of the Olympics always to be emissary for a decent and humane set of relations among the people of the world. Most of what people are fighting for in this old world today, with the end of the cold war, is based on ancient hatreds, not present rational divisions, not principled arguments over differences in a way of life but old-fashioned bigotry that somehow they can't quite overcome. The spirit of the Olympics can help that, and all of you can embody that for the rest of your lives.

Somehow I think that all of these words that we've just said may not be quite registering on all the athletes because they've been through so much this year. Robert Frost once said about

the present, "It is too much for the senses, too crowded, too confusing, too present to imagine." But soon the present will be past, and all the athletes will fully comprehend, with the benefit of time, the magnitude of their achievement in making our Olympic team and what they mean in their own lives and to the lives of their friends and families and what they can mean to the lives of so many millions of others in America. The Olympic moment may be over, but their lifetime of training will bring a lifetime of benefits to themselves and to all the rest of us as well.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Leroy Walker, president, U.S. Olympic Committee.

Statement on the Bombing in Hadera, Israel

April 13, 1994

The United States strongly condemns this terrorist act. On behalf of the American people, I want to express my condolences to the families of the innocent victims killed on Israel's day of remembrance for those who fell in war. This action, like those before it, is a further attempt by extremists to derail the peace process. They must not be allowed to succeed.

We strongly support Prime Minister Rabin's pledge that he will continue the peace negotiations regardless of such terrorist acts. We also welcome Chairman Arafat's rejection of attacks on innocent Israeli civilians intended to strike at the peace process. We believe the best response to the enemies of peace is to demonstrate that negotiations can change realities on the ground and give hope to Israelis and Palestinians for a peaceful future.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Call to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

April 13, 1994

The President called Prime Minister Rabin of Israel this afternoon to express his condolences over the killings of Israeli civilians in Hadera and to express his sense of urgency regarding concluding the agreement on implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles. Prime Minister Rabin agreed with the President that it was important to accelerate the negotiations and reach prompt agreement. Both leaders underscored the need to ensure that the enemies of peace do not succeed. The President made it clear that the United States was ready to do its part to ensure that the negotiations reached a successful conclusion as rapidly as possible.

Nomination for the Export-Import Bank of the United States

April 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Julie Belaga as a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

"Julie Belaga's impressive range of public and private sector experience, particularly in the area of the environment, will be a valuable addition to the Export-Import Bank Board," said the President.

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

Remarks on the American Helicopter Tragedy in Iraq and an Exchange With Reporters

April 14, 1994

The President. On behalf of the American people, I want to begin by expressing my deep sorrow at the tragedy this morning in Iraq and to extend my personal condolences to the families and the loved ones of all those who lost their lives.

Three years ago, our Armed Forces joined in a multinational mission to provide humanitarian relief to the oppressed Kurdish minority civilians in northern Iraq. Those who died today were a part of that mission of mercy. They served with courage and professionalism, and they lost their lives while trying to save the lives of others. The important work they were doing must, and will, continue.

According to initial reports, two American helicopters were mistakenly identified as Iraqi helicopters and shot down by United States aircraft. I have met with Secretary Perry this morning. I have talked with him and with General Shalikashvili, and I have instructed him to lead a full inquiry into the circumstances of this terrible incident. We will get the facts. And when we get the facts, we will make them available to the American people and to the people of Britain, France, and Turkey, our partners in Operation Provide Comfort.

Later today, Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili will be providing further briefings to you as we know more and more facts. The facts are still coming in, and we will give them to you just as soon as we have verified exactly what occurred.

At this moment, let me close by saying that we should join together in terrible sorrow and also in honoring the high purpose for which these individuals served and in which they lost their lives. The Nation and the world should remember them in gratitude.

Thank you.

Helicopter Tragedy

Q. Mr. President, what's your preliminary assessment, though? What are you being told of how this could have happened? And is there any suggestion that the troops there are on too fine of a hair trigger?

The President. Well, all that will have to be, obviously, evaluated in light of the real facts here. There are at least three points of inquiry involving, first, the actions of the American jets; second, the AWACS and their actions; and third, the actions of the helicopters themselves. And again, I will tell you we will give you as much information as we can. I just am very reluctant to say anything until we're absolutely sure. I want you to have good information, and we will be doing continuous briefings and updates all day long as we know more.

Q. Do you know anything, Mr. President, about the numbers of people that might be involved and whether they were all American?

The President. We know that there were probably more than 20 people involved and that they were not all American. We do not believe they were all American. We believe there were some other people on the helicopters.

Q. And just to follow, you seem to be indicating——

The President. We do not have—let me say, as of the moment I walked out here, we do not have an absolute roster of the people on the helicopters. I would tell you if I knew. But we think there were approximately 12 total crewmembers, and we know there were some other people on the helicopters. And we know there were some other member countries in the operations. We do not know any more than that. When we know who was on there, we will tell you. As you know, we've dispatched an American team to the site to get all the facts.

Q. Do you know, sir, how high up the chain of command the decision had to be made to go ahead and take these helicopters out, what the process was, and whether it was followed?

The President. I have been briefed on that, but I believe, to make absolutely sure that no error is made in answering that question, that is a question you should direct to Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili, because they will be briefing shortly.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, in the wake of the decision by the U.N. and NATO to bomb in Bosnia, you're now confronted with a developing hostage crisis, it appears, there where French troops are the latest to be encircled by Serbs. What is your message to the Bosnian Serbs as this appears to be moving toward crisis proportions?

The President. Well, of course, this was a concern in the beginning of all our allies who had troops on the ground there. But I would remind the Serbs that we have taken no action, none, through NATO and with the support of the U.N. to try to win a military victory for their adversaries. What we have done is taken military action in Bosnia through NATO, with the approval of the United Nations, to get them to honor the U.N. rules and to encourage them to do what they say they wish to do, which is to engage in negotiations.

There was a hopeful report in this morning's press about the ongoing efforts of the Russians through Mr. Churkin to get the Serbs to stop the aggression and to return to the negotiations. We are in touch with all the events in Bosnia today; there are lots of things going on there. I think the Serbs would be making a mistake to start treating the United Nations and NATO forces as adverse combatants. That is not what we are doing; we are trying to get them to honor their word. And they would be making a mistake to do that.

Q. Sir, if I could follow, how would you get them to make the distinction that you're making? They don't seem to be picking up on that.

The President. I think they know quite well what went on. I think they're just trying to leverage their position.

Singapore Caning of Michael Fay

Q. Mr. President, Singapore seems intent on caning this American teenager who was convicted of vandalism. Do you think American companies that operate in Singapore should exercise their economic clout to try and stop this? And also, former President Bush is in Singapore today. Should he—would you like to see him intercede on behalf of the young man?

The President. I've not thought through your first question; I don't know the answer to that. We have generally quite good relations with Singapore. They have a different culture, a different view, a different set of laws.

As you know, I have not objected to the young man's being punished. I have not even objected to the young man's being incarcerated. I have objected to this caning. I think many Americans who have expressed sympathy with it do not understand exactly what it involves, how it is going to be administered, and that he is going to bleed considerably and may have permanent scars. And I think it is a mistake.

President Bush will have to decide for himself what he wishes to say, but I would—if he decides to say something supportive of the absence of caning, I would certainly be grateful for that. But that—it will be a decision for him to decide what he wants to say.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. in the Press Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vitaly Churkin, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister. The proclamation on the death of those aboard American helicopters in Iraq is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks to Mayors and Law Enforcement Officials
April 14, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you. Please be seated. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, as some of you may know, early this morning two American helicopters, flying in northern Iraq as part of Operation Provide Comfort to provide humanitarian relief to the Kurdish population there, were mistakenly shot down in a tragic accident by two United States jet fighters who thought they were Iraqi helicopters illegally in the area.

This is a terrible tragedy for the families involved and for the people in the Armed Forces who have courageously tried to protect the Kurds for many years now. And I would like to ask that, since so many of you put your lives on the line every day, we open this ceremony with a moment of silent prayer for those who lost their lives, their families, and their loved ones.

[*After a moment of silence, the following persons made brief remarks: Mayor Jerry Abramson of Louisville, KY; Sgt. Marc Lawson of the Atlanta, GA, Police Department; Mayor Sharpe James of Newark, NJ; Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, IL; and Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles, CA.*]

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mayor Riordan, Mayor Abramson, Mayor James, Mayor Daley. Sergeant Lawson, you gave a great talk today, and you represented people in law enforcement very well, and we thank you especially for being here. To Attorney General Reno and the other Federal officials who are here, all the distinguished mayors, the leaders of our law enforcement organizations, and all of you in law enforcement, I thank those of you on the front lines of fighting the crime problem for coming here to Washington today to urge Congress to pass the crime bill now and without delay.

Behind me stand people who represent, not only by their own courageous deeds but by the uniforms they wear, the heroes of law enforcement who stand behind all the rest of us every day, people who wake up every morning, put on a uniform, and put their lives on the line to protect our safety. There are nearly 100 of them from every State in America. They do good work. They can not only catch criminals, they can prevent crime. And that's why we want to put another 100,000 like them on our streets over the next 5 years.

Last week, I was in communities all across America like those represented here today. The Attorney General was, too. And everywhere people wanted to talk about the crime problem, about the violence, about the tearing away of the future of so many children's lives.

When you go to Capitol Hill today, tell Congress that the people you and I work for have waited long enough. The people don't care about amendments that could slow the process down. They don't want partisan bickering. They want the bill certainly to be reviewed carefully and to be honestly debated, but this is not a problem, as Mayor Riordan so eloquently said, that the American people see in terms of partisan advantages.

Nearly one-third of all American families—Democrats, Republicans, and independents, whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, you name it—all of us, we share a common curse: In the most wonderful country in the world, we have the highest violent crime rate, the largest percentage of our people behind bars, cities where young people in gangs are often better armed than the police forces who are supposed to protect the rest of the citizens. We can do better than this, and this crime bill is a very good start. Ask Congress simply to give you the tools you need to do your job.

The 100,000 new police officers is a 5-year goal. But I have made it clear to Congress that if they will go ahead and pass this bill now, even though it's mid-April, I will cut through the bureaucracy and the redtape to make sure that 20,000 of those new officers are hired, trained, and ready to go to work within the first year of this bill.

More police officers on the street, in the neighborhoods, relating to the people who live there, properly trained and properly deployed, will lower the crime rate. In Los Angeles—he was too modest to mention this, but after the earthquake, Mayor Riordan and Chief Williams responded to a potentially explosive situation by increasing police presence on the street, increasing contact with the community. And there was

instead of an increase in the crime rate, which was perfectly predictable, a dramatic decrease in the crime rate. The Los Angeles Times said it helped keep criminals off the street in record numbers. The people of L.A. rose to the occasion because they saw the police in their communities, they knew they were not alone, and they knew it was a problem that, together, they could deal with.

No matter how many more police we put into our communities, we also know that we have to do something about the relatively small percentage of our criminal population who commit the dangerous, violent crimes repeatedly. This crime bill does tell them, "Three strikes and you're out." As I have said several times and I said with the Attorney General over at the Justice Department a couple of days ago, this is a controversial provision of the bill. But let us not forget that for many violent criminals today, if the consequences of their crime are serious enough, they could get a life sentence: "One strike and you're out."

But State rules are different from State to State on parole eligibility. And there are many people that we now know are highly likely to continue to repeat certain kinds of very serious crimes. There ought to be a provision in our criminal law that identifies them and that protects the rest of the population and the law enforcement population and permits us to say to other criminals who are not in that category, "You have a chance to start your life again." So, is it right to have a "three strikes and you're out" law? I believe it is. And I think that we're doing the right thing to pass it in this bill today.

We also make available funding for 30,000 more prison cells so that we don't treat this as some sort of mandate on the States. We are trying to help the States to enact their own kinds of sensible punishment laws and bear some of the costs along with them. We also provide funding for smarter and less costly punishment for nonviolent criminals—boot camps for juvenile offenders—and significant, even dramatic, increases in drug treatment so that people who are going to be paroled have a good chance to make it once they go back on the street. I thank you, Sergeant Lawson, for mentioning Lee Brown, the Director of our drug policy. Now he worries not only about community policing but about how we can make sure, when we do parole people, they're likely to be law-abiding. And I can tell you, it does not make sense, when you look at the percentage of people who commit crimes who have a drug or an alcohol abuse problem, it does not make any sense to put them back on the street without adequate drug treatment. Finally, this bill does something about that. And the Congress should be urged to pass it for that reason alone, along with the other good things in the bill.

Let me say finally, this bill has a healthy dose of prevention. And we know that works. And I was glad to see Sergeant Lawson speak up for prevention. It's funny, you know, you hear sometimes the debates in the Congress and people who want to be tough on crime say, "Well, this prevention stuff, it's a little squishy, and maybe we shouldn't spend the money on it." But if you talk to any veteran police officer, they tell you, "Spend the money on prevention. Give me the tools to do alcohol and drug abuse education. Give me the tools to give these kids something to do before school and after school and at night. Give me the tools to give these young people something to say yes to, instead of just having us tell them to say no to something wrong." That's what the law enforcement community tells us. So I would ask you as you go to the Hill today, if you believe that, as every law enforcement official I've ever spoken with does, tell the Congress that prevention is an important part of this.

On Monday at the Justice Department, a young man from Boston named Eddie Cutanda stood up and said he used to hate the police. Pretty brave kid. There were about 500 police officers there when he said it. [*Laughter*] And he said he used to hate the police, because he used to run the streets with his friends. But he got away from gangs and drugs, thanks to a community policing program and the kind of afterschool activity that the officers were able to bring to the young people of Boston, a prevention program that worked, that made this young man and his friends go from hating the police to loving the police and had him standing up in the Justice Department with the Attorney General and the President of the United States, saying, "We are not part of a lost generation. We want to have a life and a better future." There are all kinds of prevention strategies in this bill including the opportunity for some of our communities to offer large numbers of jobs to teenagers who are today out of work, just to test to see whether that will lower the crime rate dramatically. We will be able to experiment

with a lot of different things, as well as building on what works in community after community.

You know, I ran for this job and moved to Washington because I wanted to help empower people back home all over America to solve their own problems. That's what this crime bill does. And another thing I am proud of is we do it without new taxes, even though, as Mayor James said, it is by far the biggest Federal investment, and Mayor Abramson emphasized, by far the biggest Federal investment in anticrime activities in the history of this country.

We do it by taking a major portion of the Vice President's reinventing Government plan, a plan to reduce the Federal bureaucracy by 250,000 employees over the next 5 years and put all the savings into a trust fund directed to fund the crime bill. That's a pretty good swap: reduce the Federal Government by 250,000 by attrition, by early retirement, with discipline over the next 5 years, and give all the money from the savings back to local communities to make our streets, our homes, and our schools safer.

Again, let me thank you all for coming here. Let me remind you that this is not a partisan issue or a sectional issue or a racial issue or an income issue. If anything should unite our country, if anything should truly make us a United States of America in 1994, it should be the passionate desire to restore real freedom to our streets, to give our families back their security, to give our children back their future.

I thank all of you for what you have done to secure it. I look forward now to honoring these fine police men and women behind me, and I urge you: take this opportunity to make it abundantly clear to the United States Congress that America should not wait another day, another week, for a crime bill that will achieve these objectives. We need it, and you can deliver it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Willie L. Williams, chief of police, Los Angeles, CA.

Statement on the Pacific Northwest Forest Management Plan

April 14, 1994

Today marks the beginning of a new era for the Pacific Northwest and for forestry management across our Nation.

With this decision, we begin efforts to restore the forests that make the region beautiful, productive, and utterly unique. We are taking the single most important step toward once again having a steady flow of timber to Pacific Northwest mills. At the same time, the plan provides for sustainable management of our Nation's precious natural resources.

This plan fulfills the commitment I made one year ago. It is environmentally credible and backed by the best available science. It meets the high standards required by Federal court and expected by the American people. It is a document that should move management of Federal forests out of the courts and into the hands of professional resource managers. Today's decision moves us from gridlock to growth, from obstructionism to opportunity.

The Secretaries' decision today offers a hopeful break from the past. It is just one element of a strong and comprehensive plan for the Pacific Northwest. Working closely with the Congress, my administration has forged powerful new partnerships with State and local governments in the region. We are creating new, well-paying jobs in timber-dependent communities and are providing the certainty that investors and businesses in the region have so desperately needed. Our ties to the region and our commitment of financial support for the next 5 years will continue to provide the leadership for a full economic recovery.

NOTE: The Record of Decision was signed by Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt.

Nomination for an Under Secretary of the Treasury
April 14, 1994

The President today announced the nomination of Assistant Treasury Secretary Ronald K. Noble as Treasury Under Secretary for Enforcement.

"I am pleased to nominate Ron to this newly created and critically important position," the President said. "I am confident that his proven leadership and skilled service in the area of law enforcement will continue to contribute greatly to our fight against crime."

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

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Meeting With Prime Minister Tansu Ciller of Turkey
April 14, 1994

President Clinton offered his condolences to the Turkish Prime Minister and to the families and loved ones of those Turkish citizens who lost their lives today in the accident in northern Iraq. Prime Minister Ciller expressed her own sorrow at the loss of life.

The President and Prime Minister Ciller discussed her economic reform package. He urged her to move forward quickly with her reform program and to work closely with the International Monetary Fund. The two leaders also discussed the situation in Cyprus. President Clinton and Prime Minister Ciller agreed to continue to do what they can to make progress soon in the talks on the confidence building measures package.

Remarks on the American Helicopter Tragedy in Iraq and an Exchange With Reporters
April 15, 1994

The President. Hello. The people here from Louisiana and Texas are here primarily for health care, and I apologize for the delay. But I met for an hour and a half this morning with my national security team about a variety of issues, but I wanted to say in particular a word of update about the terrible tragedy in Iraq yesterday.

After I met yesterday with my national security advisers, I spoke with Prime Minister Major and with President Mitterrand, expressed my condolences for the losses of French and British citizens, and assured them of what I can now reassure you about, which is that we've put together an investigative team which is now on the site and is working. We will move as quickly as possible to do a thorough and complete investigation and then to put out all the facts.

In a couple of hours, an hour or so, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be having a briefing at the Pentagon to discuss this further and to answer further questions. But we are going to stay on top of this, work through it, and make a full report to the American people.

If there are any other questions—perhaps we could take some questions on foreign policy or any other national issues for a while, and then we'll come back to the health care questioning.

Iraq

Q. Sir, in light of that shooting down, should the peacekeeping mission in Iraq continue?

The President. Oh, I think so. I very definitely think so. Keep in mind these people—the tragedy of this is that both sets of planes, the two helicopters and the two planes were there trying to save the lives of the Kurds. And I think it has performed a very valuable function, not only in saving the lives of the Kurds but in permitting them to continue to live in northern Iraq and relieving Turkey of a very serious potential refugee problem.

There is no question in my mind that it has been a very successful and a very important mission. The Secretary of Defense implied yesterday and said again today that we would obviously, in the course of this investigation, be reviewing all the tactical issues involved. But our policy is sound, and I believe it should continue.

Bosnia

Q. In Bosnia, sir, there's another issue of peacekeeping. You have recent events by the Bosnian Serbs' actions that have been taken against U.N. peacekeepers and military observers. You yesterday made a statement you've been sending a message to them. But apparently, that message has not been getting across. Why is that, would you say? And is there a chance that there could be a stalemate emerging?

The President. Well, I think that some friction was predictable when the policy began. But let me remind you that since the United Nations has taken a more vigorous approach and asked NATO to be available, in fact, to provide close air support and created a safe zone around Sarajevo, substantial progress has been made. After a long time when virtually no progress was made, we've had relative peace in the Sarajevo area; we've had the agreement between the Croats and the Muslims which is holding.

We had some friction as a result of the last round of very modest air strikes as a result of the shelling of Gorazde which put United Nations personnel at risk. I think that what I have to do again is to clarify, if there is any real doubt, that the United States has no interest in having NATO become involved in this war and trying to gain some advantage for one side over the other.

But I think we must maintain an absolutely firm support of the U.N. policy. We can't have our U.N. personnel there vulnerable to shelling and to attack with no one there to defend them. The United Nations does not wish to become involved in changing the military balance.

Finally, I would say the most important thing is for the parties to get back to the negotiations. And I, again, want to say that Mr. Churkin from Russia is working hard on this. Our Ambassador, Mr. Redman, is there working. The United Nations is working. So I'd say our position is to be firm but not provocative and not trying to change the military balance. We need to get the negotiations back on track.

But remember, this policy has produced a lot of progress, after a prolonged period in which there was a lot of bloodshed and no progress. And I think if the Serbs will consider what the reality is, they will see that they have a lot more to gain from negotiations than from provocation. We should just be firm and work through this.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, you say the investigation is continuing in Iraq. Do you have, however, any preliminary estimates of what caused this incident?

The President. No, sir, I don't, really. Like every other interested American—and I think almost all our people are interested in this, I suppose—I have asked a lot of questions, and I've been able to ask a lot of those questions. But I think it would be a real disservice to the process for us to jump the gun. I don't want to mislead the American people. I don't want to say something that might later be proved wrong. We will conduct a thorough and vigorous investigation, and we will do our best to get all of the evidence out to you. But I don't want to make a preliminary judgment.

Peacekeeping Operations

Q. Mr. President, right now on your desk you have the Presidential directive dealing with peacekeeping. We understand that it's very close to completion, if not virtually completed. And it raises—a lot of the things that have been happening this week are touching on the issue of peacekeeping. Our understanding is, there are going to be tougher criteria for getting involved in peacekeeping activities. Is that the case? And could that mean that there would be fewer peacekeeping ventures?

The President. Well, keep in the mind, the United Nations decides which peacekeeping ventures it will get involved in. And then we

have to decide which ones in which we will become involved.

There are several issues here. And if I might, let me just outline some of them. Some of them relate to the management of the peacekeeping operations rather than particular decisions. The United States has long favored tighter financial controls and oversight. And we have urged the appointment of an inspector general at the United Nations publicly. We have also felt that our overall contribution to the peacekeeping cost was higher than it should have been and considerably higher than our world's share of annual income. So we have asked for some—we will seek some change of that. We also want to be very clear about the standards for our involvement in peacekeeping operations.

Now, having said that, I met with a bipartisan committee of congressional leaders yesterday morning and urged them to support our peacekeeping budget this year because we have a sensible way of avoiding dropping behind again in our obligations, dividing the responsibilities between the Defense and State Department. And I asked Congress to help me pay the arrears that we owe to the United Nations in peacekeeping. Even our own forces who went to Somalia can't be fully reimbursed in large measure because the United States owes more debt to the peacekeeping fund than any other country.

So I believe being involved with other nations in peacekeeping is a good way of burden sharing. After all, we only have—I think fewer than one percent of the forces involved in peacekeeping in the world now are American forces. We have about 5 percent of the world's population. We have less than one percent of the world's forces involved in peacekeeping.

So while we pay a little more than I think we should, our commitment in terms of manpower is less than our population would appear to warrant and certainly than our military capacity would. So we have been advantaged by multinational peacekeeping, and I will support it. I do think we need to have higher standards, and that will be in my directive when it comes out.

Thank you.

Q. Sir, when do you sign the——

The President. If you all have any other questions that are unrelated to health care, I'll answer them, too.

Q. Sir, when do you sign it?

The President. I'm not sure. We're working—we're very close. We've been working on it for a long time, as you noted.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:51 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House, prior to a question-and-answer session with the Louisiana and Texas media. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Charles Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia.

Statement on Disaster Assistance for California

April 15, 1994

Our administration is doing everything we can to respond to the continuing needs of individuals, families, businesses, and communities arising from the January earthquake. California's economic future depends in part on a strong recovery from the earthquake, and the loans and other assistance included in this package will help considerably. Our departments and agencies will continue to monitor events in California and take whatever actions are needed to meet Federal responsibilities there.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement on disaster assistance for California.

The President's Radio Address
April 16, 1994

Good morning. This week we joined in sorrow for those who lost their lives in the downing of two of our helicopters over Iraq. I want to begin by expressing, again, my condolences to the loved ones of those who died. They gave their lives in a high cause, providing comfort to Kurdish victims of Saddam Hussein's brutal regime, and we honor the sacrifice of those brave individuals.

Today I want to talk about one of the greatest threats we face right here at home: the threat of crime in our communities. In 1991, I visited the Rockwell Gardens in the ABLA housing projects in Chicago where I saw firsthand what happens to our children who live too long in the shadow of fear. Dozens of children rushed out to greet me, eager to have someone to tell their stories to. They talked of gunshots and drug dealers, of late-night knocks at their doors and hallways where they dared not stray. Many of their stories had a common theme: their childhoods were being stolen from them.

Vince Lane, the head of the Chicago Housing Authority, is a genuine hero to these children. He's trying to show the children that someone cares. To help, he put into effect a search-and-sweep policy to clean out Chicago's public housing communities, to find weapons, to get people out of those housing projects who didn't belong, to find drugs. But just over a week ago a Federal district judge declared Vince Lane's search-and-sweep policy unconstitutional.

Every law-abiding American, rich or poor, has the right to raise children without the fear of criminals terrorizing where they live. That's why, as soon as I heard about the court's decision, I instructed Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros and Attorney General Janet Reno to devise a constitutional, effective way to protect the residents of America's public housing communities. Secretary Cisneros and Attorney General Reno moved quickly. Today I am announcing a new policy to help public housing residents take back their homes.

First, at my direction, Secretary Cisneros is in Chicago to provide emergency funds for enforcement and prevention in gang-infested public housing. We'll put more police in public housing, crack down on illegal gun trafficking, and fill vacant apartments where criminals hide out. And we'll provide more programs like midnight basketball leagues to help our young people say no to gangs and guns and drugs. Second, we will empower residents to build safe neighborhoods, and we'll help to organize tenant patrols to ride the elevators and look after the public spaces in these high-rise public housing units. Finally, we're going to work with residents in high-crime areas to permit the full range of searches that the Constitution does allow in common areas, in vacant apartments, and in circumstances where residents are in immediate danger. We'll encourage more weapons frisks of suspicious persons, and we'll ask tenant associations to put clauses in their leases allowing searches when crime conditions make it necessary.

This new policy honors the principles of personal and community responsibility at the very heart of this administration's efforts. It also shows all Americans that their Government can move swiftly and effectively on their behalf.

Now we must move swiftly on the crime bill before Congress. The bill provides the right balance of protection, punishment, and prevention. It will put 100,000 more police officers on the streets for community policing efforts that work. It will make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land and provide money for new prisons. And it will pay for a wide variety of prevention programs to give our young people a future they can say yes to.

This is a crucial moment in the crime bill debate. It's time to tell Congress you've waited long enough for comprehensive national crime legislation, that you don't want political posturing or frivolous amendments, and instead, you need help to take back your communities.

This crime bill is for all our people, but nobody needs it more than the people like the mother of three who lives right here in Washington. A week ago, this 33-year-old mother came home after celebrating her 10-year-old daughter's birthday to find a gang of gunmen ransacking her apartment. The mother had one plea for the intruders: "If you believe in God, please don't shoot my children. Shoot me." The

reply was cold and terrifying. "I don't believe in God," said one of the gunmen. Then he shot her daughter dead. Before the gunfire ceased, another child and the mother were both shot, and her 3-year-old son witnessed the whole thing. The sad fact is, the police now believe the shootings were carried out by youths who hang out in the very apartment complex where that mother was trying to raise her children.

There are many rights that our laws and our Constitution guarantee to every citizen, but that mother and her children have certain rights we are letting slip away. They include the right to go out to the playground and the right to sit by an open window, the right to walk to the corner without fear of gunfire, the right to go to school safely in the morning, and the right to celebrate your tenth birthday without coming home to bloodshed and terror. The crime bill will help us take back those rights for all of our people, so will our new policy to protect public housing residents.

We must decide we will not tolerate more tragedies like that mother's. When we do that, together, we can replace our children's fear with hope.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:20 p.m. on April 15 in the Cabinet Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 16.

Remarks on Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters in Newport News, Virginia

April 17, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I've received a number of reports today on the situation in Bosnia. I've also been in touch today with President Yeltsin.

We don't have any definitive reports on the status of Gorazde, but I can tell you that there has been some progress in the negotiations between the United Nations and the Serbs. Mr. Akashi has been working on it, Ambassador Redman and Mr. Churkin, and they may have something to announce shortly.

I also—I don't know that this has been made public or not, but the Serbs released 16 Canadian soldiers, and we're working on the release of the other UNPROFOR forces today. So the situation is still tense around Gorazde. There is still some degree of uncertainty there, but there has been, as of my latest report, which was just about 10 minutes ago, some progress in the negotiations between the U.N. and the Serbs on getting back to the negotiations and reducing the tensions.

Q. What's the U.S. role been?

The President, Well, essentially, we've been—Ambassador Redman has been there. He's been working very hard, especially for the last 7 hours, trying to hammer out an agreement that everybody could live with, along with the U.N. and Mr. Churkin.

Secondly, we've worked very closely with the Russians trying to think about what the end game might be, how we can work this out to a successful conclusion over the long run. And of course, we're still a very important part of the NATO alliance, and we're committed to doing whatever we're asked to do by General Rose. But keep in mind, except for the safe area around Sarajevo, our role in NATO has been to provide close air support, or, if necessary, to protect the UNPROFOR troops, the U.N. troops, and where it's possible to do that. So we have the role, but we also have this diplomatic role, and we're doing our best to fulfill it.

Q. Have there been any violations of the new truce since the 3-mile zone was agreed to?

The President. I don't want to comment on anything definitively with regard to Gorazde, because we have been getting reports over the last 4 and 5 hours, kind of mixed reports. But on balance, the last report I got was encouraging in terms of an agreement impending between the U.N. and the Serbs.

Q. Were the next reports reports of tank incursions into that zone?

The President. There's one, I think. I think there was a news report that there was at least one tank sighted. But I want to say that we

have no reports at the moment that the status of Gorazde has changed.

Thank you.

Q. Is military action still possible?

The President. It depends on NATO. It depends on what the U.N. commander on the ground, General Rose wants. But their conclusions were twofold. One is that with regard to Gorazde itself, it wouldn't necessarily be possible now for close air support to have the desired military effect. And secondly, that they're trying to get a negotiated agreement here that can serve as the basis not only for relieving Gorazde but for getting these peace talks back on track. So that's what we hope we're doing.

Q. Are you considering actually easing the economic sanctions on the Serbs?

The President. No, not based on anything that's happened so far. We have said to the Russians that if they want to discuss that with us, that of course we would be willing to discuss it if certain conditions on the ground were met. But continued Serb aggression on the ground, not only in Gorazde but everywhere else, is hardly an encouragement to discuss that. That's not even—we can't even begin discussions in the environment which has existed for the last few days there.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. at the Newport News Williamsburg International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Yasushi Akashi, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for the Former Yugoslavia; Ambassador Charles E. Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia; and Vitaly Churkin, Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
April 18, 1994

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to say a word or two about the situation in Bosnia. First of all, as all of you know, the situation in and around Gorazde remains grim and uncertain. I think it is important to point out why this happened. It happened because the Serbs violated the understandings of a cease-fire agreement they made with both the United Nations and with the Russians. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that the Russians, working through Mr. Churkin's able leadership, have reached an agreement with the Serbs which they have not honored.

The United Nations commander on the ground, General Rose, made the judgment at several points over the last couple of days that NATO close-air support was either not practically feasible or would not be helpful under the circumstances. In Gorazde, we, the United States working through NATO, basically are empowered only to provide close-air support to U.N. troops when they are under siege or under threat of attack on request of the U.N. commander.

I have monitored this situation very closely all weekend; I spent a good deal of time on it on Saturday. I had lots of conversations yesterday about it and have met this morning with Mr. Lake. Our national security principals will be meeting today to consider what else we can and should do in this circumstance.

The main thing I want to point out is that we have to find a way to get the momentum back. The big successes in the last couple of months in Bosnia have been, obviously, preserving Sarajevo and achieving the agreement between the Croatians and the Government, the Bosnian Government. They are very important; those things still hold, and I'm convinced we can find a way to build on them and go forward.

But this has not been a great weekend for the peace effort in Bosnia. I do think that the big things are still working in the long-term favor of peace. And we'll just have to see where we are, and we'll be reporting more as the day goes on and through the rest of the week.

Q. Mr. President, you wanted to lift the arms embargo a year ago——

The President. I still do.

Q. ——would you still like to do it? Would you lead an effort to do that? It would take American leadership, many in Congress say, to do this.

The President. The Americans tried to lead it before. We will be discussing now what our other options are. As you know, at the time there was a clear specific reason we couldn't succeed in lifting the arms embargo, which was that not just the Russians but the French and British did not want to do it because they had soldiers on the ground. Now their soldiers on the ground are in danger. The real question we would have to work through there is how many countries would go along, and could we get it through the U.N.? But I've always favored doing it.

I just want to say, though—I want to ask you all to think about—those who say, there are many who say, "Well, we can do it unilaterally, and we ought to do it unilaterally." But remember, if we do that, first of all, there are substantial questions about whether under international law we can do it, but secondly, if you resolved all those, what about the embargo that we have led against Iraq that others would like to back off of but they don't because they gave their agreement that they wouldn't? What if we needed embargoes in the future? What about the trade sanctions on Serbia themselves? What about any possible future economic action in other countries where we have difficulties today that we'd want other countries to honor?

So we have to think long and hard about whether we can do this unilaterally. But certainly, as you know, I have always thought that the arms embargo operated in an entirely one-sided fashion, and it still does. That's the reason we're in this fix today because of the accumulated losses of the Bosnian Government as a direct result of the overwhelming superiority of heavy artillery by the Serbs.

But again, I would say we have been making good progress at the negotiating table. I don't want to have a wider war. I think even if you lifted the arms embargo and you had a lot of other people fighting and killing, in the end there would not be a decisive victory for either side in a war. There's going to have to be a negotiated settlement. And the real problem now is that the Serbs agreed to a cease-fire with both the U.N. and the Russians, and they didn't keep their end of the deal. We're going to have to see where we are today, and we'll have more to say.

Q. Why do you say you're making progress, and couldn't you have moved a little faster? This has been coming on for a couple weeks.

The President. I disagree with that. What do you mean? Keep in mind, the role of the United States and NATO is to respond when the United Nations asks for close-air support when its troops are in danger. This is not Sarajevo; Sarajevo was a special case. And the no-fly zone—if planes violate the no-fly zone they can be shot down. That was done by NATO and the United States. This is a different case. We can only do what we have the authority to do.

And frankly, I think it is a little too easy to Monday-morning-quarterback General Rose who has been very aggressive, very strong, and very much supported in this country and throughout the world for his aggressive actions. It's easy to say now he should have been more aggressive in Gorazde. I think he did the best he could with the resources he had under the facts as they existed. And so I don't know that General Rose had any other options. I just know that we have a disappointing and difficult situation there today, and we'll be working on it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:12 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Milwaukee, WI.

Remarks to Ameritech Employees in Milwaukee, Wisconsin
April 18, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Kohl. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that warm welcome. I started to stand on this thing so you would think I might be the mayor of Milwaukee, but on reflection I decided, like all public officials, I'd rather be closer to the microphone. [*Laughter*] I want to thank Senator Feingold for his support

and his leadership and his fine remarks. Congressman Barrett and Congressman Barca, we're glad to see you here. Thank you for being here with us. Congressman Gerry Kleczka, thank you so much; I'm glad to be here with you in your district and in your hometown. I want to say a special word of thanks to the Ameritech team for the welcoming here today. Dick Notebaert came out with me, along with Morty Bahr on the airplane, so the three of us had a chance to visit a little bit about what we would be doing today. And between the two of them, they convinced me that this may be the best company in the history of the world. They were talking about—[*applause*] I want to thank Gary Keating and Rick Compost in Detroit and Deborah Echols in Chicago and all the employees who are there. I also want to say, in addition to the fine work done by the CWA, I know that many of you are part of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; I thank you for your support in this health care effort. There are a lot of people here in the audience—I won't recognize all of them, but I would like to say a special word of thanks to the speaker of the Wisconsin House, Walter Kunicki, an old friend of mine, for being here. Thank you very much, sir, for coming. And I'd like to thank the Wisconsin Ameritech team, Bronson Haase and Bob Johnson and others. Thank you so much. We're glad to be here.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I came to Wisconsin first as a candidate for President, I did so not simply because I wanted to have the honor of the job, although it is a very great honor indeed, the highest any American citizen can receive, but because I thought the President's job was to bring the American people together and to move our country forward, to seize our opportunities, and to honestly face our problems. And we've been trying to do that.

We've seen a lot of talk over the last several years about our deficit, for example, but finally now, in the last year, the Congress has passed an economic plan that has brought the deficit down, helped to create a stronger economic climate, and 2½ million jobs have come into our economy, 90 percent of them in the private sector. That's more in 15 months than in the previous 4 years, in fact, twice as many as in the previous 4 years.

Congress now has a budget before it which it is passing in rapid fashion, perhaps record fashion, which does what we're supposed to do in Washington: make the difficult decisions. It eliminates 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, reduces overall discretionary domestic spending for the first time since 1969, and at the same time, spends more money on education, on Head Start, on defense conversion, and on the new technologies which will create the high-wage jobs of the 21st century.

If this budget passes, for the first time since Harry Truman was President we will have 3 years of declining deficits in the Federal accounts. That's a pretty good record for a Congress and an administration working together, breaking deadlocks, talking less, and doing more. I think that's what we were all hired to do.

Congress has a lot of other interesting work to do this year. It is taking up sweeping education reforms, some of them modeled on a lot of the exciting things that have gone on here in Wisconsin and some of your neighboring States. I signed a bill the other day called Goals 2000 which, for the first time ever, commits America to world-class standards of educational excellence in every school in the country and at the same time, promotes a lot of innovative grassroots reforms to achieve them and encourages communities to try new and different things.

We're trying to set up a system now that takes into account the fact that young people don't necessarily have to have 4-year college degrees to get good jobs as we move toward the 21st century, but they sure need more training than they get in high school. So we want a school-to-work transition that takes account of the real needs of people who don't go on to 4-year colleges.

Congress has a bill before it to completely redo the unemployment system. The unemployment system takes money, I would argue, under not entirely fair circumstances now from employers who pay the unemployment tax, because it used to be that when people lost their jobs, they were called back to their old jobs. So unemployment was a premium the employer paid to pay people at a lower level so they could at least get along until they got called back to their old jobs. Most workers do not get called back to their old jobs today. Most people have to find new jobs.

The economy is churning and changing, and no matter how many new jobs we can create, there will still be a lot of change in this economy. So we want, instead of an unemployment

system, a reemployment system, so the minute people lose their jobs, they're immediately eligible for retraining and for job help to find new jobs and different jobs, because the average 18-year-old will change work eight times in a lifetime, and we owe it to ourselves and our future to make sure that always people are retrained and placed as quickly as possible. We intend to do that this year; that's very important.

Our administration has been committed to welfare reform, to ending the whole welfare system as we know it, something that Wisconsin has a great deal of experience in. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Mayor Norquist and the city of Milwaukee, who have a national model in Project New Hope. It says you can move people from welfare to work. I know we can do that; I'm going to talk more about it in a minute. But that is another thing we are facing this year. This is an exciting time in our Nation's Capital, because people are actually working on the problems facing America.

The first item of business now, when we go back tomorrow in Congress, will be the crime bill that's in the House of Representatives. And then the House and the Senate will get together. If the best of both bills passes, we'll have 100,000 more police officers on the street; we'll have huge new opportunities for young people to help prevent crime, to keep our young people from getting in trouble, and give them some things to say yes to; we'll have drug treatment that is very important, that we don't now have in a lot of our programs, and alcohol abuse treatment; we will have a tough "three strikes and you're out" law for people who shouldn't be paroled that we know are likely to recreate serious violent crimes; and we'll ban 28 kinds of assault weapons, if the best of both bills passes. That ought to happen this year in the Congress.

And I want to say a special word of thanks in that regard to Senator Kohl for his leadership in supporting the Brady bill, which we passed after 7 years of deadlock last year and his attempt to keep dangerous handguns out of the hands of minors who have no business carrying them on the streets of our cities.

Now, last year, according to a lot of independent analyses, this Congress and I did more work together in more substantive ways than had been done in the first year of an administration in a whole generation, in over 30 years. But this year can be better, if we do the things that I just mentioned and if we have the courage, finally, to solve this health care problem.

I want to talk a little bit about what specifically is in our plan and what some of the problems are, the real problems and the political problems with passing this plan, because if you're going to help us pass it, you have to understand the pressures that your Representatives in Congress are under.

First of all, what are the problems? Well, at any given time during the year, 58 million Americans will be without health insurance out of a Nation of 255 million. About 39 million of our fellow countrymen just don't have it all year long. Eighty-one million of us—81 million—almost one in 3, live in families where someone in our family has a preexisting condition: a child with diabetes, a mother who has had breast cancer relatively early in life, a father who had an early heart attack. And these people either pay much higher premiums for their health insurance or they can't afford insurance at all or they're insured at their present job but they are terrified to leave their job for fear that they will lose their insurance. And so, at a time when job mobility is highly prized, we see people never leaving their jobs. This is a huge problem.

And 133 million of us, more than half of our population and three-quarters of the Americans who are insured at work have lifetime limits on our policy. So that if one of our children were to be born with a serious long-term disease or problem—or in the case of a family I met a couple of weeks ago in another State, where they had three children and the first two sons were born with a very rare form of cancer which may well be treatable and which may well be able to be maintained—they're going to run out of their health insurance coverage before the second boy gets out of the house. And they'll have to figure out what to do and whether they can continue to work and what in the world is going to happen to their family.

Not only that, 100 percent of us just about are at some risk of losing our health insurance. If you work for a government or if you work for a wonderful company like this, you won't lose it. But what if you decided to change your job, or what if you had to quit your job, then what would happen?

And finally, as has already been said, the system we have—I was glad to hear Mr. Notebaert say this—is the most expensive system adminis-

tratively in the world. We spend roughly twice as much money on paperwork and other administrative costs as any other country in the world does, with the consequence that, in America, we spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. Canada spends 10 percent of its income; Japan and Germany spend 9 percent of their income. And half of that is for good things—I'll say more about that in a minute—and for things that we can't do anything about. We're more violent than all these other countries, so we have more emergency room bills. We have higher rates of AIDS. But half of it is the crazy way our system is organized.

There was a recent study of two hospitals, one in Canada, one in the United States, with the same number of beds, the same vacancy rate, the same patient caseload. There were 200 people in the clerical department of the American hospital and 6 in the Canadian hospital. You're paying for that.

You're also paying, as has been pointed out, a significant premium because we are the only advanced country that permits some people just to say, "I won't have any insurance; I don't believe I'll be covered." But they all get health care if an emergency happens or when it's too late and they're too sick and they show up at the emergency room. And then the cost is passed on to the rest of you in higher premiums.

There are all kinds of other things we pay for, too. Because we don't provide prescription drugs for elderly people in a lot of family policies, our hospital bills are much greater, particularly for older people, because of maintaining themselves with adequate prescriptions, a lot of people on Medicare choose every month between medicine and food. But they wind up getting care when it's too late, too expensive, and they're in the hospital. And it adds costs to the whole system.

There are millions of Americans who have disabilities that if they were able to have some in-home care would save us money. They would be able to get health insurance, and millions of them would be able to work who cannot work today.

So our whole system, because we don't cover everybody, because we are willing to spend too much on paperwork and, therefore, too little on things that keep people well, like primary and preventive health care, costs too much and does too little. You might ask, "Well, if it's all that simple why haven't we fixed it?" Well, because it's not all that simple. And I'll explain why.

There are all kinds of improvements going on now all the time. I just got a wonderful demonstration—you all heard about it already—from the Wisconsin Health Information Network. And Marsha, the lady who showed me, was terrific; I learned a lot and I was—if I hadn't been late I would still be out there fiddling with the computer to prove that even I could do it, a total computer illiterate. [*Laughter*] There are some things we can do. But I believe with all my heart, having studied this now for years and years, that we cannot fix these problems unless we have a national response, not a national health care system run by the Government but a national response. The Government of the United States needs to reorganize the health care system to keep what's best and fix what's wrong. And make no mistake about it, there are a lot of things that are great about our system: the doctors, the nurses, the medical research, the technology, the advances.

I have a friend from Wisconsin here—Brianne Schwantes. Stand up and wave to the crowd here. [*Applause*] She was born with a problem; her bones were prone to break easily. And she comes to the National Institutes of Health on a regular basis and gets world-class care. And so here she is. And you know where I found her? Working with the flood victims in the Middle West, risking her brittle bones to help other people who were in trouble. If it weren't for the miracles of our system, she would not be able to do that. And we don't have to mess that up. But we do have to make some hard decisions. We're going to have to either cover everybody or not. If we don't cover everybody, your wages are still going to be stressed by paying too much for health care because other people won't cover their own. You're still going to have horror story after horror story of people who can't get coverage or who are terrified of losing it. And we will continue to pay more than we should.

If we do want to cover everybody, we only have two choices. You look all around the world; there are only two options. You either have to do it through a Government-funded program, like Medicare for everybody—abolish all insurance, charge everybody a tax and fund it—or you have to have insurance for everybody. And if you have insurance for everybody, then either the employers have to pay it or the employees

and employers together have to pay it or the employees have to pay it for those who are working, and the Government's got to help for those who aren't working, who don't have insurance. Now, you can look all around the world. I don't think there are any other options if you believe that the only way to fix this is to make sure that we have health security.

Here's my plan. First, guarantee everybody private health insurance. Why do it that way? Because that's a system we have now and just apply it to everybody. Nine out of 10 Americans who have health insurance buy it at work, and 8 out of 10 Americans who aren't insured have someone in their family who works. So the simplest way is just to extend the system we have now.

Second, make sure the benefits are adequate, not just catastrophic health care but primary and preventive health care, too, mammographies for women in the appropriate age group, cholesterol tests for people. Do the primary and preventive stuff that will hold down the cost of health care and keep us well, as well as take care of us when we're sick.

Next, permit people to choose their own doctors and health plans. Less than half the American people today who are insured at work have a choice of the health plan they're a part of. Now, is that because there's somebody bad in the system? No, it's because that's all the employers and the insurance companies can afford under the present system. But if everyone were insured properly, then the employees and their families could choose what kind of plan they want. And under our plan, every employee in America and their families would get at least three choices every year. If you didn't like the choice you had, next year you could make another choice. I think that's very important.

Third, have insurance reforms. Don't permit insurance companies who issue health insurance to pick and choose whom to cover. When insurance was started for health care by Blue Cross, that's the way it was. Everybody paid more or less the same thing, and we were all insured in huge pools. And insurance companies then made money the way grocery stores do: They made a little bit of money on a lot of people. Today in America, there are 1,500 different health insurance companies writing thousands of different policies and the reason is, as Mr. Notebaert noted, that 25 percent of our money goes to health care paperwork. You think about it: 1,500 companies, thousands of different policies, everybody with a different deal. Think about how many people you have to hire in insurance offices and doctors' offices and clinics just to figure out what's not covered, just to figure out what not to pay for.

And when you put on top of that the cost-control pressures so that doctors all over America are going crazy, even as we talk, because they have to call some distant insurance company employee to get credit to perform a procedure or practice medicine in a way that to them is perfectly self-evident and when you add to that a separate Government system for the poor, Medicaid, and for the elderly, Medicare, you have a paperwork nightmare.

And it's really tough. So we have got to reform insurance. We've got to say, you can't kick somebody off and you can't charge them more just because one of their children has been sick. You shouldn't charge an older worker more than a younger worker when the average worker is changing jobs six, seven times in a lifetime. You've got people losing jobs in defense industries that are in their late fifties and early sixties who must find new jobs and who cannot find them because their employers can't afford to provide health insurance for them. It's not right. So we've got to have insurance reform.

Fourth, I think we ought to protect Medicare, as I said. Leave it the way it is; it's working. But extend the benefits to elderly people to include a benefit of prescription drugs, which will save money, and for help for the elderly and the disabled for long-term care in the home and in the community.

I think these benefits ought to be provided at work. Why? Because it's the system we have. Now, you need to know that this is at the center of the political debate. And in Washington, a long way from Milwaukee, here's what they're saying. They're saying, "Well, that's all very well for Ameritech. They can talk about that, they're a successful company, they have a strong union, they pay good wages, they've got a great future. But what about all these small businesses in America? What about the poor guys with 10 or 20 employees who have a very narrow profit margin? They shouldn't have to do this." Well—and the argument is that they can't afford to do this. They're going to lose jobs, and most new jobs are being created in the small business sector, and it's a terrible thing, you shouldn't do it.

Now, what's my answer to that? First of all, there are a lot of small businesses in America who are providing health insurance to their employees today, and they are at an unfair competitive disadvantage to those who don't. I met a woman in Columbus, Ohio, running a restaurant and a deli, with 20 people—20 full-time employees, 20 part-time employees. She says to me—this is a typical story—she says, "I'm in the worst of all worlds. I insure my full-time employees, I don't insure my part-time employees, and we pay too much for insurance because I had cancer 5 years ago." She said, "I got it coming and going. I pay more than I should. I feel guilty that I don't insure my part-time employees. And I get punished for insuring my full-time employees because my competitors don't even do that. I would gladly pay a little more if you made all my competitors do the same thing. That would be all right; I'd be on a fair basis with them."

I have a friend who is a car dealer at home in Arkansas, in a little town—said to me the other day, said, "You know, I've been feeling sorry for myself for 20 years because I always covered my employees, and none of my competitors ever did. And I just went around feeling sorry for myself. And then I realized that three of my competitors had gone out of business, and I made more money last year than I ever have. And I think it's because I never lost an employee because I gave them decent health care." Interesting, right?

Today, as I was shaking hands leaving the White House, a small businessman came up to me and says, "I have got 80 employees, and I implore you to pass this health care. I am tired of these lobbies I pay my membership dues to telling you that small business doesn't want this. A lot of us cover our employees. I cover my 80 employees. It costs me 20 percent of payroll. Under your plan my bills would go to 7.9 percent because all my competitors would have to do what I do." The guy just stopped me in the line today on the way out to the helicopter.

Not only that, under our plan, we give discounts to small businesses. If you've got under 70 employees and an average payroll of under $24,000, you get a discount. And some of these businesses will only have to pay 3.5 percent of payroll for their insurance. The average business has about a third of their cost of doing business in labor costs. So if you pay 3.5 percent, and that's only a third of your cost of doing business, then it's only going to cost you a little more than one percent of the cost of doing business to insure your employees.

I would submit to you that that much, if all your competitors are doing it, can either be passed along or the employees themselves will absorb it. It will only take one year to lower the raise they were going to get by one percent, and then it will all be in there. But that's what these Congressmen are hearing, and they're saying, "If you do this, small business in America will come to an end." Now, the truth is, most small business people are paying 35 percent more than most big businesses for the same insurance.

The other thing they're telling them is, this is a Government-run program and Government would mess up a one-car parade. [*Laughter*] That's the other thing they're saying. And we have all felt that at one time or another, right? Especially now, it's so close to tax day. But that's what they're saying. That's not true.

Here's what the Federal Government does in our program. The Federal Government says everybody's got to have insurance. The Federal Government says there must be insurance reforms so that people can be insured in large pools. And the Federal Government organizes small and medium-sized businesses so they can get buying power to get the same competitive rates that people in big business and Government have. And we have some basic quality controls which are an extension of what we have now. That's what we do.

We also leave to the States then the ability to decide exactly how these mechanisms will be carried out. This is not a Government-run program. It is private health insurance and private medical providers just like we have today except now the worst abuses of the present system will be erased. That is what we are trying to do. And I think it is worth doing. I think it needs to be done.

Let me say to you that you will have to decide whether you agree. You'll also have to decide whether you think you can persuade your Members of Congress without regard to party that they can do this and be reelected. Every time I go into a congressional district, there are these furious radio campaigns run to send a message to your local Congressman not to bankrupt all the small businesses in the area. But we had several hundred small businesses in Washington

the other day all asking us to do this so they could get a fair deal, so they could buy insurance on a competitive basis.

Now, what's behind this? Somebody's got to lose, right? There will be some changes. What will they be? If you endorse this program, fewer Americans will work in the clerical departments of hospitals, clinics, and insurance offices. And the small insurance companies will not be able to write policies for hundreds of thousands of people. So in order for them to keep writing health insurance, they'll either have to write specialty policies, like many do today for extra cancer coverage or something like that, or somehow find a way to pool with other companies, or they won't all make it. That's true. That is true.

You have to decide whether you think it's worth it. Is it worth it for every American to have the same health care security that you have and to stop your wages from being depressed and your profits from being depressed by paying too much for health care and to provide some sort of security to the working people of this country. I think it is.

We will also create more jobs in the health care industry in providing long-term care. There will not be a net loss of jobs, but there will be a shift of jobs. You need to know that. This is not a free thing. But is it a good swap? I think it is a laydown clear choice, the right thing for the country. But we have got to decide that.

And let me close by just—I don't know if these folks are here. I had three letter writers, people who wrote—we had a million people who have written to my wife or to me on health care—and I think they're here. Are Sheryl Brown, Tami Stagman, and Susan Millard here? Are you all here anywhere? Stand up there. [*Applause*] Now, I want you to—now these are not abstract theories. These are three citizens of your State. Sheryl Brown from Madison wrote a letter to Hillary about her health insurance. And her husband came down with a serious illness; he lost his insurance. She had to leave her job because she couldn't insure her husband and go on public assistance to get the benefits she needed. Then when she got herself off welfare and went back to work, her family lost their benefits. That's the system we have today.

If you go on welfare—this is a big State for welfare reform, right? I've bragged on Wisconsin until I was blue in the face, about welfare reform all over the country. In our country today, if you go on welfare, you get health care. If you get off of welfare and go to work and start paying taxes, if you live in a family with a preexisting condition or you take a minimum wage job, then all of a sudden you are paying taxes to pay for the people on welfare to have health care, and you don't have it anymore. So if you want welfare reform, you've got to pay for the health care of the working people because the people on welfare have got it.

Susan Millard wrote me because she's had a lot of health problems, and she's got a job which doesn't provide health benefits. Should she just quit and give it up? Aren't we proud of her? Wouldn't we rather her work? Isn't it better for us that she works instead of going on public assistance?

And Tami Stagman from Lancaster—in a way the most interesting letter of all. She wrote me because she had some serious health problems, but she had a good health insurance policy because of her husband's job. So she's thinking, what if my husband ever loses his job? What if he ever wants to change his job? And what about everybody just like me who doesn't have the same policy I have?

We can fix this, folks. We can fix this if we remember that there are real Americans out there who are doing their very best to contribute to this country and to move us forward and who deserve to have this fixed. It is in our common interest to do it, and I think we're going to do it this year.

Thank you very much. Bless you. Thank you.

[*At this point, Bronson Haase, president, Ameritech Wisconsin, presented the President with a jogging suit.*]

The President. I want to tell you what your fearless leader had just said to me, in a way that you couldn't hear over the microphone—[*laughter*]. He said, I want you to have this jogging suit because I keep seeing you running in running shorts, and I think it would be better if you had long pants. [*Laughter*] Hey, you know it's part of my job to make people feel better, and I've made millions of Americans feel better about how they look in running clothes. I thought it was a good idea. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much. I'll wear them. Great. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. at the Italian Community Center. In this remarks, he

referred to Richard Notebaert, chief executive officer, Ameritech Corp.; Morton Bahr, international president, and Robert D. Johnson, district 4 vice president, Communications Workers of America; Ameritech employees Gary Keating, Rick Compost, and Deborah Echols; Mayor John Norquist of Milwaukee; and Marsha Radaj, vice president of operations, Wisconsin Health Information Network.

Exchange With Reporters in Milwaukee
April 18, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. What about the Fed and the interest rates?

The President. Well, I have two reactions. First of all, there is still no evidence of troubling inflation in this economy, but there is a lot of evidence of growth. And in the last couple of weeks we've seen even more evidence of growth in the economy, for example, big backlogs on automobile orders.

When you have growth in the economy, normally short-term interest rates go up. The estimates are that inflation will be around 3 percent. Historically, short-term interest rates have been about three-quarters to one percent above the rate of inflation. So, this is still within the range of interest rates that should not do anything to harm the economic recovery. And I can only guess that that had something to do with—the signs of economic growth have been very strong in the last couple of weeks, and that the interest rates at 3.5 percent were still only a half a point above the inflation rate, so that's the real interest rate. So I don't think it's cause for real alarm; I wouldn't say that.

But on the other hand, what normally triggers interest rates going up is some evidence of inflation. We don't have that. So we'll just have to watch this. But I think it would be a real mistake to overreact. This is a very strong economy; it's very healthy. We've got good growth.

Q. But this is not overreaction?

Q. By the Fed?

The President. All I can tell you is what I said. I don't make a practice of commenting on what they do. There is no evidence of inflation, but there is evidence that economic growth is stronger even than we thought, say 2 months ago. And historically, in times of real growth, short-term interest rates have been somewhere between three-quarters of a percent and one percent above the projected rate of inflation, which is 3 percent. So in larger historical terms, this should not be any cause for alarm. We've still got good strong growth, and everybody, including Mr. Greenspan, says that the conditions of economic growth are better than they've been in two or three decades. So I still feel very good about that.

Q. So you have no beef with the Fed? You have no beef with the Fed for raising rates again?

The President. I don't comment on what they do one way or the other, except to try to explain it to people in terms that I think are relevant. I understand what happened if the objective is to have a real rate of return on short-term interest rates. That is, the short-term interest rates ought to be something above the rate of inflation.

But even Mr. Greenspan has said repeatedly that this should not lead to an increase in long-term interest rates. He has said long-term interest rates are, if anything, too high while short-term interest rates might have been too low. So if the market is going to rationally react to this, long-term interest rates should say, well, there's not going to be any inflation in the economy, and we've got good growth so interest rates ought to stay down, not go up. That's what I hope will happen over the long run.

Bosnia

Q. Any new actions for Bosnia, Mr. President?

The President. Well, I'm going back now to find out what happened today.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:05 p.m. at Leon's Frozen Custard Stand. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict
April 18, 1994

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered the remainder of September 1993, through November 15, 1993. The current report covers the remainder of November 1993, through March 1, 1994.

Ambassador Richard A. Boucher, my new representative in Cyprus, presented his credentials at a ceremony in Nicosia on November 22. In his remarks, Ambassador Boucher reiterated the strong commitment of my Administration in supporting efforts to resolve the Cyprus question. Stressing the importance of breaking down barriers of mistrust, Ambassador Boucher said he would actively promote bi-communal contacts and measures to enhance confidence between the two communities.

On November 22, 1993, the U.N. Secretary General issued his report in connection with the Security Council's comprehensive review of the U.N. Peacekeeping Operation in Cyprus (UNFICYP). The Secretary General concluded that while UNFICYP has successfully kept the peace, the resulting opportunity has not been used properly by the two sides to reach an overall settlement. The Secretary General had no doubt that, were UNFICYP to be withdrawn, the present buffer zone would be a vacuum that each side would want to fill. He thus recommended that the mandate of UNFICYP be extended for a further 6-month period, until June 15, 1994. The Secretary General also stated emphatically that the two sides on the island, as well as Turkey and Greece, should work more effectively for a negotiated settlement. He called on all parties to show a serious willingness to negotiate and urged both sides to work to promote tolerance and reconciliation. He faulted both sides for their reluctance to undertake bi-communal activities.

On December 1, 1993, Mr. Robert Lamb was appointed as U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator. Robert Lamb, having served as U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus from 1990 to 1993, brings valuable experience to the position. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of Mr. John Maresca, who, as U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, contributed significantly to the process.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Cyprus December 1. His arrival in Cyprus on the first day of his appointment underlined my Administration's resolve to achieve progress on the island. He conveyed the message that the confidence-building measures (CBMs) are a balanced, workable package for both communities, and that the United States was prepared to work with both communities to ensure that their concerns are addressed satisfactorily.

Assistant Secretary Stephen Oxman traveled to Turkey December 8–9, 1993, for the United States-Turkey Joint Economic Commission. While there, he met with Prime Minister Ciller and Ministry of Foreign Affairs Under Secretary Sanberk. He told Prime Minister Ciller that after the December 12, 1993, Turkish-Cypriot election, the United States wanted to move the process forward. The Turkish side pointed out that Turkey had spoken out in support of the Secretary General's efforts for the CBM package, and assured Mr. Oxman of Turkey's continued cooperation.

The Director of the Department of State's Office for Southern Europe, Marshall Adair, accompanied Assistant Secretary Oxman to Turkey and also met with a variety of Turkish government officials and parliamentarians to emphasize the importance of moving forward on the CBM package. He then visited Athens and met with Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials on this subject there. On December 12, 1993, Mr. Adair traveled to Cyprus. He and Ambassador Boucher met with President Clerides and Mr. Denktash on December 13, 1993, and stressed that the United States believes we are at a stage where a step forward could be taken.

In New York, Mr. Lamb met December 14, 1993, with the U.N. Special Negotiator for Cyprus, Joe Clark, and his deputy, Gustave Feissel. Mr. Clark said that the Turkish-Cypriot elections created a favorable atmosphere for progress on the CBMs. The United Nations noted, however, that both sides had legitimate questions that should be answered before implementation.

Also in New York on December 15, 1993, the U.N. Security Council Resolution 889 (1993) was adopted unanimously, extending UNFICYP's mandate for another 6 months. The resolution also called upon the authorities to ensure that no incidents occurred in the buffer zone and to extend the 1989 Unmanning Agreement. It also welcomed the Secretary General's decision to resume extensive contacts with both sides in order to achieve an agreement on the CBMs, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report in late February on the outcome of his efforts with respect to the CBMs.

On the same day, the Secretary General released two studies on the CBMs. The reports concluded that the reopening of Nicosia International Airport and the closed city of Varosha would offer significant economic benefits for both the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities. They went on to say that the CBMs were not a substitute for a comprehensive political solution, but rather were intended to create momentum to reach an overall agreement. The reports also noted that the work required to reopen Varosha and Nicosia International Airport would lead to much-needed direct contacts between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Athens on December 21, 1993. He met with Director General of the Foreign Ministry Christos Zacharakis and Deputy Foreign Minister George Papandreou. On December 22–23, 1993, he continued to Ankara where he met with Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin and other officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He thanked Turkey for its support for progress on the CBMs and an early resumption of the talks. The Foreign Minister assured Mr. Lamb that Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots wanted to work within the United Nations process. The Athens and Ankara meetings were very positive. Mr. Lamb stressed that the United States wanted an agreement soon on Cyprus, but it had to be a fair agreement that takes into account the interests of both communities. He said that we should concentrate first on the CBMs, as they offered the most promising approach.

Throughout the period, Ambassador Boucher remained in close contact with the two sides to offer U.S. encouragement and assistance to the process.

On January 10, 1994, following the December 12, 1993, Turkish-Cypriot elections, the Democratic Party and the Republican Turkish Party completed their coalition and received a vote of confidence. The stage was thus set for a quick resumption of the negotiations.

While in Brussels January 9–11, 1994, I had the opportunity to raise many issues of U.S. concern, including Cyprus, with Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller. I told them that we must move forward with a fair and permanent settlement. Both leaders assured me of their interest in finding a solution on Cyprus and promised to work diligently towards this goal.

In Cyprus Mr. Feissel continued his contacts, seeking an agreement in principle on the CBMs from the two leaders. Mr. Clark visited Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey January 22–28, 1994. He stressed the importance of proceeding quickly and directly. Following additional exchanges of correspondence with the U.N. Secretary General, both leaders confirmed their acceptance in principle of the CBMs and their willingness to discuss modalities for implementing them.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb traveled to Nicosia on January 31, 1994, to consult with each side. He reiterated the U.S. message that there was an urgent need for progress on the CBMs. Both sides stated their willingness to negotiate in good faith. On February 3, U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali wrote to the parties welcoming their acceptance in principle of the package and urging the discussions on key issues be completed within 2 months.

U.N. Special Negotiator Clark opened proximity talks on key issues related to the CBMs in Nicosia on February 17–18, 1994. He characterized these talks as constructive, and praised the goodwill he found on both sides. The talks are continuing under Deputy Representative Feissel.

Special Cyprus Coordinator Lamb consulted on February 25, 1994, with Russian Foreign Ministry officials in Moscow. These consultations were in the context of our continuing dialogue with the Russians on a variety of international issues. He also met with British Foreign Office representatives in London on February 28, as part of our routine, periodic discussions with the British. These meetings with two representatives of the Permanent Members of the Security Council once again demonstrated the international resolve to find a fair solution to the Cyprus question.

There is currently a window of opportunity that should not be allowed to close without an agreement being reached on the CBMs. They provide real benefits to both communities, not least of which is that they can form the base from which the two parties could resume discussions on an overall settlement.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Interview on MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum
April 19, 1994

Tabitha Soren. Welcome to MTV's "Enough is Enough" Forum with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. Joining the President is an audience of 200 16- to 20-year-olds from here in DC and all over the country. Obviously, there are a lot of issues on the President's mind today, including some hard decisions on the U.S. role in Bosnia. But we've invited him here to talk about violence in America.

Alison Stewart. "Enough is Enough" is a comprehensive campaign put forth by MTV to explore the subject of violence, giving young people an outlet for their concerns and bringing them closer to the people who can bring about a change.

"Enough is Enough" is also the cry of a generation of young people who, according to an MTV poll, specify violence as their number one concern, surpassing the economy and job opportunity.

Ms. Soren. Despite the fact that violence is young people's number one anxiety, the country's crime rate has actually gone down in recent years. However, violent crime committed by young people has exploded. We are losing a whole generation to crime, to drugs, to lost hopes.

Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, Tabitha and Alison. Thank all of you for joining me, and I want to thank MTV for giving me a chance to keep my commitment to come back on the show, to talk about something I care a lot about: the rising tide of violence in America, especially among young people.

As you heard, the crime rate overall in our country has pretty well leveled off, but it's still going up among young people. Young people are the principal perpetrators of violent crime; young people are also the principal victims of violent crime.

You may have seen the public service announcement I did with a young teenager from here in Washington, Alicia Brown. And on the day we taped this announcement and then the day we announced it, she was on her way to the funeral of her sixth friend who had been felled by gun violence. It's a terrible problem.

I want to talk today about what we can do about it together. In Washington, we're debating a crime bill that I care a lot about, which will put more police officers on the street, working with young people in their community; which will give a whole range of prevention programs that work a chance to work in every community, everything from after-school programs to midnight basketball to jobs for young people. We are seeing that work in places, so that I know it will work if we can put it everywhere.

But I have to tell you, no matter what we do with the laws, we have to have a change in behavior and attitude and feeling among young people all across this country, in every community in the country. And maybe we can talk a little about that today, too.

I met a young man about a week ago, named Eddie Cutanda, from Boston, who was working with the Boston police in their community policing program. And he said, before he met these two men, he hated police officers. But he wanted me to know and he wanted the country to know that he did not represent a lost generation. He said of all of you, he said, "We're not a lost generation, but sometimes I think there are a lot of adults who'd like to lose us, and we can't let that happen."

So, today, maybe together we can figure out what we can do about this awful problem and give you and your generation your future back.

Ms. Soren. Okay, Mr. President, let's get down to it. We've got our first question over here. Tell us who you are and what your question for the President is.

Teen Suicide

[*A 17-year-old participant discussed the feelings of hopelessness and despair many young people experience and asked what could be done to help them understand how important their lives are.*]

The President. Well, first of all, you asked a good question. Maybe the question you asked is the most important question. Suicide among young people, as you probably know, has doubled in the last 10 or 15 years. And it reflects a larger problem of millions of young people who don't commit suicide.

I think it is rooted in part in the fact that there are a lot of young folks who grow up never feeling that they're the most important person in the world to somebody. I know—there were times in my childhood when I had a difficult childhood, but I always knew I was the most important person in the world to my mother and that somehow together we would get through whatever we were going through.

With so many kids growing up in difficult family circumstances, in violent neighborhoods where there's so much destructive things around, including drugs, my own opinion is that we have to really make an effort to reach children when they're very young but not to give up on them when they're adolescents and they're going through the toughest times of life, so that they always know that they matter.

The other thing we've got to do is to somehow get out of this sort of instant emergency way we tend to look at life. I mean, we all have more information today, more access to information than any generation before us. You can turn on the television and see 50 channels in a lot of the communities where you live. We've got a lot of information, but we think everything happens right now. And the truth is, a lot of things take a long time to unfold; a lot of the meaning of life takes a long time to develop.

And one of the things that I find—to go back to your comment about young gang members not expecting to live very long—is that I find a lot of young people think the future is what happens 30 minutes from now or 3 days from now, instead of what happens 5 or 10 or 15 years from now. And somehow, the adults in this country—we have to find a way to help young people think in a hopeful way about 5 and 10 and 15 years from now and understand that there are sacrifices and tough times and disappointments that never go away in life. They never go away no matter how old you are and how much you get things together. But if you can keep your eye on the future, then suicide doesn't become an option because you know there can always be a better tomorrow.

So those are the two things I think we have to do: Teach people they're the most—everybody needs to be the most important person in the world to somebody. And people need to think of the future in terms of the real future, what happens years from now, not what happens minutes or days from now.

Ms. Soren. What's your question for the President?

Crime and Individual Freedom

[*A participant discussed Singapore's sentencing of an American student to be caned and asked if a similar penal system that was not based on a strong belief in individual rights would be beneficial in combating U.S. crime.*]

The President. Well, that's not where I thought you were going with the question. Good for you.

Ms. Soren. He's obviously talking about the caning in Singapore.

The President. Yes—the young man, Michael Fay, in Singapore. As you know, I have spoken out against his punishment for two reasons. One is, it's not entirely clear that his confession wasn't coerced from him. The second is that if he just were to serve 4 months in prison for what he did, that would be quite severe. But the caning may leave permanent scars, and some people who are caned, in the way they're caned, they go into shock. I mean, it's much more serious than it sounds. So, on the one hand, I don't approve of this punishment, particularly in this case.

Now, having said that, a lot of the Asian societies that are doing very well now have low crime rates and high economic growth rates, partly because they have very coherent societies

with strong units where the unit is more important than the individual, whether it's the family unit or the work unit or the community unit.

My own view is that you can go to the extreme in either direction. And when we got organized as a country and we wrote a fairly radical Constitution with a radical Bill of Rights, giving a radical amount of individual freedom to Americans, it was assumed that the Americans who had that freedom would use it responsibly. That is, when we set up this country, abuse of people by Government was a big problem. So if you read the Constitution, it's rooted in the desire to limit the ability of—Government's ability to mess with you, because that was a huge problem. It can still be a huge problem. But it assumed that people would basically be raised in coherent families, in coherent communities, and they would work for the common good, as well as for the individual welfare.

What's happened in America today is too many people live in areas where there's no family structure, no community structure, and no work structure. And so there's a lot of irresponsibility. And so a lot of people say there's too much personal freedom. When personal freedom's being abused, you have to move to limit it. That's what we did in the announcement I made last weekend on the public housing projects, about how we're going to have weapon sweeps and more things like that to try to make people safer in their communities. So that's my answer to you. We can have—the more personal freedom a society has, the more personal responsibility a society needs and the more strength you need out of your institutions, family, community, and work.

[*At this point, MTV took a commercial break, after which a videotape about proposed anticrime legislation was shown. A participant then praised the Brady law and asked what the President proposed to do about the flow of illegal guns into the Nation.*]

Handgun Legislation

The President. Well, first, let's get that out—the Brady bill is working. It is true that you can still buy an illegal gun with cash in the streets. But it's also true that a lot of people with criminal backgrounds try to buy guns in regular gun stores, and now they're being checked. And it's really working to prevent the sale of guns to a lot of criminals. So it doesn't solve all the problems, but it helps.

Now, in terms of stemming the flow of illegal guns into the country, we can do things that I have already done, for example, to ban the import of certain guns in the country. The big problem is the number of guns we have in the country already and what happens to them. They're already about 200 million guns in circulation. And there are still a lot of things that are legal that shouldn't be.

There is a horrible—I mean, to me—story on the cover of USA Today about people making automatic weapons in the United States saying, well, you know, if one of these automatic weapons gets taken out from under a bed and used by some kid illegally, it's not their problem.

I think we should ban the—several kinds of semiautomatic assault weapons. I think we should pass the ban on handgun possession by minors, unless they're with an adult supervisor and using it for approved sporting purposes. I think we should go further in trying to regulate what these gun dealers do with these guns because they will—sometimes they put them in circulation in ways they know they're going to wind up in the hands of criminals. All these things we're moving to do now. Will it solve all the problems? No, it won't. Is it a step in the right direction? Yes, it is.

And you cannot—one of reasons we've got the highest crime rate in the world and the highest murder rate is that we have more guns in the hands of more criminals and people who are likely to act in an impulsive manner. You can't—and there's no place else in the world where this would happen, where you'd have just people walking the streets better armed than the police. It's not right, and we've got to do something about it.

[*A participant asked why so much money was spent to make it difficult for law-abiding citizens to obtain guns legally, rather than to enforce criminal justice.*]

The President. Well, first, we are doing that. I mean, this plan of mine—you heard the young people commenting about debating whether 100,000 more police officers will make a difference. It will make a difference. It will not only catch more criminals, it will prevent more crime. We know that when you have police walking the streets, knowing the families, knowing the kids in the neighborhood, making their

presence felt, the crime rate goes down. We also know you catch more criminals more quickly. The crime bill actually puts more people in prison. So there are a lot of issues being dealt with there.

But keep in mind the restrictions that are put on gun ownership in terms of having to have background checks and waiting periods to catch people with criminal records. One hundred percent of the criminals in this country do not buy their guns off street corners. A lot of them buy them through gun stores, and we're going to catch those now. So it's worth doing. It's worth a little bit of sacrifice on the part of law-abiding gun owners to do that.

Anticrime Legislation

[*Following a commercial break, a participant asked to whom the "three strikes and you're out" proposal would apply and how many people it would affect.*]

The President. Well, I hope only a small number of people. Let me answer your question in this way: First of all, a small percentage of the criminal population—of the criminal population—commits a large percentage of the truly violent crimes. A lot of those folks, they're "one strike and you're out." You commit murder or rape or something else, you get a life sentence.

The "three strikes and you're out" bill is designed to deny parole to people who commit three violent crimes in a row where, by accident, the consequence was not as serious as it might have been. That is, no one died or the building didn't burn down or whatever, so the victims weren't hurt as badly. But this is a person who is plainly prone to do things that will cause life or serious bodily harm. So it will cover—the reason that I recommend coverage—it doesn't cover drug offenders, for example. It covers people who do things that are designed to hurt people repeatedly, and they're just lucky that nobody has died, so they haven't gotten a life sentence. But if they do it three times, they still have to serve unless they are specifically commuted; they're not eligible for parole.

Ms. Soren. So does that mean it ends up affecting about 200 to 300 people a year?

The President. It wouldn't affect many people. But as I said, we know that a small percentage of the people are serious repeat offenders. A small percentage of the criminals are serious repeat offenders. And if this is drawn right, it will make us safer at relatively lower costs. A lot of people go to jail when they ought to do something else, go to a boot camp, be in some alternative sentencing. Arguably, we have too many of certain kinds of offenders in jail, but there are some people who get out too quickly, like that man that kidnaped and killed Polly Klaas, for example.

Ms. Soren. "Three strikes and you're out" is so popular, but a lot of critics say that perhaps the jails will fill up with 60-, 70-year-old men and women past their crime-producing life. Do you think that's smart?

The President. Well, it could happen, but let me say that in many States today—in my State, for example, where I'm from, if you get a life sentence you can't get out unless you get parole commuted by the Governor, anyway. So about 10 percent of our prison population are people on life sentences. It is rare for people over 70 to commit those serious crimes. It sometimes happens. If they are clearly not a danger to society, they ought to be able to make their case and get their sentence commuted.

[*A participant asked about prevention of violent crime in communities where children think violence is the only way to solve problems.*]

The President. Perhaps the best thing about this crime bill from that point of view is that this is the first crime bill in my lifetime that—as far as I know, anyway—that has a huge amount of money allocated to crime prevention, to programs that work in the neighborhoods, for example, before and after school programs, programs to keep young people active, programs to give young people jobs in the summertime or after school, programs to give people something to say yes to, not just tell them something to say no to.

There's also a huge amount of money in this crime bill for drug and alcohol education and prevention, as well as treatment. And there's some money in there that can be—for example, suppose in your community you've got an innovative project that you want to try. Under this crime bill, the States and the localities will be able to have the flexibility to try some things that they know work and expand them.

One other thing I want to say—just to put a plug in because it hadn't come up yet—I believe that a lot of the violence that happens among young people your age and younger, where people just pull out knives or guns and

shoot each other because they've been fighting over something—I think people can be educated out of that. There's a lot of evidence that you can teach young people who grow up in tough environments that there are other ways to solve their problems other than shooting or cutting up each other or beating each other. And there's some money in this crime bill to do that in schools all across this country. I also think that's very, very important.

Prisons

[*A participant about changing the correctional system so that petty criminals do not become immune to it and become worse after being released.*]

The President. Well, first of all, you're echoing what was on one of the earlier film segments, that a lot of young people do not fear going to prison. A lot of them come out of prison just better trained criminals.

I think there are two things that we have to focus on. First of all, if you do a crime, you've got to expect to either do some time or be punished for it. You can't stop the system of having consequences for destructive behavior. But I think there are two things we can do. Number one, there ought to be alternatives to prison for first-time nonviolent offenders. People ought to get a chance to do something else that connects them to the community and gives them the future. Number two, if young people do go to prison and they're going to be paroled, and most everybody does get paroled, then they shouldn't be paroled unless, in prison, there is a good program for alcohol and drug abuse prevention, there is a good program for education and training, there's a good program, in other words, to prepare people to reenter society and be more successful, instead of just preparing them to do what they used to do, better.

If all you do is go to the penitentiary and you deal with people who are tougher than you are, who are better fighters than you are, and you spend 2 hours a day in a weight room pumping iron, then when you get out, you're just prepared to do what you used to do better than you did before you got in. So we have to change the way people spend their time in prison, and we've got to divert as many first offenders as we can from prison the first time in community-based settings and boot camps and things like that.

Community Programs

[*At this point, Ms. Stewart introduced a videotape on community programs designed to help children before they turn to crime. A participant then asked how youth could be persuaded to give up drug profits.*]

The President. Well, I think there are only two ways that a teenager who has a chance to make that kind of money won't do it. And maybe you need them both. One is that all the teenager's peers and family members and friends and everybody else needs to always say that this is wrong, and the teenager needs to believe it's wrong. Keep in mind, most of us obey the law most of the time not because we think we're going to get caught, but because we think it's wrong.

The second thing is we need to do a better job of making people think there is a real price. When somebody gets into something like that for serious money, then we have to do what we can to cut it off. We have to try to be more effective on the law enforcement end, and not just with the people like the teenager but with the people that are supplying them with the dope and the money, the bigger people. And we've got to try to be better at that. And of course, we're trying to give ourselves some resources to do that better, too, in this crime bill.

But I don't think it's very complicated. I think you either—if you're doing the wrong thing for money, you've either got to stop it because you think it's wrong or because you think you're going to get caught and you don't want to pay the price. And if you can't—if you don't have those two things, it's not very good.

Now, let me make one other point. I think also there has to be more hope. I think the midnight basketball and all those things are great. I really support them. And funding for them is in our crime bill. But I also think there has to be a longer term hope, that maybe you won't have $1,500 in your pocket living a straight life tomorrow, but if you go back to school, you can get an education, and there will be a decent job and a good life for you over the long run and there will be more money at less risk with more happiness over the long run. Those are the things I think we have to do.

[*A participant asked about funding to start a community center in east Baltimore.*]

The President. First, there might be some funding through the Housing and Urban Development Department. And I would urge you to write Secretary Cisneros about that or give me something on it now. Secondly, your community, if they would support it, your local community could ask for funding through this crime bill prevention strategy to do it.

I think it's very important. These community centers can make a huge difference, especially if the tenants support them, if the adults as well as the kids support them. But I think that you should be able to get some support for that from one of those two sources.

Mayor Schmoke in Baltimore has been extremely active in the whole housing area. He's done some of the most innovative and impressive things in the country, and there may be, for all I know, some help the city government itself can give you. But if you'll give me your name and address at the end of the program, I'll see what I can do to help.

Television Violence

[*A participant asked why the Attorney General and the Congress were focusing on TV violence when real violence was such a problem.*]

The President. I don't know that the Attorney General and the Congress want a law—at least I don't think a majority of the Congress wants a law to limit what can be on television. But there is some evidence that the accumulated exposure to random violence over years and years and years by a generation of young people who watch far more television than their predecessors did has some effect on people's willingness to then go out and recreate what they've been exposed to on television.

Now, I'm not against all violence in movies and TV. I thought—for example, I thought that movie "Boyz N' the Hood" was a great movie, because—it was a very violent movie, but it showed you the real—it was a true movie. I mean, it showed you what the horrible consequences to life and to family was of that kind of behavior.

But I think what bothers people about television is not so much this or that or the other program but the overall impact of watching several hours a day every day and just one violent scene after another coming at you. If you start doing that when you're about 5 years old, by the time you're 15, 16, or 17, there may be a whole lot of messages in your mind that may make you more prone to be violent, again, if you don't have an off-setting influence from the family, the school, the church, the community, some other place. That is the concern. It is not that there are bad people doing the television or that one program or two, in and of themselves, can make a difference. The question is whether the overall impact of it makes young people more likely to be violent.

Public Trust in Government

[*A participant cited the frustration and anger young people felt toward Government bureaucracy and asked if the administration would keep its promises and make a difference.*]

The President. Well, all I can say is you just have to watch and see. Insofar as the Congress has worked with me, we've been able to do a large number of the things that I said I'd do when I ran for President. I came on MTV, and we talked about the motor voter bill; we signed it after years of not signing it. It took—for 7 years the Brady bill was hung up in Congress. When I became President, we passed it; we signed it. The national service bill was something I ran on, trying to get young people like you interested in community service and then allowing you, in return for that community service, to earn money against a college education. It was passed and signed.

So we're able—we are making progress on the commitments I made to the American people in general and to the young people of this country. We redid the student loan program, so now you can pay a loan back—college loan back as a percentage of your income. So I'm trying to do what I say I'll do. All I can tell you is—this is a general rule—cynicism is a cop-out because once you become cynical and you say somebody else is not going to do something, that lets you off the hook. And in the end, we can only go forward if we believe in each other, until we understand we can't believe in each other anymore.

So I would plead with you—it's a very fair question. You've got a lot of reasons to be disappointed. But we can make a difference if we work at it together. And neither you nor I will be able to do everything we want to do, but

we can do a lot of the things we should do if we'll get to work on it.

Whitewater and Vietnam Draft

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, you speak so passionately and directly about issues like violence and education. But why is it, when the issues pertain to you personally, like the draft or Whitewater, that people seem to get the idea that you're giving them less than a straight answer, even when you have nothing to hide?

The President: Well, first of all, I think it's hard to know what the rules are; they keep raising the bar. Let me just give you a real answer to that. I was asked by the press and the Republicans to agree to a special counsel on Whitewater, right, even though there were—no one had accused me of doing anything wrong, and therefore there was no ground, traditionally, to have a Special Counsel. Everybody said, "Prove your innocence." In a country where people are presumed innocent, the President isn't. You've got to go prove your innocence, even though no one's accused you of anything wrong. So I agreed. I said okay, we'll have a Special Counsel.

Then, in past Special Counsels, Presidents have resisted subpoenas, applied things like executive privilege. I cooperated entirely. And the Watergate Special Counsel said we were a big departure from the past; this administration has totally cooperated.

The press keeps saying, "Well, we said 'Special Counsel,' but now we want to ask questions anyway. And you've got to have all the answers right now, and if you don't, you're not being forthcoming." Well, I couldn't remember everything I was asked. It's been a long time since you had somebody who's given you 17 years worth of tax returns, for example. But I don't think it's fair to say we haven't been candid.

Now, maybe in the beginning I didn't want to just shut the Government down and just do Whitewater. And I still don't. But I have tried to be as honest as I could. I also, frankly, have questions. I don't think just because you become President that everything all of a sudden should be subject to answering.

I disagree on the draft; I did my best to be candid. And that's another interesting thing, the person that made the draft charge against me was the person who changed his story. Not me, I didn't change mine; somebody else changed theirs.

Ms. Soren. I think what angers young people about Whitewater is the fact that it seems like it's slowing down all of the other important issues that they want to get through.

The President. I think that does bother you, but you shouldn't worry about that, at least not now, because the reason I agreed to have a Special Counsel look into it is so anybody who asks me a question, I can say, "I'm going to give it all to the Special Counsel. If I did anything wrong, he'll find out," so that it wouldn't slow us down.

And let me just say, this year already, we've signed a major education bill to try to improve public schools in America and set world-class standards for all our schools. We are proceeding at a very rapid rate on the crime bill. We are proceeding toward passing a budget at the most rapid rate in recent memory, which, if it passes, will lower the Government's deficit for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We are proceeding on health care reform. So we are moving ahead.

So far, the work of the Congress has not been diverted, and the work of the Presidency has not been diverted. I know it may be hard—you can't tell, in other words, from the news coverage that, but that's the truth. And we're not going to let it be diverted if we can possibly help it.

Violence in Schools

[*Ms. Stewart introduced a videotape on guns at school. A participant then described the shooting of a teacher in his school and asked when funding would be available for metal detectors.*]

The President. In the crime bill there's about $300 million for safe schools. And the money will be given out to the schools that have a demonstrated need for it. So I would urge you to apply for the money.

I don't know what all of your reaction to all this was, but I remember when we all started going through metal detectors to get on airplanes, a lot of people were upset. Now everybody just does it as a matter of course. I think until we get guns out of the hands of our young people, every school that needs it ought to have whatever security is needed to take care of that. You ought to be safe at school. Then you've got the problem of going to and from school. That's what the community policing is supposed

to take care of. But I think every school that needs it ought to have this kind of security. People should be safe in the school, and they ought to know when they get there they're going to be safe.

Bosnia

[*Following a commercial break, a participant stated that she voted for the President because he had indicated he would not let ethnic cleansing continue in Bosnia, and she expressed frustration with current administration policy.*]

The President. Well, first of all, go back and talk about everything I said. I also said that the United States should not enter the war, a civil war, on the side of the Bosnian Government. I said that the United States should not put its troops there to get involved in what was a centuries-old conflict. But we should do what we could to stop the fighting and to stop ethnic cleansing. So you have to tell the whole story; if you're going to give my campaign commitment, give the whole thing.

I advocated having NATO's air power put at the service of the Bosnian Government to stop aggression by the Serbs and lifting the arms embargo. The United Nations was in Bosnia. Our United Nations allies, France and Britain, would not support lifting the arms embargo. It took me from the time I took office until August to get NATO committed to use their air power to try to stop the aggression; they did. Then, finally, we began to do that.

Now look what's happened. In 15 months, which may seem like a long time, but is not such a long time, we now have finally relieved the siege of Sarajevo, and the Croatians and the Muslims have gotten together in an agreement. The Serbs are doing what they've always done; they're just trying to get as much land as they can for greater Serbia.

We're doing what we can, but everything we do, we do through the United Nations or through NATO. I have never favored—I was explicit in the campaign—unilateral United States action. If we do that, if we go into Bosnia all by ourselves, say, "We know what's right, nobody else does," then why should any other nation ever work with us through the United Nations? Why should the nations who don't agree with the embargo on Iraq that we imposed go along with it?

So I think we have done the best we could with a very difficult situation when we don't have troops on the ground, and I don't think we should until we get a peace agreement. I also believe that American troops should participate in Bosnia in trying to enforce a peace agreement once one is achieved.

Ms. Soren. Considering what's happened in the last 48 hours in Gorazde—and I understand that you met with a foreign policy team this morning—would you lobby NATO allies to increase air strikes? Would you support such strikes?

The President. Well, I'm working on that. I met for an hour and a half this morning; I'm going to work for the rest of the day. Then I'll have an announcement about what our policy will be later. But I can't announce it now.

Ms. Soren. Not now? Okay. Thanks a lot.

The President. I understand your frustration. Let me just say, I understand your frustration, but when I took office, the United Nations was already there. Their job was to try to provide humanitarian relief. Since I have been there, the U.S. took the lead in providing the longest humanitarian airlift in history, longer than the Berlin airlift after the Second World War. We pushed NATO to get more actively involved. We have been actively involved. We have made some progress.

There is still a war on the ground. The Bosnian Government has a bigger army than the Serbs do, but the Serbs have the heavy artillery. We tried to take the heavy artillery away from Sarajevo. That has worked so far. But until they reach an agreement, both sides are still fighting on the ground. Yes, Gorazde has been attacked by the Serbs; the Bosnian Government's also made some military gains elsewhere.

Do I think what the Serbs did was right? No, I don't. The United Nations recognized Bosnia. Should they have never imposed an arms embargo on them? I don't think they should have. But right now we are doing everything we can to bring an end to the war on terms that provide the Bosnian Muslims and the people who want to be part of a multiethnic state the best deal we can possibly get, given the circumstances as they exist. And that's the best we can do. The United States cannot go over there unilaterally, send its forces in, and start fighting on the side of the Bosnian Govern-

ment. I don't think that is the right thing to do.

Music and Violence

[*A participant stated that her favorite rap music artist was Snoop Doggy Dogg and asked for the President's opinion on gangsta rap.*]

The President. I don't know. I'm not dodging your—I just don't know. I read an article about Snoop Doggy Dogg. It is not exactly my music, you know; I don't necessarily know a lot about it. [*Laughter*] So I read an article about it, and I was interested in the—in the article that I read he talked about his life, you know, and the time he'd done. And the writer of the article talked about the whole idea behind gangsta rap was trying to dramatize how difficult life is for young people.

So I guess the answer is, it depends on what the end of the song is. I mean, what is the purpose of it? Is it to make people understand and empathize with and try to do something about these terrible problems? Or is it to legitimize violence and criminal conduct and, ultimately, self-defeating behavior? And for me to answer your question, I'd have to know the answer to that, and I just don't know enough to answer it.

Gun Exchange Programs

[*A participant discussed the effectiveness of gun exchange programs and asked what national programs could be enacted to get guns off the streets.*]

The President. Well, actually we're looking at that. We're looking at what, if anything, we can do on a national basis to try to have a more effective handgun purchasing program or gathering program.

I'm not so concerned that maybe some people buy them on the black market and make a little profit on them if the guns are actually destroyed and taken out of commission, and if then we have more control over the circumstances under which people buy the next gun. But you're talking about tens of millions of guns. We're talking about major numbers of guns. And it seems to me if we're going to do this effectively—and I think we ought to look at it—you have to know what happens to the guns when the government takes possession of them, whether it's a city or a State or the Federal Government, what happens to them then.

I think there's a lot of merit in doing this, but it seems to me you have to melt down the guns, you've got to destroy the weapons in order for it to be worth the effort so you reduce the overall supply of black market guns.

Teen Violence

[*A participant stated her view that some teens were resorting to violence as a status symbol.*]

The President. You mean you think a lot of people do it because they think it's the thing to do now?

Q. Yes.

The President. I think there's something to that. But that's why I think it's so important that in the schools and wherever else young people can be found, there are real efforts to show people that it is not a status symbol, that it can ruin your life, that it can destroy somebody else's life, and that there are other more satisfactory ways to resolve your conflicts.

I mean, there was just another story today about one student shooting another student over a girl they were both interested in. Well, you know, if you live long enough, that will happen to you several times; you can't start shooting people over that. But it happens all the time now.

And I think that it's a terrible indictment of all of us, the adults in this country, that we haven't provided the kind of leadership to our young people to know that that is not the way to behave. And I think there are too many young people who just feel like they're out there on their own. How many of these films did we see where these young people say "Our parents don't care about us. No grownups care about us. Nobody really cares about us?" If you go back to that, people have to believe they're really important to somebody who really cares about them before that person can help to change their behavior. I really believe that. And I say we've got to—and that goes back to your question about the gangster rap. She asked the same question in a different way. I don't know. I just know we've got to demystify violence, and we've got to say it's a bad thing. It is not a good thing; it is a bad thing.

Drugs and Crime

[*Ms. Soren discussed drugs as a major cause of random violent crime, and a participant asked*

the President if he thought mandatory sentences for drug offenders were effective.]

The President. I think the mandatory sentencing program has—of course, keep in mind, that's basically a Federal program, although New York also has a mandatory sentencing program. Some States have it, and some States don't. By and large, there have been a lot of problems with mandatory sentencing programs related to drugs because they tend to treat cases that are different, the same.

The second thing I have to say is that there isn't enough drug treatment on demand. We know that appropriate drug treatment, if you also accompany it with something that a young person can do, works in more than half the cases. So I think what we need to do is to focus on having an appropriate level of punishment but also an appropriate alternative so people can move out of the life they're living. That's what I think.

So the mandatory sentencing program, there have been problems with all of them, largely because they tend to treat cases that really are different, fundamentally the same.

Now, on the other hand, if you listen to anybody talk, they'll also tell you a lot of people get parole without doing an appropriate amount of time. So the system is not as rational as it ought to be. And I do think there's some problems with the sentencing. I'd like to see some changes.

Ms. Soren. Many politicians are afraid to back away from the mandatory minimum sentencing that started in the eighties because it would make them look soft on crime. But if your "three strikes and you're out" becomes law, couldn't you repeal the mandatory minimums?

The President. I think we could certainly change it some. Let me say, one of the things, though, that frustrates people when there were no guidelines is that people who were the same were treated wildly differently. That also makes—to go back to the young man's question—this is the frustrating thing about—should there be sentencing guidelines or should there not be? When people who are different and their circumstances are different are treated the same, we all get mad, right? And we should. But when people who are the same in their offense and their degree of guilt are treated dramatically differently, we all get mad.

So there is no perfect solution to this. But I will say again, what are the important things: crime prevention; when people get in trouble, do drug education and treatment, do education; and give people something to say yes to when they get out, because there will never be a fully perfect way of sentencing.

Would I have the power to say maybe we ought to take another look at this, with "three strikes and you're out," with my long support for the capital punishment? I think so. But there is no perfect answer to the sentencing problem when you have a crime problem as big as ours is. And the real thing you've got to do is focus on what happens to the people once they're in the prison, once they're in the boot camp. And more importantly, what can you do to keep people out of the system in the first place? What can we do to prevent this?

[*A participant stated that drug addicts should not be imprisoned and suggested more drug prevention and rehabilitation programs.*]

The President. I agree with half of what you said. I think there should be more drug prevention programs, and I think they'd work, the drug education programs. I think there should be more drug treatment programs. But some of you, perhaps all of you know that my brother is a recovering drug addict who actually went to prison for 14 months. It is my opinion that if he hadn't been caught up in the criminal justice system, he probably would have died because his problem was so gross and so bad. And I think he would tell you the same thing if he were standing here with me.

So I don't think it's inappropriate for people to do some time for violating serious crimes when they have a drug problem, and it may actually jerk them out of the life they're in and help to save their life. But I would say two things. Number one, you don't want to overdo the length of time they have to serve; if fundamentally they're not drug pushers, they're really drug users and abusers and addicts, you can overdo the length of time. And number two, you've got to have adequate drug treatment as well as preparation for living a different life if you want a different kind of behavior coming out of the prison than you got going in. That, it seems to me, is the biggest problem.

So a little time won't hurt people who are in the process of killing themselves anyway, if you make the most of them. But if you just

send them to prison for a too-long sentence and you never do drug treatment and they get nothing when they come out, then you're right, it's self-defeating.

[*Following a commercial break, Ms. Soren conducted a poll of the audience to determine if they thought the Government's priority should be programs and education to prevent crime, or punishment of criminals.*]

Ms. Stewart. Somewhat overwhelming for prevention in the room, President Clinton. Are you surprised by that at all?

The President. No, because I think a lot of young people know others who have been to prison and haven't been deterred and because I think the problem seems so overwhelming. People know that you've got to change behavior, you have to change people from the inside out. You have to change community by community, school by school.

My own belief is that we shouldn't make a choice, because the two things can work together. You can be tough, and you can be compassionate. You can be oriented toward prevention, but when somebody does something really horrible, you just can't walk away from it. You can't. So I think you have to do both.

But one thing I'd like to say to all of you who are here—there is a limit to what the Government can do unless people are working at grassroots level. And every one of you, if you really care about this, could make a contribution to making the problem better. Is there an organization in your school? Is there an organization in your community? If you believe in prevention, are you doing something to try to touch somebody else? Because most people have to be rescued one at a time, just the way they get lost, one at a time. And there will never be enough police officers; there will never be enough Government workers to do this. So I would just urge you—we had one young lady from Baltimore there who said she was going to work on setting up a community center. I think that there are things that you can do to give people something to say yes to that will make this prevention strategy work. And all the crime bill funds are basically just designed to give you the right, you and people like you all over America, to get together with people who care about this and do something about it in school after school and neighborhood after neighborhood.

Ms. Soren. So even though there's approximately $16 billion for police and prisons, some of that money is preventative and treatment and——

The President. In the House bill, I think, there is about $7 billion for prevention. There's a lot of money for prevention, much more than ever before from the Federal Government.

Ms. Soren. One thing that we didn't get a chance to talk about, but there were a lot of questions about was the role of families in preventing violence. Can you legislate a better family? Can you——

The President. No. No, but you can have pro-family policies. A lot of this violence occurs within the family. And you can have policies, for example, that don't push people into welfare. We lowered taxes for working people, one in six American families, for working people whose incomes are very low and who have children. We're trying to pass health care reform so people will never have to go on welfare just to get health care. We passed the family leave law, so when there are problems in the family, people can get off work and take a little time off work and tend to their problems with their children without losing their jobs.

In other words, the Government can do things that say we want to support family. And with more and more single-parent families and with more parents having to work, even when their children are very young, we have to be thinking all the time about how we can do things to help people succeed as parents and as workers. And then, when families get in trouble, we need to work on how we can preserve the family, not just how we can deal with the kids after it falls apart.

None of these things are easy, but frankly, if all of the families in this country were functional, we'd have less than half of the problems we've got today. I think all of you know that. We'd still have some problems, but we'd have less than half the problems we've got. And so we have to really keep that in mind.

[*Following a commercial break, Ms. Soren invited participants to ask brief questions on any topic they chose.*]

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, I'm curious to know how your meeting with Pearl Jam went.

The President. It was great. [*Laughter*] My daughter was jealous that she wasn't in the White House that day.

Q. Mr. President, do you speak any other languages?

The President. I studied German in college, and I can still read it and understand it a little bit, but my speaking is way down.

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering if you'd ever asked your daughter not to wear a specific piece of clothing to school.

The President. No, I haven't, although we've had a lot of general conversations about clothing. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, the world's dying to know, is it boxers or briefs? [*Laughter*]

The President. Usually briefs. I can't believe she did that. [*Laughter*]

Q. How do you feel about the Secret Service following you around everywhere you go?

The President. It's hard sometimes. But they do a good job protecting me and my family. And it's their job, so I'm getting used to it. But it's hard.

Ms. Soren. Do you keep a diary?

The President. No. I try to collect my recollections on a periodic basis, but I don't keep a daily diary.

Q. Mr. President, what was the best advice your mother ever gave you?

The President. Never give up.

Q. Mr. President, first of all, I want to say that I think you're great. Second of all, I want you to say, "yes," "no," or "I don't know." Will you run in '96?

The President. Probably. [*Laughter*]

Q. Do you have a charity you contribute to regularly?

The President. Yes, I do. We, my wife and I, contribute to a shelter for battered women and their children back home, regularly, and a number of other charities. We always give money to the Children's Defense Fund.

Q. Mr. President, what's your idea of the perfect day?

The President. A good book, a good game of golf, a long run, dinner with my wife and daughter, and movies with friends. You've got to stay up a long time to do all that. [*Laughter*]

Q. What do you think about the Clinton jokes?

The President. The what?

Q. What do you think about the Clinton jokes?

The President. Some are funny, and some aren't.

Presidential Nominations

Q. Do you regret not giving Lani Guinier the chance to defend her views to the Senate?

The President. Well, she defended them to a lot of individual Senators. The problem was we were facing a very divisive fight over an issue in which she and I had a fundamental disagreement, of which I was unaware at the time she was nominated. She might have been able to get confirmed, but based on what I was hearing from the Democrats, I doubt it. I think she's a very fine woman. She's one of the best civil rights lawyers in the country, and she's going to have a great career.

Q. In light of Justice Blackmun's recent decision, what do you think the chances are that you will replace the vacant seat with a minority that will, in fact, represent the needs and the concerns of minorities like Thurgood Marshall once did?

The President. Well, I'm going to try to make a good appointment, but I haven't made up my mind who to appoint yet. I think Justice Ginsberg, whom I appointed last time, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, will be terrific. And I will try to make—I hope when I'm done, you will think that all my Federal judge appointments not only are the most diverse but are the most excellent in American history. And we're on the way to having the most diverse and the most highly qualified appointments.

Ms. Soren. Can you give us your short list?

The President. I could, but I won't. [*Laughter*]

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering, what is your favorite song, and do you think you could sing a little bit of it?

The President. I have a lot of favorite songs, but I love the song that Ray Charles won the R&B Grammy for this year, "A Song For You," a song written by Leon Russell. I don't know if you know it, but it's an unbelievable song.

Q. Would you sing——

The President. No. [*Laughter*] "Our love is in a place that has no space or time. I love you for my life. You are a friend of mine." Do you know the song? It's a wonderful song, but he sings it better than I do.

Q. Do you support Howard Stern's candidacy for Governor of New York?

The President. I support his right to run. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Stewart. Do you have a favorite Biblical passage that means a lot to you?

The President. "Let us not grow weary in doing good, for in due season we shall reap if we do not lose heart." Galatians 6:9.

Q. Mr. President, what's your favorite type of running shoes?

The President. What did you say?

Q. What's your favorite type of running shoes?

The President. New Balance, and—I normally wear New Balance or Asics. I like them both. They're slightly different. I need something that a heavy guy can run in without falling over. [*Laughter*]

The Presidency

Q. What has been your toughest obstacle as President?

The President. I think sort of the culture of Washington, a lot of partisanship and a lot of negativism and focus on process, who's in and out and who's up and down; instead of let's all get together, pull the American people together, put the country first.

Admiral Frank Kelso

Ms. Soren. Do you think Admiral Kelso should get all his stars when he retires, despite his role in the Tailhook scandal?

The President. Based on the facts as I know them, I do. I believe that the evidence is not sufficiently compelling that he knew about it and that he was sufficiently culpable to deny him his stars. That's a very severe thing to do, and I don't believe the evidence warrants it. That's based on the Inspector General's report in the Pentagon.

Popular Culture and Private Life

Q. Mr. President, who's your favorite jazz saxophonist?

The President. Boy, that's tough. Probably Stan Getz.

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about your likeness on "Beavis and Butt-head"?

The President. My what?

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about your likeness on "Beavis and Butt-head"?

The President. Sometimes I like it; sometimes I don't. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Soren. We're about out of time. Thank you, Mr. President, for joining us today and continuing the dialog with young people.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:30 a.m. in the Kalorama Studio. In his remarks, he referred to entertainers Pearl Jam and Howard Stern, and Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, USN, Chief of Naval Operations. A portion of this interview could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
April 19, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. This morning I met for an hour and a half with our national security team to discuss what our options were to regain the momentum in Bosnia for a peaceful settlement. Several options were presented to me, and we discussed some others. When we adjourned the meeting, I asked the team to refine three points and to work on some of the options and to come back and meet with me again at 3:30 this afternoon. So we will meet again.

In the meanwhile, as I'm sure you know, President Yeltsin has issued a statement, which I very much appreciate and which I think is very helpful, calling on the Serbs to honor their commitments to the Russians to withdraw from Gorazde, to allow U.N. personnel back in Gorazde, and to resume the negotiations toward a peaceful settlement.

We are working closely on this. And I believe that we have a chance to build on what has been done in the last several weeks in and around Sarajevo and with the agreement between the Croatians and the Bosnian Muslims. And we will just keep working on it.

As I said, I meet again at 3:30 p.m., and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to make some constructive moves over the next couple of days.

Q. Mr. President, Mr. Yeltsin is also asking for a summit of all of the major powers to try to find some sort of solution. How do you feel about that?

The President. Well, he and I have discussed that on the telephone at least once, maybe twice, and I think it has some merit. We both agreed the last time we talked, before this development in Gorazde, that we were making progress doing what each of us was doing and that it might be a little premature, and that that sort of thing, in effect, can only be done once, and it might be better to save it for a time when, hopefully, the negotiations between the Serbs on the one hand and the Croatians and the Muslims on the other were coming down to an end point.

I presume from his statement today that he's sufficiently concerned about what's happened in the last couple of days, that he thinks maybe we ought to go ahead and do it now. I think it deserves serious consideration, and I want to discuss it with him and with the other nations that would be involved. But I think in the context of the statement President Yeltsin made today, it has to be considered seriously because it was a very important, positive statement that he made.

Q. What about Boutros-Ghali's proposal to expand air strikes to the other five safe areas in Bosnia? Would the U.S. and NATO be willing to go along with that?

The President. That's what we're discussing today. And we're discussing exactly how that would be done and, of course, whether the other NATO allies would be willing to do it and what the ups and downs of it would be and what else we could do to get this thing going. But again, I want to have my meeting at 3:30 p.m. You should know we're discussing all these options, but I reserve the right to announce a clear policy on where we go on the specifics until after the next meeting, because I did have some questions after our meeting this morning that the security team will answer for me later today.

Q. How concerned are you about empty threats——

The President. I think that there must not be any. When we had the NATO meeting in January, the one thing I implored our allies to do was not to reaffirm our position unless we were willing to see it through. I still feel that way. The possibility of misunderstanding in this area is so great anyway, because of the shared responsibility and the contingent responsibility of NATO—contingent on what the U.N. does—and the difficulty in getting all the parties together, that we simply must not be on record in favor of any policy we are not prepared to follow through on.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Statement on the Agreement on Elections in South Africa

April 19, 1994

I warmly welcome today's agreement among the South African Government, the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party to renounce violence and to bring Inkatha into the nation's first non-racial elections next week. Throughout the historic process of change in South Africa, the leaders of that country have shown great courage and a capacity for compromise. Today's bold action by Chief Buthelezi, Nelson Mandela, and F.W. de Klerk is one more act of collective statesmanship that bodes well for the prospect of free and fair elections in South Africa and for the success of the future Government of National Unity.

What happens in South Africa is of vital importance to us all. South Africa has the potential to alter the world trend toward greater ethnic division and establish a powerful model for democratic reform and national reconciliation. We will remain steadfast in our support for South Africa as it makes this difficult and historic transition to nonracial democracy.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Peacekeeping Operations in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

April 19, 1994

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

On January 8, 1994, I provided my second report to you on the deployment of a U.S. Army peacekeeping contingent as part of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I am now providing this further report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to inform you about my decision to augment our contingent in support of multilateral peacekeeping efforts in the region.

Since its arrival in July 1993, our combat-equipped U.S. Army contingent of approximately 315 Americans has been an important part of UNPROFOR Macedonia. Along with a Nordic battalion consisting of troops from Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark, the U.S. Armed Forces have assisted in the U.N. Security Council-authorized mission of monitoring and reporting developments along the northern border that could signify a threat to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The U.S. contribution has played an important role in the UNPROFOR Macedonia effort to prevent the conflict in the former Yugoslavia from spreading while contributing to stability in the region.

In order to support the United Nations as it sought additional forces to serve with UNPROFOR Bosnia-Herzegovina, the United States offered to increase the U.S. contribution to UNPROFOR Macedonia by approximately 200 personnel. The United Nations expressed its appreciation for continued U.S. cooperation and support and requested that the additional U.S. personnel be deployed to UNPROFOR Macedonia. We believe that the decision to deploy additional U.S. personnel to replace elements of the UNPROFOR Macedonia Nordic battalion has contributed to the decisions by member governments to deploy additional military personnel to Bosnia-Herzegovina.

As a result of these decisions, the U.S. European Command is deploying a reinforced company of approximately 200 personnel to augment the U.S. Army contingent in UNPROFOR Macedonia. The additional U.S. Armed Forces are from Company D, 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, V Corps, Vilseck, Germany. This unit is joining the U.S. reinforced company that was deployed earlier. The unit is equipped to assume sector responsibilities for departing Nordic troops as part of the ongoing U.N. monitoring and observer mission.

United States forces assigned to UNPROFOR Macedonia have encountered no hostilities, and there have been no U.S. casualties since the operation began. The mission has the support of the government and the local population. Our forces will remain fully prepared not only to fulfill their peacekeeping mission, but to defend themselves if necessary.

This additional U.S. contribution to UNPROFOR Macedonia is consistent with our commitment to multilateral efforts to address threats to international peace and security in the former Yugoslavia. I have ordered the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts in the former Yugoslavia, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in these matters.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Nomination for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
April 19, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Jan Piercy as the U.S. Executive Director at the World Bank and Michael Marek as the Alternate U.S. Executive Director at the World Bank.

"I am pleased to nominate Jan Piercy and Michael Marek to the World Bank. I am confident their skilled leadership and first-hand experience with the global marketplace will be a tremendous asset in their new roles," the President said.

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

Nomination for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
April 19, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Paul Steven Miller and Paul M. Igasaki as members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"I am delighted to nominate Paul Steven Miller and Paul Igasaki as members of the EEOC. With their distinguished careers in civil rights, they have the requisite vision and expertise to provide effective leadership in the Commission's efforts to ensure equality of opportunity in the workplace," the President said.

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

Remarks on Signing the National Infant Immunization Week Proclamation
April 20, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to thank all the people who have participated in this wonderful program today and all of you who worked to put it together. I want to say a special word of appreciation to Secretary Shalala, who is the owner of a current Mustang. [*Laughter*]

You know, when we have events like this, sometimes I think that the people who are on the stage ought to be out in the audience, and the people who are in the audience should be up on the stage, because by and large, by the time we have an event like this, what we're doing is announcing something that the rest of you have been trying to get us to do for 5 or 10 years. [*Laughter*]

So I want to begin by just saying to all of you who have labored so long in this field, the Members of Congress, the people in our administration, to the citizens groups—I'm sorry Mrs. Carter couldn't be with us today, but I'm glad Mrs. Bumpers, Mrs. Riegle are here—to the advocacy groups, our friend Marian Wright Edelman, the head of the Children's Defense Fund, and so many others who are here. You made this day possible, and we thank you all for it.

The second thing I'd like to do is to thank people like Dr. Johnson, who are actually out there doing something about all these poor kids that a lot of other people just talk about.

If you think about what the Vice President said and what others said about the comparative global statistics in immunization and the trends and you think about how many other areas there are like that when our country, even though we have a very powerful economy and, thank goodness, a growing one with growing jobs where we still have these continuing problems, we really, for reasons no one fully understands, continue to resist disciplined, community-based

organizations where we all look after one another without regard to our race or our income. We're just not as good at it as we ought to be. And we talk about it a lot better than we do it. And I think we all have to admit it. But we are trying to do better. And this is a truly remarkable initiative. This gives us a chance to put all of our actions where our words are.

Under our plan, every one of the things we could ever think of to do to get kids immunized will be done. And I appreciate what Dr. Johnson said about our health care plan because we also try in the health care plan to take care of the needs of our children and to do more primary and preventive work. And that goes along with the work that Senator Kennedy and others have spearheaded to try to expand the reach of Head Start to even younger children and to improve its quality.

We have got to do a better job of dealing with the health, the nutrition, the educational, and the emotional needs of our very youngest children if we expect to have the kind of future that America deserves.

Again, let me say to all of you, I am profoundly grateful for the work that has been done. I would be remiss if I didn't mention one of my pet projects, the national service program, AmeriCorps. Last year, 87 of our national service participants, in our very first summer of service, helped to immunize over 100,000 children in Texas. And it was a pretty good investment. So we will keep doing that. We'll keep working at it. Dr. Satcher, Dr. Elders, and others will keep spreading the word. But we know in the end, our ability to succeed depends upon the ability of grassroots-based community organizations to reach everybody in a disciplined way.

When I saw Secretary Riley sitting out here, I leaned over to Hillary and I said, "You know, you'd think that as long as we've been married, we've been asked and answered all the questions." I said, "Did you ever get any shots in school?" [*Laughter*] And she said, "Yes, I did." And I got my shots in school. That's where I got them. And then I got to thinking, listening to everybody talk, that our generation, all of us baby boomers, who are often known for other things, have a great debt to the immunization movement. We were the first generation of children in the very first year to be immunized against polio. My daughter cannot imagine what it's like to go to school as a first grader and be terrified that you're going to get polio and spend the rest of your life in an iron lung. But all of us grew up with that. Surely, those of us who have tangible, personal experience from the benefits of immunization can at long last solve this problem.

When I was a young man, I read a book by a southern author named James Agee about the Great Depression called, "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men." Some of you may have seen it. It also has some of the most astonishing photographs ever taken by an American photographer, a man named Walker Evans. In this book, James Agee said something that I have carried with me for a long time now, and I'd like to close with these remarks and then get on with the business at hand. He said, "In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances and no matter what parents, the potentiality of the whole human race is born again, and in him, too, once more, and of each of us, our terrific responsibility toward human life, toward the utmost idea of goodness, of the horror of error, and of God." That is what we are here about today. And we are bound to do a better job.

I now want to sign a proclamation designating National Infant Immunization Week. And once we've done that, we're going to see an example of what it is we are all talking about. We are going to see the first infant of the week being immunized right up here by Dr. Mohammed Akhter, the public health commissioner of the District of Columbia. The parents are Laura Loeb and Howard Morse, right? And their wonderful little daughter, Elizabeth. And for all of you here who are squeamish, relax; she is not going to be immunized with a shot. For all of us who had only shots in immunization, we sort of resent it, but—[*laughter*]—modern medical practice has permitted the public alleviation of pain. So let me sign the proclamation, and then we'll have the immunization.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:27 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Betty Bumpers, cofounder, and Lori Riegle, spokeswoman, Every Child By Two; Dr. Robert Johnson, director of adolescent and young adult medicine, New Jersey Medical

School; and Dr. David Satcher, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chancellor Franz Vranitzky of Austria

April 20, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are the allies on board now for your new Bosnia policy—strategy?

The President. Well, I've talked to President Yeltsin and President Mitterrand today, and Prime Minister Chretien. And I have not talked to Chancellor Kohl or to Prime Minister Major today. I haven't been able to get them, but I talked to them in the last couple of days. And I'll have more to—they were all good conversations and I'll—as you know, I'm going to make a statement after I meet with Chancellor Vranitzky.

Q. Minister Kozyrev said that they are dead set against air strikes. Does that set you back in initiating the policy?

The President. I read his statement; I didn't quite read it that way. But I had a conversation with President Yeltsin, and I will report it when I go out and make my statement. I'll tell you what he said.

Q. One hundred and seven people have been injured in the last 24 hours in Gorazde. We understand 38 are dead. Do you think that this new policy will help ameliorate the situation? Will the Serbs now take heed?

The President. We'll see. I'm going to make a statement and answer questions about it.

Richard Nixon

Q. Did you get a chance to talk to President Nixon's family?

The President. No, I talked to—actually, I talked to Billy Graham right after—he was on his way to the hospital right after he had his stroke. And I had—as soon as all this is over, I'm going to attempt to get in touch with one of his daughters at the hospital. I've been getting reports every hour or so for the last couple of days.

Q. How is he doing now? Is he——

The President. I think that's for them to say.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, what should Austria do concerning Bosnia?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. What should Austria do concerning the Bosnian crisis?

The President. Of course, that's partly for Austria to decide. But I think that all of us should be working toward doing whatever can be done to stop the aggression of the Serbs and to restore a diplomatic initiative that will actually work. It should be clear to everyone that this issue is not going to be solved ultimately on the battlefield. And the best thing that's happened in months and months was the agreement between the Croatians and the Muslims, freely entered into, dealing with a lot of the very difficult issues between them. And I believe the same thing could be done with the Serbs, unless they believe that they can continue through aggression to win the territory. And their actions now are inconsistent with offers they themselves have put on the negotiating table just in the last month or two.

So we're going to do what we can to exert whatever pressure and to take whatever initiatives we can to restore a climate in which a decent and honorable agreement can be reached. And I hope that that would be the same policy that Austria would have.

Q. Mr. President, do the Russians agree with the United Nations position and the position of the NATO, the current one?

The President. Well, I think we have—there is a broad agreement on objectives. I had a good talk with President Yeltsin, but I believe, frankly, we have to wait and get the details all written out, you know, so that we see whether we're in complete accord. I'm hoping that

we will be. I felt very good about the telephone conversation I had with President Yeltsin.

I think—they're also very upset with the Serbs. They feel that they had a clear commitment to back out of Gorazde, not to endanger the U.N. forces there. And yesterday President Yeltsin made a very good statement about saying the Serbs should withdraw from Gorazde to a certain distance and that the U.N. forces should go back in. And my own view is that we have a chance to have a common policy.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:42 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Russian President Boris Yeltsin, French President François Mitterrand, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and evangelist Billy Graham. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference
April 20, 1994

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to begin by saying that I want to join all the American people as Hillary and I pray for the health and the recovery of President Nixon. I want to again say how much I have appreciated the wise counsel he has given me on the question of Russia and many other issues since I have been President.

I spoke with a member of his family just a few moments ago, and I did speak with Reverend Billy Graham shortly after President Nixon was admitted to the hospital when Reverend Graham was on the way to the hospital. And I have nothing public to report about that, except to say that his condition remains serious, and I hope he will be in the prayers of all Americans.

Over the last several days, the situation in Gorazde has become increasingly grim. The Serb forces have broken their own truce agreements, persisted in brutal attacks on civilians, United Nations personnel, and NATO forces protecting those personnel. These events are clearly a setback for the momentum achieved in recent months. The NATO ultimatum brought a reprieve to Sarajevo: humanitarian routes were reopened, agreements between Muslims and Croats changed the balance of power on the ground and offered new diplomatic opportunity.

There are reports that the Serbs have released more U.N. personnel and returned heavy weapons seized from U.N. control near Sarajevo, and they are welcome. But the imperative now is not only to address the latest Serb transgressions, it is to renew the momentum toward peace.

Let me be clear about our objective. Working with our allies, the Russians, and others, we must help the warring parties in Bosnia to reach a negotiated settlement. To do that, we must make the Serbs pay a higher price for continued violence so it will be in their own interests, more clearly, to return to the negotiating table. That is, after all, why we pushed for NATO's efforts to enforce a no-fly zone and the Sarajevo ultimatum and to provide close air support for U.N. forces who come under attack.

In pursuit of that policy, we must take further action. Therefore, the United States has today undertaken the following initiatives:

First, we are proposing to our NATO allies that we extend the approach used around Sarajevo to other safe areas, where any violations would be grounds for NATO attacks. I have insisted that NATO commit itself to achievable objectives. NATO's air power alone cannot prevent further Serb aggressions or advances or silence every gun. Any military expert will tell you that. But it can deny the Serbs the opportunity to shell safe areas with impunity.

Second, we will work with others to pursue tighter sanctions through stricter enforcements. The existing sanctions on Serbia have crippled Serbia's economy. In light of recent events, there must be no relief.

Third, we are taking other steps to relieve suffering and support the peace process. We are offering the United Nations assistance in addressing the humanitarian crisis that is now

severe in Gorazde. And we expect the Security Council to take up a resolution authorizing additional U.N. peacekeepers, which we will support.

These steps support our intensive work, along with others, to secure a negotiated settlement.

I have just spoken at some length with President Yeltsin, as well as with President Mitterrand. I spoke earlier today with Prime Minister Chretien. I have not yet spoken with Chancellor Kohl or Prime Minister Major today. I have attempted to do so, but I have spoken with them in the last couple of days about this important issue. President Yeltsin and I agreed to work closely together to pursue peace in Bosnia. President Mitterrand expressed his agreement with the general approach.

I was very encouraged by President Yeltsin's statement yesterday, calling on the Serbs to honor their commitments, insisting that they withdraw from Gorazde and that they resume talks and that they permit U.N. personnel to return to Gorazde.

I think you can look forward to a major diplomatic initiative coming out of our common efforts, but I cannot discuss the details of the outlines of that with you at this moment because we have agreed, all of us, that our foreign ministers need to talk and flesh out the details before we say exactly what approach we will take. The telephone conversations themselves were an insufficient basis for the kind of specific detailed approach that I think would be required.

In any case, it is clear that our test of Serb intent must be their actions, not their words. Those words have often proved empty.

Let me reiterate what I have said often before. The United States has interests at stake in Bosnia: an interest in helping to stop the slaughter of innocents; an interest in helping to prevent a wider war in Europe; an interest in maintaining NATO as a credible force for peace in the post-cold-war era and in helping to stem the flow of refugees. These interests justify continued American leadership and require us to maintain a steady purpose, knowing that there will be difficulties and setbacks and that in this world where we have a set of cooperative arrangements, not only with NATO but with the United Nations, there will often be delays that would not be there were we acting alone or in a context in which our security were more immediately threatened.

Ultimately, this conflict still must be settled by the parties themselves. They must choose peace. The agreement between the Croatians and the Muslims was a very important first step, but there is so much more to be done. By taking firm action consistent with our interests, the United States and our NATO allies can, and must, attempt to influence that choice.

Thank you. Go ahead.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, did President Yeltsin raise any objections to this expanded use of NATO air power? And are all the NATO allies on board on this, such as Britain and Canada?

The President. Well, first of all, we are still involved in our consultations about it. Secondly, I don't think I can commit President Yeltsin to a course until he sees our proposal in writing.

I can tell you, in general, what he said, however, which was that he agreed that the present understandings for air power were ineffective and that the Serbs plainly violated their agreement and overreached in Gorazde, something he's already said publicly. But he feels, as everyone does, that over the long run, NATO air power alone will not settle this conflict; this conflict will have to be settled by negotiations.

Let me tell you the argument I made to him and the argument I want to make to you, because I know a lot of you have been as frustrated as have we by what happened in Gorazde.

We have, through NATO, three separate authorizations for the use of air power, and air power has been used under two of those three. And arguably, the possibility of air power has been successful under two of those three, but they're not the same.

Authorization number one is to enforce the no-fly zone. We have done that and planes have been shot down, as you know. And I think the no-fly zone clearly has been successful in preventing the war from spreading further into the air and the slaughter from coming from the airplanes.

Option number two was the Sarajevo option. That is, a safe zone was created around Sarajevo, and all heavy weapons either had to be withdrawn from the safe zone or turned over to United Nations personnel. Then any heavy weapons shelling within the Sarajevo safe zone by anybody could trigger NATO air strikes. There were no NATO air strikes under that, but it clearly worked, and it was clearly more enforceable.

Option number three is what you saw at Gorazde. Option number three gives the United Nations commander the authority to ask for United Nations civilian approval to ask for NATO air support to support the U.N. forces on the ground when they're under duress.

Now, consider what the difference is between that and the Sarajevo option and all the conflicts that came along. First of all, you have to go through the approval process, which came quickly the first time when the NATO planes went in, the United States planes, and took the first action. But then you have to keep coming back for that approval. And you're always subject to an argument about who started what fight and what the facts were. And then what happened to us in Gorazde was, if an assault results in having the NATO forces close at hand with the aggressing forces or if NATO forces are captured, then any use of air power may lead to the killing of the very people we're there trying to protect. Whereas under the Sarajevo model, you can just say, "Okay, here's the safe zone. All the heavy weaponry has to be withdrawn or put under U.N. control, and if there's any violation by anybody, there can be air action." It is a much clearer thing.

That is a point I made very strongly to President Yeltsin. I think he was quite sympathetic with it. His only point was the same point that everyone makes, which is that in the end, the use of air power by NATO cannot bring this war to an end. Only a negotiated settlement can do that. I think that, generally, you will see the United States and Russia working together, and I've been impressed by how aggressive the Russians have been with regard to the Serbs in this.

Yes, go ahead. I'll take it.

Q. Mr. President, do you think that now the Serbs should be prepared for strategic air strikes, as well as tactical, that you would need to go after their supply lines or their ammo dumps? And secondly, are you also pressing the allies to try to lift the arms embargo, as many in Congress are demanding?

The President. Let me answer the first question first by simply saying that I do not think it is appropriate for me to discuss the tactical details of our policy—not ever probably—but certainly not until they have been worked out with our allies. We have to do that through NATO.

Secondly, as you know, I have always favored lifting the arms embargo. And I am glad that there is so much support for it in the Congress now from—much of it coming from people who've not said it before. And I think that's encouraging. But many of them are saying that somehow we should not be in a cooperative effort with the United Nations and NATO but instead should just, on our own, lift the arms embargo, make sure the arms get there, and then, with no danger to ourselves we can permit these people to fight against their own abuses. That has a great deal of appeal. There are certain practical problems with it.

First, I would say that if we ignore a United Nations embargo because we think it has no moral basis or even any legal validity but everyone else feels contrary, then what is to stop our United Nations allies from ignoring embargoes that we like, such as the embargo against Saddam Hussein? How can we ever say again to all of the other people in the United Nations, you must follow other embargoes? That's a serious question for me because there are a lot of things that we want to do through the United Nations.

Secondly, what are the practical problems with raising the arms embargo? Do the Croats, who now have this agreement with the Muslims, support it? Will it be facilitated? How long would it take to get there? Would that increase Serb aggression in the short run while we're waiting for the arms to be delivered? There are a lot of practical problems with it. Do I favor lifting it? I do. Do I believe the allies with whom we are working now would vote to support it? I don't. Will there be continuing discussions about it? Yes, there will. I will say this: I think the more the Serbs turn away from this opportunity for peace, the more the allies are likely to be willing to vote to raise the arms embargo. But I don't think they're there right now.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. President Clinton, it seems as though, frequently, you have characterized this as a civil war; yet the Serbs seem to be the main aggressors here. How would you define the Serbs for the American people? Are the Serbs villains in this piece?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it is a civil war in the sense that people who live within the confines of a nation we have recognized are fighting each other for territory and

power and control. So in that sense, it is clearly a civil war.

I have always felt that the Serbs were the primary aggressors, even though at various times there have been three different factions fighting, and at various times in various specific instances, you could make an argument that the Serbs were not always the initiators of a particular aggression.

The Serbs have gotten a lot of what they wanted, which was more territory to create a greater Serbia in areas where Serbs were ethnically either exclusively occupying the territory or dominant. And so I've always felt that they were the primary problem there. But in the end, there's going to have to be an agreement. Not very long ago, I would remind you, the parties didn't seem too far apart on an agreed-upon territorial division, and then this fighting resumed, I think, with quite unfortunate consequences.

Q. Are you reluctant to condemn the Serbs' behavior?

The President. No, I've been condemning their behavior for 2 years now. And let me just say this: I think—you asked me in general terms—in general terms do I consider them to be the primary aggressor? The answer to that is yes.

More specifically, and far more importantly, were they wrong in Gorazde? Yes, terribly wrong. What is their defense? That the Muslims shot at them. Did they overreact to that, even if it's true? Unbelievably. Does that justify shelling a hospital, shelling the U.N. headquarters, taking United Nations hostages when we have never been involved in the war against them, when all we did was to do what we said we would do all along, which is if they threatened our people, we would use air power? They are the complete aggressors and wrongdoers in the case of Gorazde.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—suggesting there is some reluctance to support air strikes in the House?

Q. Is it too late for Gorazde?

The President. Is it too late for Gorazde? No, it's too late for—you know, a lot of people have been killed there. But if the Serbs would do what the Russians demanded, as well as what we demand, if they would get out, withdraw, let the United Nations come back in, and then we could resume the aggressive humanitarian relief effort that we have offered to help in, it would not be too late for Gorazde in the sense that it could be restored as a genuine safe area and the town could be safe.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Q. Nothing that you are proposing today is intended to deal specifically with Gorazde, is it? And just a second thing is, have you thought through what you would propose to do if your attempt to recreate the Sarajevo model elsewhere does not deter the Serbs and they keep coming, much as they did at Gorazde?

The President. Let me answer your first question first. Our proposal would create Sarajevo-like conditions, that is, sort of safe zones around all the safe areas, including Gorazde. So we would assume that as a part of this, if our allies will agree with us, that any heavy weaponry, any heavy firing in and around that area would be subject to the same action as Srebrenica or any other safe zone.

So, that's that. The second question is, have I thought about what would happen if this doesn't work? I have. But I think we should stick with this policy, and if the Serbs continue their aggression in an irresponsible way, then there are other things that can be done. I have given a lot of thought to it, but I don't want to talk about it now. I want to talk about this policy.

Go ahead, Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service].

Admiral Frank Kelso

Q. Mr. President, you've had a lot of other things on your mind besides this war. Would you please do something about Admiral Kelso? Can you veto that bill that gives him pay for four stars when all he needs is pay for two? And that is in the traditions of the past. The military men only got their own regular pay. They didn't have to go to Congress and get paid for two more stars. That's spending Government money that we can't afford now.

The President. No, that's not what happened.

Q. If he didn't know what was going on in Tailhook, then he should have known because he's head of naval operations.

The President. Well, the—I agree with the decision made by the Pentagon and ratified by the Senate. So I can't agree to do it because I agree with it.

Q. Why do you agree with it because—why do you agree with spending more money on this man's salary?

The President. Because I believe—because I disagree with you. I believe the evidence does not condemn the conduct or knowledge of Admiral Kelso sufficient to justify taking the two stars away from him.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, can I just follow up on this Sarajevo model? How long will it take, in your opinion, in your military advisers' opinions to (A) expand this model to protect the five other safe areas, especially because you say you need another U.N. Security Council resolution? So it seems that that process could take a long time.

The President. Well, no, no. We believe that the United Nations has the authority under Resolution 836 to do this or that you could have a Presidential statement from the head of the Security Council. There are lots of ways to do it.

Q. But in terms of expanding the U.N. personnel who are required——

The President. We believe that what's been lacking there is just an agreement on how many more people, where they'll come from, and how the money will be provided. But General Rose has wanted 10,000 more. There was agreement among those of us who contribute but do not provide troops but who provide money, for something like 3,700 more recently. And my announcement today should be read as our willingness to play a major role in contributing to a larger peacekeeping force.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, are you going to put U.S. troops in?

The President. No.

NOTE: The President's 55th news conference began at 4:49 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to evangelist Billy Graham; President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; President François Mitterrand of France; Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada; Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany; Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom; President Saddam Hussein of Iraq; Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and Lt. Gen. Michael Rose, Commander of U.N. Forces in Bosnia.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Embargo on Haiti
April 20, 1994

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

Six months ago I provided you with my initial report on the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces in the implementation of the petroleum and arms embargo of Haiti. I am now providing this further report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to inform the Congress about the status of the U.S. contribution to the ongoing U.N. embargo enforcement effort.

In response to the continued obstruction by the military authorities of Haiti to the dispatch of the U.N. Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) and their failure to comply with the Governors Island Agreement, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 875 (October 16, 1993). This resolution called upon Member States "to use such measures commensurate with the specific circumstances as may be necessary" to ensure strict implementation of the Haitian embargo on petroleum and arms and related material imposed by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873 (1993). Under U.S. command and control, and acting in concert with allied navies and in cooperation with the legitimate Government of Haiti, U.S. Naval Forces began maritime interception operations on October 18, 1993, in order to ensure compliance with the embargo terms.

Since that time, U.S. Naval Forces have continued enforcement operations in the waters around Haiti, including at times in the territorial sea of that country. The Haiti maritime interception operations generally have employed up to six U.S. surface naval combatants serving on station in the approaches to Haitian ports. The maritime interception force has been comprised of naval units and supporting elements from the United States, Argentina, Canada, France, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

The objective of these maritime interception operations is to ensure that merchant vessels proceeding to Haiti are in compliance with United Nations Security Council sanctions. The enforcement operations have been conducted in a thorough and safe manner. As of April 18, 1994, more than 6,000 vessels had been queried, 712 boarded, and 44 diverted to other than Haitian ports due to suspected violations or cargo that was inaccessible to inspection. These operations have been generally effective in preventing the sale or supply of embargoed items through sea trade and have specifically deterred tanker shipments of petroleum products, as one important aspect of the Haitian embargo enforcement effort. There have been no U.S. personnel casualties during the conduct of these operations.

The valuable U.S. contribution to U.N. embargo enforcement operations is important to U.S. goals and interests in the region and, fundamentally, to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. I am not able to indicate at this time how long the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces in this multilateral operation will be necessary. I have continued the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief.

I appreciate the support the Congress has provided for this important U.S. contribution to multilateral efforts to restore democracy to Haiti, and I look forward to continued cooperation with you in these matters.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Nomination for the Rehabilitation Services Administration

April 20, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Fredric K. Schroeder as Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration at the Department of Education.

"As one who gradually became blind as a teenager, Dr. Schroeder knows all too well the challenges facing people with disabilities," the President said. "He has devoted his life to empowering disabled people, and I'm confident he will continue in his new assignment to help disabled Americans achieve their goals."

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

Remarks at the Democratic Congressional Dinner

April 20, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that enthusiastic introduction and for your equally enthusiastic leadership of the House. Senator Mitchell, Congressman Gephardt, Senator Graham and Congressman Fazio, Senator Rockefeller, Congressman Torricelli, to the host committee, and especially to our chair, Hugh Westbrook, all of you who have made so many sacrifices for the Democratic Party and for our country.

The Vice President and I are glad to be here tonight to see so many old friends; to know that what we have done together has made you willing to continue to work to keep our majority so that we can continue to work for you. And I have to tell you that I'm very proud—very, very proud—of all the Democratic Members of Congress who have worked with us and without whom we could not have done anything over the last 15 months to deal with the profound problems this country faces.

In that context, I am praying for the largemindedness to forgive George Mitchell for retiring. I have found the silver lining in that cloud. I finally figured out what George had in mind, you know, when he said at least he was going to give his whole heart and soul to passing health care. I didn't have it figured out until he announced today his engagement to the director of a sports marketing firm. [*Laughter*] This is the method behind his madness. He is always methodical.

What he's got in mind for the rest of the year is a bunch of commercials with George and Larry Byrd and Michael Jordan. [*Laugher*] And they'll be at the top of a building or in space somewhere, and he'll say, "Here's how we're going to pass health care." He'll say, "Off the Finance Committee, over the Ways and Means Committee, through the Conference Committee, to the President, nothing but net." [*Laughter*]

I will say Senator Mitchell has caused me some minor inconvenience, not at all of his own doing, but because of developments in the last 24 to 36 hours when he decided he did not want to be on the Supreme Court. I had to go back to the drawing board. Well, you know, it's a real pain to get anybody confirmed in the Senate today. Have you noticed that? [*Laughter*] I mean, it's gotten to the point where I don't even want to go to dinner with anybody that can get confirmed in the Senate. [*Laughter*]

Anyway, we did, because this is the second time this has happened, we had a lot of sterling candidates for the Supreme Court whom we thought we had thoroughly vetted. And now, lo and behold, I've got to go back to every one of them and ask them, boxers or briefs? [*Laughter*] Can you believe the indignities you have to endure if you're President these days? [*Laughter*] James Carville said the other day that the President ought to be accountable, but he shouldn't become America's pinata. [*Laughter*]

I want to say a special word of tribute and appreciation to Tip O'Neill and to Millie and to the O'Neill family. I loved that film. And I loved being reminded that in the midst of all the things that we sometimes get diverted by in this town, engagement in politics can serve a deeper purpose and it must. I am so proud of the life that Tip O'Neill lived and the legacy he left.

And I guess what I want to say to you tonight—I've given a lot of thought to it; I don't have to recount what we've done; others have done that—is to ask you to remember what was in that film. I have often wondered what I would think about 5 minutes before I left this old Earth if I had 5 minutes' notice. I think that I would think about the people that I loved, my family and my friends, the people with whom I shared friendship, the exhilarating things in which I was involved, and maybe what the flowers looked and smelled like in the springtime. And that most of the things that we obsess about for most of our lives would just vanish away if we all had 5 minutes' notice.

So the trick is always to live as if we were on 5 minutes' notice. I say that because you and I know that this election season, if history is any guide, will be a challenging one for us. We know that because we have more seats up than the other party. We know that because, historically, the President's party loses some ground at midterm. We know that because we have so many people who are retiring after justifiable, laborious service.

But I know something else: I know that for 15 months, we have worked hard to say yes to America and that by and large, vast majorities of the other party, at every turn in the road, have focused on how to keep saying no. I know that we have tried to come to grips with problems that were long ignored. I know that I have tried to reach out beyond party divisions and invited others in good faith to join us. I know that together we have tried to lift up our common efforts, not tear other people down, to unite this country and not to divide it.

You can't blame the American people for being cynical after all they've been through and the way it's all portrayed. And you can't blame people for expressing their frustrations and their hurts when they still haven't felt the updraft that is in this economy. And many of you go on to face difficult races in an atmosphere that may seem slightly unrealistic and sort of shrouded in a fog, but what I want to say to you tonight is to pierce the fog. You must show the conviction that what you have done matters to you and will matter to the last day you're on this Earth and that you intend to keep on facing these problems and seizing these opportunities and what pierces the fog is the record.

There is a truth here, there is a reality. The deficit is down. We are dealing with the prob-

lems of crime and the problems that working families face and the problems of health care and the need for more jobs and all the difficult challenges facing America. And we are trying to seize opportunities that we had for too long ignored.

And even in the areas in foreign policy that have taken so much of my attention in the last 2 weeks, that have no easy answers, we at least are squaring our shoulders to the wheel and trying to honestly face the problems facing this country and move it forward.

And so, we believe the purpose of politics is to unite the American people and to move this country forward, to enter the next century with this still being the greatest country in the world, to give everybody in this country a chance to live up to his or her God-given capacities. And we believe that Government has a role in that, that we can't live other people's lives for them but neither can we walk away from people's problems.

We offer a partnership in America. We offer opportunity; we insist on responsibility. But we know that what binds us together is more than a bunch of words; it's a shared existence, a shared set of values, and a common future whether we all like it or not. We are going up or down together.

And for 15 months we have begun to push away the fog. We have begun together to take on these problems and to move this country forward and to give people a sense of possibility again so that politics could be more than personal advantage or personal harm. It could be about how to lift ourselves up together and to give people chances they don't now have and to solve problems that only Government can solve. This must be the message of this election year.

For those of you who have come here to make it possible for the campaigns to be staffed and the ads to be run, I say to you, we have a record to run on. We have a message to take out there. And we can defy the odds because the odds are about statistics and not about the reality of 1994.

The reality of 1994 is that we are fulfilling the promise of that remarkable campaign in 1992. And eventually, in race after race, in district after district, in State after State, if there is conviction and if it's backed up by reality and we keep working this year to build on what happened last year, then the people of this country will respond whether they are retired to sunny Florida in Senator Graham's State or whether they live in Co-op City in Congressman Engel's district or whether they're living in one of those beautiful towns in Speaker Foley's wonderful district in Washington or someplace in between, the truth will prevail if we believe it, if we have conviction, and if we fight not for ourselves but for some higher purpose.

It is no accident, my fellow Americans, that in the face of the march of progress you have seen in these last 15 months, there has been an intensified atmosphere of highly personal attacks and negative, often, histrionics. It is because we are on to something. And good things are happening, and we are moving forward.

But we focus on those things at our peril. The American people have a lot of sense and an enormous capacity for discounts, and they know politics for what it is. And yes, they make a mistake every now and then, but more than half the time on more than half the issues for over 200 years now, they have been right. And that's why we're all sitting here tonight, because our system has worked.

Tip O'Neill once said, if you take care of the people, that'll take care of the next election. Well, we're taking care of the people, and we've got to make sure they know what we're doing, and we've got to make sure that we know that we will be rewarded.

So, I say to you, what's the prescription for '94? People like you helping the Members of Congress to get their message out, Members of Congress full of conviction and courage, and a record in Congress in '94 that equals the one in '93 with a crime bill, with health care reform, with the education reforms, with the training reforms, with a message that says, we're going to face our problems and seize our opportunities.

I want you to feel good about this year. So what if it's a higher hill to climb. The reason we've got more folks up is because we've got more folks in. And if we didn't have more folks in, we wouldn't be doing what we're doing. And we have to keep it that way.

I used to tell people in the campaign of 1992 that I was a Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction. And even though I get mad from time to time at things that happen, I never thought about leaving. I always felt that when I was home serving in State government and for a dozen years as my State's Governor—but

I'll tell you something, after spending 15 months here, I know it's true more deeply, more profoundly than I could have ever imagined before I showed up. I want you, every one of you, to leave this room tonight and say,"We're not going to have to run against the other guys. We're going to defend ourselves, but we're going to run on our record and for the people of the United States, and we are going to lift this debate in 1994. We will not let it be torn down. We will not let the fog of inaccuracy and negativism embrace the American people. In every district, in every State, we will be proud of what we have done. We will assert it with conviction." And when it's all over, when people vote in November, they will look and say, "We want those people to stay in because they're interested in us, not themselves. They're fighting for us, and they're making a difference. And it's good for America, and it's good for my children. It's good for the grandchildren," like that wonderful little girl that Tip O'Neill held up.

Don't forget what this is about, folks. And imagine what you want to be remembered for because you were in politics if you get your 5 minutes' notice. If we take that 5 minutes' notice to the American people in 1994, we will have a thunderous victory.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:32 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Hugh Westbrook, director of finance, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Remarks on the Observance of Earth Day

April 21, 1994

Thank you, Josephine—I saved the environment; did you like that? [*Laughter*] Thank you, Josephine, for that wonderful statement. Thank you, Steve, for your work, and all of you who helped to restore this wonderful park. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming.

There are so many people here we could introduce, but I do want to mention two others who are here: First of all, the wonderful Representative of the District of Columbia in the United States Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton, thank you for coming. And the head of our national service movement, which is providing a lot of our foot soldiers in our attempt to merge the community and the environment, Mr. Eli Segal, thank you for coming, sir. I also see in the audience two people that make me wonder if we're going to be extras in a 1994 movie, Dennis Weaver and Chevy Chase. Thank you for coming, guys. Thank you both for coming. Stand up. [*Applause*] We're all available for tryouts, aren't we? [*Laughter*]

I want to say a special word of thanks as I begin to Josephine Butler and to all the people in this community for making this park what it is. I'm proud to say that the Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt has designated this park as a national heritage site, not only because of its beauty but because of what it represents about what we, as a people, can do.

The people of this community took this park back. They made it a place where families could come and young people could come and children could play. I don't know how many times in the 1980's when I was just visiting Washington like any other Americans, when I went right by this park, when I would ask people over and over and over again, I said, "That is the most beautiful place I've ever seen," and somebody from Washington would say, "Well, don't go in there. It's a dangerous place." I mean, in broad daylight. I must have asked a half a dozen times.

And now, because of what you have done—look at it, I mean, look at the fountain, the water, the beauty of this place. It's absolutely unbelievable and a great, incredible tribute to the people in this community. That's the most important thing I think we can say or do today, just to recognize the power of ordinary citizens to rebuild their own lives, environmentally, responsibly, and make their lives better at the same time. You are a shining example of that.

Today we honor the community leaders who've reclaimed the park: the president of the Friends of Meridian Hill—how many hours have

you donated to this, sir?—over 5,000. Reverend Morris Samuel, who courted his wife under a cherry tree not far from here and never stopped visiting this park; Malcolm Peabody, a businessman who helped to bring 150 businesses into the Meridian Hill coalition; Antonio Montes, a community leader and assistant to Congresswoman Norton, who helped to get the first funding increase for this park in the Federal budget in almost 20 years; and Lieutenant Henry Berberich of the U.S. Park Police, who turned down several promotions because he wanted to keep protecting this park and who embodies the spirit of community policing at its best. Where are you, sir? Let's give him a big hand. [*Applause*]

In just 4 years, crime in this park has declined by 90 percent. That's a pretty good standard for America to try to emulate. New businesses have moved nearby. I was in the Kalorama Studio just a couple of days ago doing the MTV forum with young people. Just as this community has restored this park, the park has helped to restore the community.

I am here today because what this community has done is what our country as a whole must do. In restoring a piece of nature, the people here have helped to restore a strong sense of place, of their own history, of their roots, a sense of purpose, a sense of pride, and a sense of hope for their children, proving the wisdom of the great American naturalist John Muir, who founded our national parks and whose birthday we celebrate today. He said almost a century ago, "Garden- and park-making goes on everywhere in civilization, for everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to the body and soul."

Each of us has a special place where we can stand silently all alone, except for the presence of nature and the Creator. And if we don't, we need it, and we deserve it. When I was growing up, it was the lakes, the woods, the hills of my native State. For a young man or woman growing up in this community, it may well be this wonderful park. Preserving those things enable us to bring our communities and our country back together.

There is clearly today a hunger in our national spirit not only for more security, for more economic opportunity but for something we can all be involved in that is larger than ourselves and more lasting than the fleeting moment. Reclaiming our rivers, our forests, our beaches, and our urban oases, like this one, is a great purpose worthy of a great people. The love of nature is at the core of our identity as individuals, as communities, and certainly as Americans and increasingly, thankfully, a part of the community of nations.

Preserving the environment is at the core of everything we have to do in our own country, building businesses, creating jobs, fighting crime and drugs and violence, raising our children to know the difference between right and wrong, and restoring the fabric of our society. For we are here today to bear witness to a simple but powerful truth: As we renew our environment, we renew our national community.

Since the first Earth Day 24 years ago, our Nation has been on a journey of national renewal. But as long as 70 million Americans live in communities where the air is dangerous to breathe; as long as half our rivers, our lakes, and our streams are too polluted for fishing and swimming; as long as people in our poorest communities face terrible hazards from lead paint to toxic waste dumps; as long as people around the world are driven from their homelands because what were their fields are now deserts, their fisheries are dying, and their children are stricken by diseases, our journey is far from finished.

That's why we are trying to bring a new spirit of community to the work of protecting and restoring the environment. I have often said in many places that governments don't raise children, parents do. I'm here today because governments alone cannot save the environment, people and communities must.

In everything we do to protect the environment, we must, it seems to me, be guided by four fundamental principles. First, we understand that a healthy economy and a healthy environment go hand-in-hand. In the long run we cannot have one without the other.

Tomorrow people all around the world will celebrate Earth Day, because they care about the air they breathe and the water they drink just as much as we do. That's why there is now a $200 billion to $300 billion market for environmentally conscious products, from technologies for cleaning toxic dumps and scrubbers for power plants to energy-efficient air conditioners. Last October we started our strategy to help American companies, large and small, get their share of that market. If your company

makes a product or offers a service that will protect the environment, all over the world you can find capital, customers, and expert advice. We Americans can do what we set our minds to do, including slowing down global warming without cooling down our economy.

A year ago on Earth Day, we made a commitment to reduce greenhouse gases which cause climate changes, from global warming to increasingly severe hurricanes. In October, we produced a plan to cut greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2000. Today, thousands of companies have come to Washington as partners in that goal. Many are causing less pollution because they're using less energy, cutting fuel bills, investing more in new products and new jobs, proving that good environmental policies are, in fact, good business.

Last night, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary signed an historic agreement with virtually the entire electric utility industry to cut greenhouse gases. That means some of our largest industrial polluters are going to clean up their act and clean up our air.

Our climate change programs helps companies and consumers save energy and money with air conditioners, computers, refrigerators, and light bulbs that use less electricity than ever before. And we're helping American companies to build those products and create those jobs.

Anyone who believes that environmental quality threatens jobs can talk to one of the people who has already been introduced. I'd like to ask her to stand again, Fabiola Gonzalez. Stand up. [*Applause*] She came here today from Maybrook, New York, one of 400 workers from the Osram-Sylvania factory who make energy-efficient, compact, fluorescent light bulbs. Now, I have to tell you, to show you that we never do things as quickly as we could, the first time I ever heard that these light bulbs were the wave of the future was in 1978 from Amory Lovins, who is sitting out there today. Thank you, sir. This is a 23-watt replacement for a 90-watt bulb that lasts 10 times as long as the average light bulb and will save $67 in energy costs, one light bulb. And there is a huge market for them all over America and indeed all over the world, and a job for this fine woman and others who are contributing to our future. Thank you so much.

There are some people who still say that if you protect the environment, you're going to hurt the economy. Well, there are tough choices to be made, but those choices can lead to more opportunity, as we have seen. We can't turn back the clock, and we cannot deny that Government has a role in helping to preserve the natural beauty of our rivers, our forests, our mountains, our beaches, and our parks; and not to create bureaucracies that grow faster than garden weeds.

That's where the second principle comes in: reinventing the way we protect the environment so that Government is a partner, not an overseer. The Vice President has led the charge to make this administration a leader in the global environmental effort, and at the same time, to give us a Government that works better and costs less. He's a proven friend of the environment who's making Government a more effective friend of the environment.

And I must tell you that when we started our partnership back in 1992—and we couldn't have known even then whether we would win the election or not—one of the major reasons that I asked him to be part of a new and different relationship, to be a true partner with me, was because of the phenomenal insight and knowledge he had of environmental issues and how they had to be woven into the fabric of our life and no longer set out as a special problem and a special issue just for Earth Day but needed to be something for every day. And all Americans are in debt to the work that Al Gore has made the work of his lifetime.

This year we're asking Congress to pass new and stronger laws to protect our lakes, our rivers, our beaches, and the water we drink, the "Safe Drinking Water Act" and the "Clean Water Act." And we're offering new approaches to get the job done.

Just a few months ago, folks right here in Washington, maybe a lot of you, had to boil their water just because the experts said it might be contaminated. Just a year ago in Milwaukee, a dangerous microorganism got into the water supply, killing more than 100 people and causing tens of thousands to become ill. In New York and in other cities all across the country, people are afraid they might be next. In this great country we can do better, and we must do better than letting people die from dirty drinking water. That's why we're fighting for a stronger and smarter "Safe Drinking Water Act." We want to keep communities with healthy water systems, so parents won't feel a fear when their children brush their teeth in the morning. We

can do it for our children and our families and our future, and we will.

But rather than dictate from Washington, we want to help communities develop their own plans to clean up their own water supplies without a bureaucrat telling them that water problems in Philadelphia are the same as they are in Phoenix, because they're often just not the same. With a stronger and smarter "Clean Water Act," we can reclaim our waterways, make it safe to eat fish and swim in the rivers and surf in the beaches. And in the process we'll create new jobs, from engineers to pipefitters.

We've proposed changes in the Superfund to make cleanups faster, cheaper, and more effective. Many of these toxic waste dumps cause urgent dangers to public health. And we owe it to communities to make the Superfund work for them.

And we want to give you a Government that leads by example, not just by command and control. You know, the United States Government, for example, is one of the world's leading buyers of goods and services. And we're using that buying power to create a new market for new products that save energy and protect the environment, wasting less of your natural resources and less of your tax dollars.

A year ago on Earth Day I pledged to use the Presidential pen to make our Government the greenest in history. I've signed Executive orders to use recycled products, from paper to retread tires. We're reducing Federal energy consumption by 30 percent and saving the taxpayers a billion dollars a year using more cars and trucks that run on alternative fuel that cause less pollution, from compressed natural gas to electrical power. Our Federal facilities are cutting their own toxic emissions by 50 percent and complying with community right-to-know laws.

The White House is becoming a showcase for energy efficiency and environmental responsibility. Hillary and Chelsea and I have recycling bins in our kitchen. We have a new refrigerator, built in my home State, that uses 50 percent less electricity than most refrigerators and doesn't use gases that deplete the ozone layer. We're using less water on the lawn, fewer pesticides on the ground, and more efficient air conditioners in the big Old Executive Office Building. We're trying to do our part.

Protecting the environment begins in our homes and in our communities. And I came here to demonstrate that commitment in a third principle: Government should work with local folks, not over them. You did this; we didn't. We provided a little more tax money, but you did it. We're working with communities through our national service program, AmeriCorps. Thousands of young men and women are working in communities while earning money for their education. Starting 2 months from now, a special part of AmeriCorps will work not far from here. The new National Civilian Community Corps, based out of the Aberdeen Army Base in Maryland, will work with community groups to reclaim the Anacostia River, stabilizing its banks, skimming off the trash, redesigning and replanting it.

For too long, this kind of pollution has been associated and concentrated in poor communities, from central cities to small towns. And for too long, Government has been part of the problem, not part of the solution.

I'll never forget a young man named Pernell Brewer, whom I met at our children's town hall meeting last year. He comes from a part of Louisiana now known as "Cancer Alley" because it's filled with chemical plants that may contribute to the unusually high cancer rates found there in Louisiana. And he told me that 20 of his relatives have had cancer; many have died of it, including his 10-year-old brother who died of a rare brain tumor.

We cannot stand by while people are suffering and dying. That's why I signed an Executive order on environmental justice, to make sure that Government controls environmental hazards in every community in this country. And Government should encourage people to work together, not pit business and workers and environmentalists against each other.

When I asked for the Presidency 2 years ago, I met people whose lives were literally torn apart because Government refused to resolve the tensions between protecting our ancient forests and logging on Federal lands. Just over a year ago, at a conference in Portland, Oregon, we brought together loggers, environmentalists, and community leaders from the great Pacific Northwest and Cabinet officials responsible for environmental policy, for commerce, and for labor.

I met people like one man who's come all across the country to be with us here today.

I'd like to introduce him to you, Mr. Eric Hollenbeck. Eric, stand up. [*Applause*] Eric came here today from Eureka, California. His family business was logging. He cares about his community with all of his heart, and he understands that in order to survive, his industry and his community have to embrace change. That's why when hard times hit the logging industry, Eric changed his company from logging to woodworking. And that's why today he's teaching young people woodworking, masonry, home building, metal working, and printing. He has made a change to help save the environment and preserve the economy of his community. And we owe him a lot for his courage. Thank you, sir.

Most of the people I met out there had differences of opinion on a lot of these issues. But they wanted an end to the posturing, an end to the conflict. They wanted us to make some tough decisions so that people could move on with their lives and move on with the common goal of making a living and preserving the environment.

Our fourth principle is that we have to understand the urgency and magnitude of this environmental issue as a global crisis. We have to work to stop famine and stabilize population growth and prevent further environmental degradation. If we fail, these problems will cause terrorism, tension, and war. None of us can live without fear as long as so many people must live without hope. That's why we're working around the world to protect fresh water resources, to preserve forests, to protect endangered species, leading a fight for strong environmental protection in our global negotiations on trade.

We must never forget that we share the air and the planet and our destiny with all the peoples of the world. And we must help people in poorer countries to understand that they, too, can find better ways to make a living without destroying their forests and their other natural resources.

The nations of the world are working together to achieve what is now called "sustainable growth," growth that meets the needs of the present without sacrificing the needs of the future. It's an ethic as modern as microprocessors and as old as the Scriptures. In our homes and houses of worship, we often learn the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Sustainable development is the Golden Rule for our children and our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

And I want to give you the last example of that. Last June I asked 25 leaders from across the country to join the President's Council on Sustainable Development, to look carefully at communities practicing sustainable development with an eye toward developing a strategy that any community in the country could embrace.

And we can all learn from a town called Valmeyer, Illinois. Under the leadership of Mayor Dennis Knobloch, who is also with me here today—stand up, Mayor—[*applause*]—this community is literally recreating itself. It was part of the great middle-western flood. They were in a flood plain. And they decided that they would move and recreate a totally sustainable development community. They're building their homes, their stores, and their schools to be energy efficient. They're even thinking about solar-powered street lights and geothermal heating systems.

We can go to this community and watch it grow, keeping the community roots, understanding what happened in the flood, being committed to a sustainable environment for the river, for the land, and for a new community that is as old as the deepest roots in the beginning of Valmeyer, Illinois. We owe a lot to these people. They're setting an example that all of us will be able to learn from, too, for years and years to come.

So today, in this wonderful park, let me end where we began. Let every American look to the example of the people here in this park, to the example of people like Fabiola Gonzalez and Eric Hollenbeck and Mayor Dennis Knobloch and the wonderful people of Valmeyer, Illinois. We can all listen to the love of nature in our hearts and rejoice in our responsibilities to pass along a better and more beautiful country to our children and their children and understand that part of our common responsibility to the future is preserving the environment and that that will make our present better.

Three decades ago, President Kennedy said, "It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down, undiminished to those who come after us, as was handed down to us by those who came before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours." This wonderful community has kept that faith. So must we all.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:21 a.m. in Meridian Hill Park. In his remarks, he referred to Josephine Butler, vice chair, Stephen W. Coleman, founder and president, and Rev. Morris Samuel, vice chair emeritus, Friends of Meridian Hill; actors Dennis Weaver and Chevy Chase; and Amory Lovins, director of research, Rocky Mountain Institute, Snowmass, CO.

Remarks on Presenting the Teacher of the Year Award
April 21, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Riley, and thank all of you for being here to recognize Sandra McBrayer, our 1994 Teacher of the Year.

I want to say as I begin that the work in the Senate and the House has kept Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and Congresswoman Lynn Schenk from coming here today. But all three of them called and asked to be remembered at this occasion and to say they are proud of and strongly support the work that Sandra McBrayer has done.

One of the things I hoped to do when I ran for President was to increase our national effort to improve education in ways that made sense to grassroots educators who were out there making a difference. After serving for 12 years as a Governor and spending more time on schools and jobs than any other two issues, I have probably spent more time in more different kinds of classrooms than any person who has had the privilege to hold this office. And one of the things that I always believed was that virtually every challenge in American education had been met with genuine excellence by someone somewhere, that there were people committed, good people all across this country, that were trying to come to grips with the awesome challenges of educating all America's children to world-class standards and that what we had to do at the national level was to clarify what those standards are, to give people some means of measuring whether they were being achieved, and then to support the grassroots reforms and the people who were carrying them out. That's what we're trying to do with Goals 2000, with the school-to-work bill, with all our other educational initiatives.

And that's why I was so pleased, when I first met Sandra McBrayer in California not very long ago and heard about her work, that she was actually chosen as the Teacher of the Year. We met when she came to the Goals 2000 signing when she was just a California Teacher of the Year, and I didn't know she was going to get such a quick promotion, but I sort of suspected it because of what she has done.

I cannot tell you how much it means to me to have someone here who's proved that you could teach homeless kids and that they count and they matter and they can learn and they can achieve great things. She knows that children have to be fed; they need clothes to wear and a place to sleep at night, and it's harder if they don't have those things.

She started the Homeless Outreach School in San Diego in a storefront in 1988. Her school provides, in addition to education, two meals a day, showers, and laundry facilities. Her students don't follow a regular schedule; they come to class between their jobs or when they're not caring for children of their own. But they each fulfill a weekly contract of studies that are completed either at home or in school.

This is very important. This is one of the central ideas of Goals 2000. We should measure our educational effort not by how teachers do everything all day, every day, but by whether certain results are achieved. And then we should allow our teachers and our school principals to devise their own best ways to achieve those results based on the realities that they deal with.

She is living every day what I believe is the central idea that would do more to transform and revolutionize American education than any other single thing in public education, at least, if we could implement it and implement it all over America.

The most important lessons of these students may not be learned inside the classroom. Maybe it's the confidence they gain by finally having someone like Sandra McBrayer to believe in them, someone who believes they count in society and they have something to contribute and the rest of us need them.

You might have heard the line that teaching kids to count is fine but teaching them what counts is best. Sandy McBrayer has done even more than that; she's taught her children that they count. Over 25 of her students who started out on the streets are now in college.

So I want to thank her for her dedication to the students of the Homeless Outreach School, for being a model for all teachers throughout the country, and for the whole idea of education reform. And I'm proud to present her the 1994 Apple Award as America's Teacher of the Year. I'll hold your apple for you. I'll polish your apple for you. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:13 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Statement on the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments
April 21, 1994

I commend the work already done by Secretary O'Leary, other members of the Cabinet, and the many other agency officials on the issue of Government-sponsored human radiation experiments which took place during the past 50 years. Today's first meeting of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments is another step by the administration to have an honest and open approach to its investigation of the cold-war-era experiments.

The Advisory Committee has an important task in determining whether the U.S. Government treated its own citizens wrongfully through human experimentation. Both those Americans who were the subject of these questioned experiments and the scientists who performed them deserve a fair and thorough investigation.

Only by dealing honestly with the past can we hope to build a better future.

NOTE: The Executive order of January 15 which established the Committee is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on the School-to-Work Opportunities Legislation
April 21, 1994

I am gratified by today's final passage of the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act." I am particularly pleased that this vital economic opportunity legislation passed with such broad bipartisan support.

This legislation will help millions of our young people enter the middle class and secure the American dream for themselves and their families. It will give them the opportunity to receive advanced, academically rigorous technical training. And it will help them obtain the knowledge and skills they need to get jobs that pay well and offer real chances for career advancement.

School-to-work is central to our efforts to guarantee lifetime learning for every citizen. In a rapidly changing world economy, what you earn increasingly depends on what you learn. We are putting in place an ambitious agenda to prepare our people. Last year Congress enacted my proposal to make college loans more affordable for middle class students. Just 3 weeks ago, I signed into law the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which set national educational standards. And by the end of this year, I look forward to signing legislation that will reform and expand Head Start, reconfigure Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, and transform our outmoded unemployment system into a world-class reemployment system.

This is a time of real ferment and real achievement for America's workers and students. Working together, we can continue to break gridlock and build new opportunities for American families to prosper in a rapidly changing economy.

Message to the Congress on Trade With South Africa
April 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add South Africa to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 21, 1994.

NOTE: The related proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Trade With China
April 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2436) and sections 202 and 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 (as those sections were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988), I have determined the action I will take with respect to the affirmative determination of the United States International Trade Commission (USITC), on the basis of its investigation (No. TA–406–13), that market disruption exists with respect to imports from China of honey provided for in heading 0409 and subheadings 1702.90 and 2106.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

After considering all relevant aspects of the investigation, including those set forth in section 202(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, I have determined that import relief for honey is not in the national economic interest of the United States. However, I am directing the United States Trade Representative (USTR), in consultation with the appropriate agencies to develop a plan to monitor imports of honey from China. The monitoring program is to be developed within thirty days of this determination.

Since I have determined that the provision of import relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States, I am required by that section 203(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 to report to Congress on the reasons underlying this determination.

In determining not to provide import relief, I considered its overall costs to the U.S. economy. The USITC majority recommendation for a quarterly tariff rate quota (a 25 percent ad valorem charge on the first 12.5 million pounds each quarter, increasing to 50 percent on amounts above that level), to be applied for three years, would cost consumers about $7 million while increasing producers' income by just $1.9 million. The other forms of relief recommended by other Commissioners would also result in substantial costs to consumers while offering little benefit to producers.

In addition, the gap between production and consumption in the United States is approximately 100 million pounds, with imports of honey from China helping to fill that gap at the low end for industrial use. Any restrictions on imports of honey from China would likely lead to increased imports from other countries rather than significantly increased market share for U.S. producers.

Although rising somewhat since 1991, U.S. honey inventories are not large by historical experience, either in absolute amounts or relative to consumption. Honey stocks reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture were much higher in the mid-1980's (about 75 percent of consumption in 1985 and 1986), before falling

to their lowest level in a decade in 1991 (26.6 percent of consumption). The 1993 stocks were 37.8 percent of consumption, well below the 1980–1993 average level of 46.4 percent.

The U.S. government has supported honey producers since 1950, in part, to ensure enough honeybees would be available for crop pollination. This is an important national interest. I believe that current trends in the provision of pollination and honey production will not be significantly affected by not providing relief. Crop producers indicate that they believe pollination will still be cost effective even if service prices rise.

I have also concluded that, in this case, imposing trade restrictions on imports of honey would run counter to our policy of promoting an open and fair international trading system.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 21, 1994.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message. The related memorandum is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Interview With Journalists on South Africa
April 20, 1994

Q. Could I begin, Mr. President, with a two-part question? What is the significance of the South African election to you and the American people? And do you have any particular message for the people of South Africa that we could take back to them?

The President. First of all, I think it would be difficult to overstate the significance of this election to the American people for many reasons, first of all, our own history of racial division. We, after all, fought a great Civil War over slavery, and we continue to deal with our own racial challenges today. So all Americans, I think, have always been more drawn to the problems and the promise of South Africa than perhaps other nations have been.

Secondly, our own civil rights movement has, for decades, had a relationship with the antiapartheid movement in South Africa. So this will be a great sense of personal joy to many, many Americans who have been involved in this whole issue personally.

And finally, it's important to the United States because of the promise of harmony and prosperity in South Africa and what that might mean, not only to South Africa but to many other nations in the region and to the prospect of a revitalization, a new energy, a new peace, a new sense of possibility throughout at least the southern part of Africa. So it's very important.

Q. Any particular message?

The President. The message I would have is this: The United States is elated at the prospect of these elections. We have contributed to the effort to fight apartheid. We have tried to support the effort to have good elections and to make them meaningful, and we want to celebrate with and support South Africa. But we realize that the real work will begin after the election, of continuing to live in harmony, of fighting the new problems every day, of making democracy work, of dealing with the social problems and the very severe economic problems. And we intend to be a partner from the beginning. We intend to be a full partner.

Shortly after the election I will announce a substantial increase in United States assistance and support for building South Africa economically, dealing with the social problems, helping the political system to work. And then in June, we will have here a very large conference sponsored by the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, in Atlanta, bringing together large numbers of American business people to give us the opportunity to urge them to be involved with South Africa in the rebuilding.

[*At this point, an interviewer cited the Marshall plan following World War II and asked if a similar plan might be suitable for South Africa.*]

The President. Well, I do believe that we ought to dramatically increase our assistance, which we will do. I think we ought to dramatically increase our private investment in South

Africa, which I intend to work on. I think we ought to do what we can to mobilize the resources of other nations to also contribute. And I intend to spend a lot of time and effort on that.

I don't know that I would say it's exactly like the Marshall plan or that that is exactly what is needed, but it's obvious that a lot of money, a lot of investment, and a lot of opportunity is going to be needed to sort of jump-start South Africa. It's a very rich country. And I think that the promise of this new democracy is that people will be able to live up to their potential. And I intend to do what I can to be a strong partner in that.

Q. This is the last one to—would you—you would probably be going to Africa soon, and is there any intention of paying a visit to our country?

The President. Well, I hope that I can go, and I very much want to go. I assure you I'm going to send a very high-level delegation to the inauguration to celebrate the elections. And I have been talking with my staff about when I can go to Africa.

This year, because of the 50th anniversary of the ending of World War II, I will wind up making three trips to Europe, and I will go to Asia in the fall. But in 1995, 1996, my travel schedule is more open. And I very much want to go there.

I think that the United States, frankly, has not—with the exception of South Africa—has not paid as much attention to Africa as it should have and to its long-term potential and particularly to those countries that are trying to resolve their political problems and do things to help their people. So I would be honored to go there. I don't have a trip scheduled, but I hope I can go.

[*An interviewer asked whether a successful South Africa would help the world to confront the problem of increased racial and ethnic conflict.*]

The President. Well, I do have some thoughts, actually. I think it has worked in South Africa partly because people with enormous influence decided to be statesmen instead of wreckers. After a certain amount of time, you had the leaders of the various groups deciding that there was no longer a future in fighting and killing and dying, that splitting the country up was not an option, and that somehow they were going up or down together. And then they translated those understandings into concrete commitments, not just an election. An election is only part of it, although a big part.

I think the decision to go for a government of national unity for 5 years is absolutely critical to this and making the decision before you know the outcome of the election. The decision to have a bill of rights, the decision to have a constitutional court, I think all these things have made a huge difference. And I think what you've got in other places, these sort of ancient divisions—racial, ethnic, and religious divisions—where people have not come to that wisdom; they don't understand yet, for whatever reason, that in the end they'll be better off if they work together and that controlling territory is of nowhere near the significance in terms of quality of life and meaning of life that it was 100 years ago.

It's almost as if, in some of the places that you've mentioned—and you've written so powerfully about Bosnia, and I know you care a lot about Azerbaijan; you have the Abkhaz problem, you have all these things— it's almost as if the cold war sort of imposed a freeze-frame on the history of a lot of these places. And then when it went away, people woke up and resumed the attitudes that they had held in the early part of the 20th century, which they carried over from the 19th century, as if there had been no communications revolution, as if there had been no changes in the global economy, as if all these things had happened.

Here in this country, too, the ethnic diversity of the United States ought to be our greatest asset as we move into the next century. It used to be in America that the burden we carried was the burden of the fight between blacks and whites going back to slavery and the Civil War and the aftermath. Now, in Los Angeles County alone there are 150 different racial and ethnic groups, 150 different ones in one county. And there was a study released in our press last week that said sometimes these groups resented each other as much as they resented the white majority, depending on what the facts were. So we're still dealing with this.

I have to tell you, I believe that if the elections come off well, and especially in the aftermath of the agreement yesterday where Chief Buthelezi agreed with Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk to participate in the elections and they worked out the constitutional role for the King

of the Zulus—I think when that was done—I think if this election comes off, it will send a message around the world that there is another way to deal with these problems and that if it can be done in South Africa, how can you justify the old-fashioned killing and fighting and dying over a piece of land, over divisions which are not as important as what unites people in other places.

I mean, it's amazing; you think of it—contrast what we see in Gorazde with what we see about to happen in South Africa. It's a matter of enormous historical impact. And I think that when it is shown around the world it has to reverberate in ways that we can't fully assess but that have to be positive.

[*An interviewer said that the proposed aid package for South Africa was much smaller than the one offered to Russia and suggested it might be insufficient.*]

The President. Well, first of all, we've not finalized the amount of the aid package. We're working on it now, and we're going to get as much money as we can during this fiscal year from funds that are idle in the appropriate accounts. That is, there are some—we are looking, we are scouring the Government accounts for things, money that won't be spent that we can put into this. And we will do as much as we possibly can.

South Africa is a country of 40 million people where 7 million are homeless, for all practical purposes. There is an enormous amount to be done. If you look at it in the larger sense, if you look at the amount of investment we have, we have only a billion dollars invested now in South Africa since the advent of the sanctions—and I'm glad that I could lift the sanctions—but a billion dollars. In the early eighties we had $3 billion. And one of the things that I intend to do in June with this conference that Secretary Brown is having is to do everything I can to accelerate return of American investment to the levels of the early eighties, and then to exceed that, because we know, as a practical matter, if you look at the incredible human and natural resources of South Africa, that there would be more American money, private sector American money than Government money.

Now, next year and the year after—we're going to stay after this thing on a multiyear basis—we may be able to do better. But I think, given the condition of our budget laws and where the money is right now and the fact that we're in the middle of a fiscal year, we're going to do quite well.

Q. What are you trying to do with this money?

The President. Well, first of all, I want to encourage the South African leadership, once it's elected, to tell us what they think should be done with it. I don't want to be—we're in no position to be dictating that; we should be asking them. But I can tell you, I know we can make it available for economic development projects, for human resource projects like housing and health and education, and for democracy and institution building—how do you set up a system which will deliver these services and function properly.

It occurs to me, for example, the interconnection in South Africa and southern Africa generally, the transportation and waterways and the potential for telecommunications interconnection to leverage economic growth explosively throughout the region, is very great. It might be that your leaders would say, "Well, if you have this amount of dollars, put it into these investments because they'll generate more opportunities." It may be that your leaders will say, "We can't stand the sight of all these people living in substandard conditions; put more of it in housing." It might be that there's a public health problem that you want to deal with. I think that we should be guided in part, or in large measure, by what we're asked to do by the new leaders of the new South Africa.

Q. Mr. President, do you have any plans to invite the new South African President to Washington?

The President. Absolutely, I do.

Q. Quite soon?

The President. Yes, I will issue the invitation promptly after the election.

[*An interviewer suggested that South Africa's crucial need was for education in democracy and tolerance and that America might be particularly helpful in this regard.*]

The President. Well, we're certainly prepared to do that, to make that kind of investment. And we have, as you know, invested some money, as I said, since I've been President, I think somewhere in the range of $35 million, just to try to make the political process work right.

If you ask me one thing I have learned in my own life growing up as a young boy in the segregated South, it is that this is something that you never solve, you just have to keep improving, you have to keep working with.

My own interest in politics in America was inflamed overwhelmingly by my opposition to racial segregation in my own State, my own community, our own neighborhoods, our schools, and the terrible consequences which flowed from that. And so I thought, well, you know, when I grow up maybe there's something I can do to solve this. And when I ran for public office and when I served as a Governor of my State, and then when I became President, I think that I'll always be able to say I did things to make it better.

But this is not the sort of thing you solve. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, identifiable differences will always be used by narrow-minded people or frustrated people or ignorant people or sometimes bad people as a lever, a wedge, a means of acquiring power or influence or dominance or just inflicting harm. But it can get better and better and better.

That will be the test. The ultimate test of your democracy will be whether a disciplined effort can be made to take the attitudes represented, as you acknowledge, by your leaders and keep working until they become more and more and more real in the daily lives of every citizen of your country. But it is not a job that will ever be completely done. It will always be something you have to work on. At least that's our experience here. It will get better, but you'll always have to work on it.

[*An interviewer said that the United States was still a largely segregated country, despite some progress, and asked if it would improve.*]

The President. If they work at it I think it will get better. But I think you will, first of all, people will always tend to show a certain affinity to organize their living patterns around people who are more like them. But some people will seek a more integrated life. That's my experience in the South; that's my experience in America. I mean, I was amazed when I traveled around in other parts of America that a lot of people that I knew in other parts of the country lived a more segregated existence than I did, for whatever reason, maybe just the nature of the population of their communities.

But I think there will always be a certain amount of cohesion of people of the same race or ethnic group or religious group, particularly if they have strong religious convictions. You see that all over the world. You see that here. To a certain extent, there's nothing wrong with that and it's not unhelpful. What is unhelpful is if that is used as a way to divide people and if it leads to some sort of legal or practical discrimination. And I think what Mr. Lewis is saying is absolutely right. We still have too much of that in America.

We had a meeting here this morning, just for example, we had a meeting this morning; we had a couple of hundred people in the Rose Garden to talk about how we could better immunize all of our children in America. And it's appalling that a country as wealthy as we are only immunizes about two-thirds of our kids, about 64 percent of our children under 2 with all the recommended childhood immunizations. And it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that one of the reasons is that children under 2 are more likely to be children of color and more likely to be poor than adults over 50 who tend to make the decisions that control public policy in this country. That's one reason. That's not the only reason, but it's one reason.

So we had a meeting today to celebrate trying to organize ourselves with some discipline at the community level to eradicate not only a health problem but a problem of discrimination against the young, the poor, and often, children of color. But I think you see this played out over and over and over again in every society. But I do believe you can make it better.

And what I think is going to happen in this country is that increasingly we will come to understand that the fact that we are a multiracial society is an enormous asset in a global economy, but only if we take advantage of it, only if we educate all our children, keep them healthy, and teach people to live together in ways that permit them all to succeed. Otherwise, this potential asset becomes an enormous problem.

South Africa has an enormous asset now. You have a biracial society; you have some other ethnic groups, too, I know, and mixed race, but you have essentially two great large ethnic groups of people, each of whom have different experiences, different backgrounds, different contacts throughout the world now. It can be a terrific asset for you that you are different,

but only if you use it. It has been a terrible handicap. You can now turn it into an asset.

So I guess my answer to Tony is, some places it will be better; some places it will be worse throughout the world. But if you look at the way the world is going, you basically are going to have two kinds of societies that will do well, it seems to me: highly homogeneous, coherent societies that think they can operate with great discipline by their own sets of cultural rules which are widely accepted within the society, who will then attempt to do well in the global economy by having high rates of savings, investment, and exporting to others but keeping their own life; or open, multiethnic societies which welcome the whole world and try to find a way to make strength out of diversity. And what you're going to see is each of those societies will be dealing with the conflicts that any course of action dictates.

You've got a great reform movement going on in Japan, fighting great opposition, because they're saying, "We need to be more open; we need to appreciate diversity more. But we don't want to be so open we don't have any discipline or control or direction," or whatever. And you have America saying, "This diversity is a great asset for us, but not if we have so little discipline our crime rates are too high, our education systems are too poor," or whatever. So you have these two great models, each of them trying to find the strengths of one another.

You have a chance to do that in South Africa. And it's a unique opportunity, at least in that part of the African Continent. And I think it's an extraordinary thing. And I think the world will come beating a path to your doorstep. It won't just be the United States; the whole world will start showing up down there when you pull this election off, because they will be so exhilarated by the moral and the practical potential of what it is you're engaged in. That's what I believe.

[*An interviewer cited the concern expressed by a white South African journalist about possible human rights abuses by the new government.*]

The President. I'd like to answer the question—it's a good question and a fair one—and I'd like to sort of—I'll give you two answers, consistent one with the other, but I think showing what I perceive to be the dimension of the problem.

First of all, the leaders of the country have taken great steps to minimize the prospect of that development by agreeing to a constitution with a strong bill of rights and a constitutional court and by agreeing to a government of national unity and by also, frankly, siding with international global developments that are consistent with human rights, renouncing terrorism, renouncing the spread of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. All these things augur for a government that will be balanced and fair and will not tolerate as official policy the abuse of human rights. If that should occur, I would think the United States should have the same obligation to speak against it there as we did before in South Africa and as we do now elsewhere in the world. I think that's hopeful.

I think the far greater danger for the man who wrote the piece—and it was a very moving piece, I thought—the far greater danger is what is in the heart of millions of people who—to go back to your question—who have not yet bought into the whole process that is unfolding. And who knows how many people there are carrying what wounds inside who may think they have some opportunity and some position to which they might be elected or just some opportunity because of their newfound freedom for payback time? I mean, that is something that no one can calculate.

In other words, democracy requires every day millions and millions and millions of decisions in a country as large as 40 million, by people—they just make decisions—sometimes you'll begin to make them almost subconsciously—to support the democratic process, to show personal restraint, to respect the rights of other people, to deal with all these things. I think that's going to be the far bigger challenge, is when you get the government in place and you've got the laws, you've got the bill of rights, you've got all this stuff, the government's going to try to do the right thing, I think the majority party will try to do the right thing—what will happen is, what about all the people up and down the line? And what is in their hearts? What kind of temptations or opportunities will be there? Those are things that happen to free societies, and you'll just have to work at stamping them out and minimizing them. I think that's what the real problem is.

[*An interviewer asked if the United States would make a greater effort to assist Africa.*]

The President. I think the United States should focus more on Africa as a whole, as a continent.

Q. Do you intend to do that?

The President. And I intend to do that. Now, you know today, of course, we're profoundly—I know that—I won't use your term, but you know what occupies our headlines, of course, are in the north, Somalia and Sudan and the problems there and then moving down the continent to Rwanda and Burundi and then moving down to Angola where more children have been injured by land mines than in any war in human history. It's not on CNN at night, so people don't talk about it. And we're terribly troubled by Rwanda now, but it wasn't so many months ago that in a period of months it's estimated that as many as a quarter of a million or more people died in Burundi.

So it is true. But there are other stories in south Africa as well. There are other countries where progress is being made, where democracy is beginning to work, where people are beginning to try to put together these things that will make a successful country. And it seems to me that the United States ought to be working with countries that are trying to make good things happen, as well as doing what we can to alleviate human suffering where there's a tragedy.

And I think we need a more balanced and more aggressive policy in Africa, and I am hopeful that we'll be able to provide one. We've been so caught up with our own financial problems and cutting back on everything. And in our country, foreign aid of all kinds has a history of being unpopular among the people and, therefore, among the Congress. But I think that if there is a success in South Africa, which I expect there to be, I believe America will try to come to you; I believe the world will try to come to you; I think there will be a fascination about it. And I think that it will not only spark greater development in the southern part of Africa, but it will give us a more balanced view about what our overall policy should be. I realize I'm an optimist, but that's what I believe will happen.

[*An interviewer praised the President's sincerity and stated that South Africa was fortunate to have Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk as role models in the move toward tolerance and democracy.*]

The President. Well, if I might just comment on that and say one thing—I thank you for saying that. And I thank you for being positively inclined toward me. If you lived here, you would have an obligation to be more critical of me. [*Laughter*] I accept it.

Let me tell you what I think about that. I think that both Mandela and de Klerk are remarkable stories, and together, they are a stern rebuke to the cynics of the world: de Klerk for the reason you said, because he was an Afrikaner and because of the image we all have of that and what it was and what it meant politically and racially and every way; Mandela because he spent the best years of his life in a prison cell, walked out by most standards an older man, still ready to be young and vigorous and able to free himself of the bitterness that would surely have destroyed most people who had to live for 27 years behind bars. That also is an astonishing story.

If these two people are capable of that sort of internal growth and wisdom and understanding, there must be a way for the rest of us to impart some of that to the society at large in South Africa and the United States or wherever, so that they, in turn, can live together. But both stories are truly astonishing.

I think also they owe a lot to others, too. We were talking before I came into this interview—I believe, in the history of the Nobel Prize, the conflict in South Africa between the races is the only thing that's produced four Nobel Prizes over the same issue: Albert Luthuli, then Bishop Tutu, and then Mandela and de Klerk. I mean, this is something that the world has been fixated on with you for a long time.

But the internal changes of those two people, that's what you have to find a way—that goes back to where you started. You have to find a way to mirror that down here where people live and buy newspapers and go to work every day and find a way to live together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:03 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. The interviewers were Richard Steyn, editor-in-chief, The Star, Johannesburg, South Africa; Aggrey Klaaste, editor, The Sowetan, Soweto, South Africa; An-

thony Lewis, New York Times; and Clarence Page, Chicago Tribune. This interview was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 22.

Statement on Naming the South African Election Observer Delegation
April 22, 1994

The world is elated at the prospect of these elections. They are the next step in South Africa's historic path from apartheid to nonracial democracy. Americans have stood by South Africans in their struggle, and we will be steadfast in our commitment to work with all South Africans to build the prosperous, stable, and just society that can come in its place.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary announcing the following members of the delegation to observe the elections on April 26–28:

Jesse Jackson, president, Rainbow Coalition, head of delegation;
George Moose, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs;
Charles Stith, president, National Organization for New Equality;
Arthur Thomas, president, Central State (Ohio) University;
Pauline Baker, Aspen Institute;
Dick J. Batchelor, chairman, Florida Environmental Regulation Commission; and
Col. MacArthur DeShazer, Director for African Affairs, National Security Council.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece
April 22, 1994

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you going to start bombing, or are the allies going to start bombing Gorazde very shortly as a result of the NATO Council ultimatum?

The President. They're meeting now. Let's see what they do, and I'll have more to say about it later.

Q. Do you want the NATO allies to allow NATO to select the bombing targets and move more independently of the U.N.? And do you expect them to——

The President. We want to continue to work with the U.N., but they're working—our people are there now, working on the arrangements. So let's see what comes out of the meeting today, and we'll—I'll have comments about it after they do.

Haiti

Q. Sir, I wonder if you could tell us why the Haitian boat people are being allowed this time, sir?

The President. Well, two reasons: First of all, they were very close to the United States. The whole purpose of the return policy was primarily to deter people from risking their lives. Hundreds of people have already drowned trying to come here. These people were only 4 miles from the shore. The second was that we had evidence that the Haitians might have been subject to some abuse by the people who were in control of the boat. And so for those reasons, we thought the appropriate thing to do was to bring them on in, which we did.

Q. Is this a change in the policy for the future?

The President. No change in policy.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Q. President Clinton. Mr. President, are you going to discuss the problem with Greece and Skopje and the measures that Greece has got against Skopje?

The President. Absolutely.

Q. What do you believe about these measures?

The President. What I think is that we have Mr. Nimetz over there and Mr. Vance. We're trying to help work it out. I think that it's very much in the interest of Greece and Europe and the world community for the matters to be worked out between the two countries, and I think they can be.

Q. How committed are you to delaying the process until Greece's concerns are satisfied, sir?

The President. I think it's obvious that we've shown a real concern for Greece's concerns. That's one of the main reasons I sent a special envoy over there, and we're trying to work through it. We'll discuss that today. We just started out—we haven't even had our discussions yet.

Q. There's been some criticism that the U.S. side has not exercised enough of its good—[*inaudible*]—to Skopje and to come up with a solution.

The President. We're working hard on that now, and we'll continue to. I think there will have to be some changes from the point of view of Skopje.

Q. Are you going to visit Greece, sir?

The President. Oh, I'd love to do that. I've never been there.

Cyprus

Q. What about Cyprus?

The President. We're working hard on Cyprus, and I think—I hope there will be some movement from the Turkish side on Cyprus in the next couple of days with regard to the confidence-building measures. I think that the ball has been sort of in Mr. Denktash's court, and I hope he will take it up. And then I hope that Greece and all others will support pushing forward. I have worked hard to resolve this since I've been in office, and I will continue to stay on it. More later.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Matthew Nimetz, U.S. Special Envoy to the United Nations to resolve the conflict between Greece and Macedonia; Cyrus Vance, United Nations Special Envoy to the Former Yugoslavia; and Rauf Denktash, Turkish Cypriot leader. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece

April 22, 1994

Bosnia

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Before I comment on my meeting with Prime Minister Papandreou, I would like to make a brief statement about developments with regard to Bosnia today.

About 2 hours ago in Brussels, NATO's North Atlantic Council reached agreement on new steps to address the crisis in Gorazde and to promote a negotiated settlement in Bosnia.

As NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner just announced, the North Atlantic Council decided that continuing Bosnian Serb attacks against Gorazde justify firm action. Therefore, the North Atlantic Council decided that the commander in chief of NATO's Southern Command, United States Admiral Leighton Smith, is authorized to conduct air strikes against Serb heavy weapons and other military targets in the vicinity of Gorazde unless three conditions are met: First, unless the Bosnian Serbs immediately cease their attacks against Gorazde; second, unless by 8 p.m. eastern daylight time tomorrow evening, the Bosnian Serbs pull back their forces at least 3 kilometers from the city's center; and third, unless by 8 p.m. tomorrow evening, the Bosnian Serbs allow United Nations forces, humanitarian relief convoys, and medical assistance teams freely to enter Gorazde and to permit medical evacuations.

This decision provides NATO forces with broader authority to respond to Bosnian Serb attacks. The Bosnian Serbs should not doubt NATO's willingness to act.

In addition, the North Atlantic Council has begun to meet again to decide on authorization for NATO action concerning other safe areas. I applaud NATO's decision, the resolve of our allies, and once again, the leadership of NATO Secretary General Woerner. The United States has an interest in helping to bring an end to this conflict in Bosnia. Working through NATO and working along with Russia and others, we are determined to save innocent lives, to raise the price for aggression, and to help bring the parties back to a negotiated settlement.

Greece

Now let me say what a pleasure and an honor it has been for me to welcome Prime Minister Papandreou back to the United States. Last night we celebrated the Prime Minister's arrival at a reception at Blair House, and today we had a very productive meeting here at the White House. It has been about 20 years since the Prime Minister has been to America, and he told me today that 50 years ago this year, as a young man, he saw President Roosevelt in a touring car right outside the White House.

In a sense, every one of us in this country has roots in Greece. After all, the Periclean faith in freedom helped inspire our own revolution. The Athenian model of democracy helped to shape our own young republic. The common values that we share have made Greece and the United States allies. Half a century ago, our two nations stood together to launch a policy of containment. Now with the cold war over, we are joining to meet new challenges and seize new opportunities.

Consider, for example, the U.S.-Greece Business Council which was just recently established. It will enhance the economic contacts between our two nations, contacts that generated nearly $1 billion in trade last year alone.

Nowhere are the challenges of this era clearer than in the Balkans. Greece and the United States share an interest in working to resolve the conflict in Bosnia and to prevent it from spreading into a wider European war. The Prime Minister and I discussed the most recent developments, and I underscored my view that further NATO action is necessary to restore the momentum toward peace.

We also talked about the effect the embargo on Serbia is having on other nations in the region. We discussed the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United States understands the serious Greek concerns on this issue. Over the past week, both sides have been working with Cyrus Vance and my special envoy, Matthew Nimetz, to narrow their differences. We are hopeful that an agreement can soon be reached that will lead to the lifting of the trade embargo and a resumption of a dialog to resolve the legitimate differences which Greece is concerned with.

The Prime Minister and I also discussed Cyprus. The United States supports the U.N. confidence-building measures. Those measures grew out of discussions with President Clerides soon after he took office, and we hope that both sides will support them. My coordinator for Cyprus, Bob Lamb, has just returned from talks with both sides. A settlement in Cyprus would benefit all the nations in the region, especially Greece and Turkey, two vital members of NATO.

I have asked the Turkish Government to address the status and working conditions of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul. And I encourage Prime Minister Papandreou to ease his government's objections to the level of European Union assistance to Turkey. We must do what we can in these areas to promote greater understandings between these two critical nations and, in the process, to promote progress on Cyprus.

As a former professor here in the United States, Prime Minister Papandreou personifies the durable ties between Greece and America. It's been a pleasure to welcome him here as the leader of his nation, and I look forward to continuing to work with him based on the good relationship we have established. In the challenging period ahead, we face some thorny problems. Together, I am convinced we can make some progress in dealing with them.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Papandreou. Mr. President, I want to express deep appreciation for your invitation to me to visit you in Washington, to continue a discussion that we started in Brussels a few months ago.

I must say that I found our discussions to be extremely useful. We have a clear understanding of the issues before us, and I want to stress that we consider you a friend of Greece and in whatever Greece signifies, as you have said to the world.

I am very honored and pleased to be here. For me, it's a return after many years of ab-

sence; it's been 20 years ago that I last visited the United States. And I must say, I'm quite moved by the fact that I'm here now standing next to the President of the United States in this room. It's a great honor and a great moment.

No doubt we are going through a period of great international difficulties. There are many spots in the world that, after the fall of the Wall, the Iron Curtain, many spots of the world that challenge, again, peace. Wherever you look there is conflict. And indeed, in the area from which we come, the Balkans, the Balkan Peninsula, we have, really, dynamite on our hands.

No doubt there is grave responsibility for having attempted to break apart ex-Yugoslavia. And all of us, all the 12 European members of the European Union, bear equal responsibility for this. It's a fire that can spread very fast. It is Bosnia today, a tragedy, indeed, a great tragedy. And there is undoubtedly danger also lurking ahead in Krajina; there is danger in Kosovo. There are plans of expansion on the part of some Balkan countries. Many interests are in conflict in that area, and one begins to sense already the development of zones of influence.

The President has just announced the important decision of NATO to proceed with—to give an ultimatum to the Serbs either to withdraw or to face bombardment. The position of the Greek Government on this is that we do not block this decision; we do not veto this decision. We accept it, but we do express our reservations. And there is only one reservation, indeed: our fear that, step by step, we may be dragged into a land war which would be really, by modern standards, a tragedy much greater than we have seen in Bosnia.

So far as the question of the Balkans is concerned, Greece is a country that seeks peace and wants to play an active role, economically and culturally, in that region. It was not with pleasure that we imposed an embargo, with the exception of food and pharmaceuticals, on Skopje.

Skopje is a country that must survive. It is in the interest of Greece that it survives. And this may sound to you a bit contradictory, and it is contradictory, that while we believe in this, we have imposed an embargo in the expectation and hope that an SOS signal will be understood. And this SOS signal is simply that it is a matter of security for Greece that the irredentist articles of the constitution of that state, that the flag with the Birgina Sun, that the daily newspapers and radio emissions—all of them are looking to an irredentist and aggressive position which involves Greece because they talk about the Macedonia of the Aegean, meaning Greek Macedonia.

At this moment, of course, we are discussing with Mr. Vance and Mr. Nimetz. But fundamentally, I want you to understand one simple thing. What we say to Mr. Gligorov is that we are prepared to lift the embargo, to normalize economic relations fully, to vote for the membership of the state in CSCE, to support an agreement between the community, the European community and that state, provided simply that he does one act: remove the Sun of Birgina and declare that the constitution in those particular articles is not valid.

We are not asking for anything more, and we are offering normalization, complete economic normalization, keeping the question of the name, which is a difficult one, as a matter of negotiation under Mr. Vance with the assistance of Mr. Nimetz, continuing discussions under question of the name. But we separate it out to simplify the issue.

Sorry to have taken so much time on this particular issue, but because I know there will be questions, I thought it was important that I tell you what our point of view is. We hope that as soon as possible that the embargo will be removed and that will be an act on the part of Mr. Gligorov to signify his willingness to live in peace with us and to cooperate with us to develop truly a strong economic relationship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't have anything else to say, except for Cyprus, I want to thank the President. Because the President has taken action not once but more than once to further the Cyprus cause, to get, finally, a resolution after 20 years of Turkish occupation of the north part of the island. He brought us some good news today, a member of the staff of the President, that possibly Mr. Denktash has accepted the confidence-building measures. This I did not know until I came to the White House. If so, it's a good sign. But in any case, our thanks to the President, who has stood by us on this important issue, not only for Greece but for the world.

Thank you.

The President. We'll start with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International], and then

I'd like to alternate between the American and the Greek press.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you and the Prime Minister a question. Some of your officials, Mr. President, have indicated that you would no longer be adverse to sending in ground troops to Bosnia, and I think the Secretary of State's statement has been so interpreted. Mr. Prime Minister, even though you have accepted the NATO position, you obviously are against bombing the Serbs. How would you bring them to the negotiating table?

Prime Minister Papandreou. Look, I don't have the magical answer; I wish I had it. But I know there is a lot of frustration. The question is this: Is there a military solution to the problem? For me, there is no military solution; there is no possible military solution to the problem. Accordingly, it has to be a political solution. And of course, the United States has made significant efforts to push us all forward to the negotiating table, and has no responsibility, may I add, for the initial developments in the region.

The President. Helen, let me say, first of all, there has categorically been no discussion in which I have been involved, or which I have encouraged or approved, involving the introduction of American ground forces into Bosnia, with the exception that you already know, as I have said for more than a year now: If there is an agreement, then I believe the United States should be willing to be part of a multinational effort to enforce and help to support the peace agreement.

I agree with the Prime Minister, we must be, all of us, very mindful of the fact that we are not in this business to enter this war on one side against another. But I would also remind you that we were seeing peace talks unfold in which at least the stated positions of the Bosnian Government and the Bosnian Serbs were not all that different just a few weeks ago.

We had the peace zone around Sarajevo. We had the agreement between the Croatians and the Muslims, which was very, very important. And until this travesty in Bosnia occurred in an area which the United Nations had declared a safe area, I thought we were on the way to a negotiated settlement. Will this have to be resolved through negotiations? Absolutely. Our objective is to restore that and to stop slaughter of the innocents and a dramatic alteration of the territorial balance which would make it almost impossible to restore that sort of negotiating environment. But that's our objective, to be firm with the Bosnian Serbs because they are trying to do something that is inconsistent with the position they, themselves, have taken as recently as just a couple of weeks ago.

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you whether you're more optimistic after the meeting with the Prime Minister on the resolution of the Macedonian issue, and also, what kind of steps you would like to see or expect to see from both sides in the near future?

The President. I would say I am more optimistic about the possibility of the resolution of it. And what I would like to see is for both sides to work with Mr. Nimetz, who is here, and with Mr. Vance to try to resolve the legitimate concerns.

As you know, the United States believes the embargo should be lifted, but we also believe Greece has some very legitimate concerns, concerns which ought to be able to be allayed. They are rooted in history—they are rooted in recent history, not just ancient history—and we believe that these things have to be resolved.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, you say that you're not even considering at all the possibility of sending ground troops under any scenario in advance of a full peace arrangement on the ground.

The President. That's correct.

Q. Well, what do you say to the leaders of France and Canada and Britain? You're asking them to put their ground forces in harm's way, to send them into Bosnia and the United States will provide the funding. But the world's largest military, the world's greatest military, is refusing to put its soldiers in harm's way. I'm sure they've asked you about this.

The President. But we have not asked them to put their soldiers into combat. We are trying to protect their soldiers. And if—we have respected—over a year ago—reluctantly their conclusion that at that time the arms embargo should not be lifted because it might subject their soldiers to more danger. Their soldiers are there now, not to fight the war, not to take sides, but to be agents of peace.

I talked with the Canadian Prime Minister just this morning, and he said to me again, he said, "You know, in spite of all the tension there, I really believe if they would just let our troops back into Gorazde, it would tend to restore the conditions of humanity, because we have not been attacked when we have been present in substantial numbers."

When the United States goes into a situation like this, I think it fundamentally changes the character and nature of the engagement. That is why I have always said we would contribute a substantial number of troops, but it ought to be in the context of a peace agreement, and I still believe that. And I have no reason to believe that our allies understand differently.

We don't want to create the impression that the United States or the U.N. is entering the conflict to try to win a military victory on the ground. We do want to create the clear and unambiguous impression that we are angry and disappointed at the aggression and the continued aggression of the Bosnian Serbs in the area of Gorazde and their refusal to return to the negotiating table on the terms that they, themselves, set just a few weeks ago.

Greece-Turkey Relations

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you if you are aware of the tension that exists in the area of the Aegean and what the United States is going to do on this issue? Are you going to discuss with Turkey, or are you going to put any pressure there?

The President. I have had extensive discussions with Turkey, with the Turkish Prime Minister just recently about the relationship of Greece and Turkey. And I might as well say to you in public what the Prime Minister and I discussed in private. I don't want to commit him. This is just my thinking.

My thinking is that at this moment in history, we have better conditions to resolve the differences between Greeks and Turkey and to have a new basis of responsible and fair cooperation than at any time in a long while.

The Turkish Government is concerned, obviously, about instability within its own borders, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. The Government is interested in building a new and modern economy closely connected to Europe and maintaining a secular and responsible nation that is overwhelmingly Islamic. It seems to me that that is in the interest of all of us. And I think that Turkey understands that that can be achieved, and particularly, closer ties with Europe as a whole can be achieved only as the issues that divide Turkey and Greece are more nearly resolved.

So I'm quite hopeful, and I've been pushing this line with the friends of the United States in Turkey for more than a year now, and I will continue to do so.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, the Serbs' past general behavior is that when they're faced with a specific demand, they'll duck and come into compliance, but then they'll turn around and they'll come back harder someplace else. What can be done while you're trying to achieve this negotiated settlement to be sure that they don't just turn and come into Tuzla or Bihac or someplace outside the safe areas?

The President. Well, we're taking up—that's two different questions. We are taking up the question of the other safe areas through the North Atlantic Council. As a matter of fact, I imagine the debate is going on now. All of the members decided that the issue of Gorazde should be addressed first and separately, and then the other safe areas should be taken up. And as I explained—I think Mr. Hume asked a question yesterday or the day before—we're trying to create, in all the safe areas, more or less the conditions we have in Sarajevo.

Now, in the nonsafe areas, let me remind you that there is fighting going on and initiative being taken, but not just by the Serbs. The Government forces are also engaging in them. We believe that they should both stop and go back to the negotiating table. But we also believe that there should not be a measurable and dramatic change of the situation on the ground and, specifically, that there should not be an assault on areas the United Nations, itself, has declared as safe areas. So our clear objective here is first to try to reverse the terrible things that have been happening in Gorazde; second, to try to make the safe areas, safe areas; and third, through the display of firm resoluteness, to encourage the parties to get back to the negotiating table and work this out.

As you know, in addition to that, we are discussing with the Russians and the European Community—and Prime Minister Papandreou and I talked about it a little bit today—what the appropriate next diplomatic initiative ought

to be on our part. The Russians and the French have put forward proposals, as has the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and I think that you will see some progress on that front next week.

Q. After your meeting with the Greek Prime Minister at the White House, would you like to say a few words about American foreign policy regarding the Balkan situation today?

The President. Well, I think I just said all I have to say. We talked a lot about it, and Prime Minister Papandreou gave me some very good insight. And we both agreed that, in the end, we have to have a negotiated settlement. But the United States believes that we have to, in the meanwhile, be absolutely determined not to let the prospect of a negotiated settlement be destroyed by the actions of the Serbs on the ground.

Q. Senator Nunn has said that we really need to dramatically escalate our bombing and go to Belgrade, go to Serbia. Why not? Why not take that step?

The President. I think that step is not an appropriate thing to do at this time, for a number of reasons. For one, the Bosnian Serbs themselves, it seems to me, when confronted with the reality that we are serious and we continue to go forward, are likely to return to the negotiating table. Number two, the Serbian government in Belgrade could be, and should be, an ally of the peace process. We know already that they have suffered greatly from the sanctions, and we're trying to stiffen the enforcement of the sanctions at this time. Thirdly, our partnership with the Russians continues, and while the Russians are angry and frustrated that they have been misled by the Bosnian Serbs, they have continued to adopt our position that there must be a withdrawal of Serb forces from Gorazde and a cessation of shelling.

In other words, I think there are still possibilities within the framework in which we are operating to achieve a return to the negotiating process and a legitimate return. So I think at this time, it would be inappropriate to escalate the bombing that much.

Q. Would you consider that—if this does not work, sir, would that be the next step?

The President. Well, I don't like to deal in contingencies in a matter like this. I think my answer should stand on its own.

Security of Greece

Q. Mr. President, due to the Balkan crisis, could you please clarify the U.S. position vis-a-vis to the security of Greece on a bilateral level?

The President. Well, Greece is also a member of NATO, sir. And so our obligation to the security of Greece, as well as our historic commitment to it, I think, is quite clear, and there should be no doubt about it today.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, how do you plan to avoid mission creep in Bosnia if expanding the air umbrella doesn't work? Will the United States push in further or pull out? In other words, what's your exit strategy here?

The President. Well, our exit strategy is a return to the peace negotiations. In other words, this is a different thing. Keep in mind—it is difficult to analogize this conflict from the point of view of the United States and the United Nations to others which occurred during the cold war and which had some sort of cold war rationale which sometimes broke down.

What we are trying to do now is to confine the conflict, first of all, stop it from spreading into a wider war and secondly, to get the parties back to the negotiating table where they were most recently. If what we are doing doesn't work, then I will consider other options. But there is more than one way for the mission to be altered in pursuit of the ultimate objective.

I will reiterate what I said to you in the beginning: There has been absolutely no discussion that I have participated in, authorized, or approved, dealing with the introduction of our ground forces here before a peace settlement.

Q. Mr. President, how do you account for the fact that peace in Bosnia has been so difficult to be achieved? And do you think that this could be due to conflicting messages the warring parts have received from different countries?

The President. It could be due to that. But I think it's mostly due to the fact that they have profound differences over which they have been willing to fight and die and that there are differences, apparently, even within each camp about the extent to which they should seek advantages on the battlefield or at the negotiating table down to the present day.

I think it's more about the internal dynamics, about what is going on there than about any-

thing else. I think that it is important not to be too arrogant about our ability to totally dictate events so far from our shores. But I do think we can influence them in a positive way. I think we have when we've acted firmly and acted together; we should continue to try to do so.

Press Secretary Myers. Two more questions.

Q. Mr. President, you just spoke about divisions within the camps, and you mentioned a moment ago that you thought the Bosnian Serbs would be likely to go back to the negotiating table and my understanding is——

The President. No, I don't want to say that. I think that they have gone there before, and I hope that they will. I wouldn't say that—I have no information that indicates that they are likely to do that. That's the rational thing for them to do.

Q. The assumption that a lot of policy-makers have made is that the Serbs have basically taken most of the territory that they want, but we hear repeatedly statements from the Serb militia leaders indicating that they have a much more militant, aggressive desire to seize more territory.

I'd like to ask you two things. One is, do you have any sense of who's really in control over there? Are we negotiating with the people who can make a deal? And secondly, is there anything that U.S. policy can do to try to influence which parties to that internal conflict come out on top?

The President. I think from time to time there are differences between the Bosnian Serbs and Serbia-proper and its government. I think from time to time there are differences between and among various factions in Bosnia, between political and military factions, and between command centers and people out in the country, as often happens in this kind of war with this level of decentralization and with the developments that can occur in community after community.

And that means that we have to be—we have to take those things into account in developing our strategies. But we can't let the rumor of that, in effect, divide and weaken us; we just have to work ahead. Is there anything we can do to exploit those or to use those? I don't know yet. But I do know that maintaining a firm hand on these sanctions is a very important part of our policy now. And I would think that, particularly, that there may be people on the ground who, once they've been fighting, don't want to quit, especially if they think they are in a position to win in a place where they happen to be fighting. But that's what leadership is for.

You know, you could say—look at this election that's about to unfold in South Africa. I mean, I could give you lots of other examples. I'm sure there are people on the ground that don't want to quit fighting because it's what they know, and they think maybe they can press an advantage. But that's what leadership is for. And the leaders of the Serbs and the Bosnian Serbs need to assert themselves at this moment and avoid further wreckage.

Balkans

Q. The Balkan question—there is also the issue of the recent tensions between Greece and Albania. Did you discuss this issue as well as the status of the Greek minority there and the alleged human rights violations?

The President. Well, first of all, I think Greece has proceeded with real restraint and sound judgment. We are concerned about the status of the Greek minority there as we are concerned about the status of the Albanians in Kosovo. This whole area is a tinderbox, which is one of the reasons we have paid as much attention to it as we have and one of the reasons we are trying, within the limits of the United Nations and NATO, to confine the conflict.

I think the plain answer to this is to tone down the rhetoric, to observe the rights of the minorities, and not to let the war which is raging in Bosnia spread to the surrounding areas where there are equally deep tensions.

I'll take one last question.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. Rostenkowski made a speech in Boston today in which he said that he is unwilling, or will recommend against, in his committee, financing the health care bill through savings anticipated in future years from the health care, from the effects of the health care bill, and that he prefers to finance it through a broad-based tax issue. Could you give your response to that and tell us how you think it would go?

The President. I think Mr. Rostenkowski is trying to achieve our common objectives, which he defined as: universal coverage, cost control, and 218 votes. [*Laughter*] And I think he has a strategy for pursuing that.

I believe that our savings are good. I believe that obviously we intend—we always knew we'd have to make some modification once the Congressional Budget Office cost estimates came out. We are prepared to do that. But we have dealt with an awful lot of health economists. We've worked very hard on the numbers; we think they are good. But I'm going to have to let him characterize his strategy.

All I can say is that, of all the things I'm worried about in dealing with Congress over the question of health care, the commitment of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to providing health care security to every American is not one of them.

Thank you very much. We've got to go.

NOTE: The President's 56th news conference began at 2:14 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks Honoring the National Volunteer Action Award Recipients

April 22, 1994

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry we're starting a little bit late, but there are worse places to spend an extra half an hour on a beautiful spring day than here in the Rose Garden. We're delighted to see all of you here.

I'm proud to celebrate the close of National Volunteer Week, 1994, with you and with the individuals and organizations we honor today for their extraordinary service, from among the more than 95 million Americans who give of themselves to help other people every year.

This afternoon we'll hear stories of ordinary Americans doing extraordinary things all over our country, ranging from little children to noted doctors, from small neighborhood organizations to one of our Nation's largest corporations, from a refugee who barely escaped the fall of Saigon to men and women whose families have belonged to the American middle class for generations. Our honorees have confronted gangs and comforted the sick. They've tutored children, fed families, planted trees, and built homes. As they have helped to rebuild their communities, they've shown each of us what can be done when all of us join together.

We know that communities have never been built with brick and mortar alone. Our communities are a product of common effort and common connections to neighbors with whom we share a city block or country road.

Community service is neither a program nor a panacea; it really is a way we live our lives. It stems from a refusal to accept things as they are, a personal commitment to make them better and to help our fellow men and women, boys and girls live up to their God-given potential.

Service, like life, is a series of challenges. Thirty-three years ago, almost exactly on this day, President Kennedy spoke of this challenge when he announced the first Peace Corps project. His challenge in that example inspired many, many members of my generation. In just a few months our Nation's and our generation's answer to history's challenge will begin working in communities all across America. They'll be members of AmeriCorps, our new national service initiative. They won't replace the efforts we honor today, but they will expand them. Working mainly through local nonprofit groups, AmeriCorps will provide the kind of commitment and energy and daring that makes heroes and communities and that makes a difference.

Robert Kennedy perhaps said it best 28 years ago in Cape Town, South Africa. He said, "Each time someone," and I quote, "stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls."

To those we honor today, thank you for your courage and your daring. To paraphrase Robert Frost, you took the road less traveled. And it has made all the difference. I ask that each of you stay on the road to public service and voluntarism, because you can continue to make a difference.

Here in Washington we are working as hard as we know how to move this country in the right direction and to pull the American people together, to reach across the many divides that separate us from one another so that once again we can become one people and one community burning with a common desire to move into the next century still the greatest nation on Earth, still the greatest hope for children here at home and around the world.

Eli Segal, the Director of our national service program, and my good friend Edward James Olmos in their different ways exemplify that ideal. I thank them for being here today and for leading this endeavor. I thank all of you for what you have done. And I ask that today we rededicate ourselves to the principle that the Government cannot solve all the problems in America and that in the end, the Government is just another organization of the rest of us. And we have to do it in whatever way we can wherever we live.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:35 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. The National Volunteer Week proclamation of April 15 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Nominations for the Federal Reserve Board

April 22, 1994

A stable monetary system is the platform upon which any efforts for economic renewal must be built. My administration recognized that our first task was to put our fiscal house in order, so that an ever-growing Federal budget deficit did not absorb capital and slow economic growth. I believe that we have now put our Nation on the path to sustainable economic growth. The Federal Reserve Board is the critical institution that preserves the stability of our monetary system and the confidence of our markets. The position of Governor of the Federal Reserve Board requires acute sensitivity to the need to strike a careful balance, to prudently manage the money supply and avoid the excesses of inflation, while ensuring that the men and women in our economy have the opportunity to prosper and fulfill their dreams.

To fill the vital job of Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, I am delighted to nominate Dr. Alan Blinder, currently a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Dr. Blinder is one of the world's most respected macroeconomists. He is an expert on fiscal and monetary policy and productivity, has served as chairman of the economics department at Princeton, authored countless articles and books, including one of the Nation's top textbooks, "Economic Principles and Policy," which he coauthored with William Baumol.

Alan has been an integral part of my economic team over the last 15 months. He has always expressed his views to me freely, with intellectual integrity, force, and clarity. He is a keen intellect who reached the top of his profession without losing the common touch or ever forgetting the human implications of the often abstract economic decisions we in Government must make. He has served as an economic conscience in my administration, striving to ensure that our policies met the test of rationality and workability for real people.

I am also pleased to announce my intention to nominate Janet Yellen to a full term on the Federal Reserve Board. Dr. Yellen is one of the most prominent economists of her generation on the intersection of macroeconomics and labor markets. She is also an expert in international economics on such issues as the determinants of the balance of trade. She was a clear and unanimous choice of my top economic advisers who found her to be a top-flight intellect with a pragmatic approach to monetary policy and a judicious temperament.

I am confident that both candidates, if confirmed, will serve this Nation with distinction as Governors of the Federal Reserve Board.

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

Statement on the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program
April 22, 1994

When people enter this country illegally and commit crimes while they are here, it is not fair to ask the States to bear the entire cost of their imprisonment. This new program will help them considerably.

After many years of virtual neglect of the illegal immigration issue, our administration is taking major steps to address this problem. First, we are making a substantial investment in efforts to reduce the flow of illegal immigration, primarily by toughening our border enforcement. That is the Federal Government's primary responsibility in this area.

But we also need to help those States with large numbers of undocumented aliens to shoulder the resulting financial burdens. Today, we take another important step in that direction.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the creation of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program to assist States with the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens convicted of a felony.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on the Death of President Richard Nixon
April 22, 1994

The President. It is my sad duty to report to the people of the United States that Richard M. Nixon, who served as our 37th President, died this evening in New York City at 9:08 p.m., with his family at his side.

Hillary and I send our deepest condolences to the entire Nixon family. We hope that Tricia and Edward Cox, and their son, Christopher; and Julie and David Eisenhower, and their children, Jenny, Alex, and Melanie, know that the best wishes of all their fellow Americans are with them during their moment of sorrow.

It's impossible to be in this job without feeling a special bond with the people who have gone before, and I was deeply grateful to President Nixon for his wise counsel on so many occasions on many issues over the last year. His service to me and to our country during this period was like the rest of his service to the Nation for nearly a half century: He gave of himself with intelligence and devotion to duty. And his country owes him a debt of gratitude for that service.

We face today a world of increasing uncertainty and difficult challenges, but it is a world of great opportunity, in no small part because of the vision of Richard Nixon during a particularly difficult period of the cold war. He understood the threat of communism, but he also had the wisdom to know when it was time to reach out to the Soviet Union and to China. All Americans, indeed all people throughout the world, owe him what he regarded as the ultimate compliment: He was a statesman who sought to build a lasting structure of peace.

To be sure, he experienced his fair share of adversity and controversy. But his resilience and his diligent desire to give something back to this country and to the world provide a lesson for all of us about maintaining our faith in the future. In spite of everything, that faith led President Nixon to leave his mark on his times as few national figures have done in our history and led him to continue to serve right up to the end of his life. Indeed, no less than a month before his passing, he was still in touch with me about the great issues of this day.

Again I say the sorrow and the best wishes of the American people are with President Nixon's family. We thank them, and our prayers are with them.

Q. Have you spoken to the family, Mr. President?

The President. I have. I spoke with both Tricia Cox and Julie Eisenhower this evening, and we had a very good visit.

Q. Are you going to the funeral?

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Are you going to go to the funeral?

The President. I intend to go, yes.

Q. When will it be, do you know?

The President. The family has not made announcements, and I'm not sure they've made final decisions. It's my understanding that the funeral will be in California, and they'll announce something about it probably tomorrow.

Q. Will all the Presidents be going, former Presidents?

The President. I can't say that.

Q. Can you tell us something about your relationship with Mr. Nixon?

The President. Yes, well, we made contact with each other shortly after—I think shortly after the election—either that or shortly after I came in here. And then, as you will remember, I had him up to the White House for a visit. We talked frequently on the phone. I sought his advice about a number of issues in foreign policy, and we talked quite a lot about Russia. We had a good, long visit right before he went to Russia, and as I said, just a month ago today, I think, he penned his last letter to me of his thoughts on that trip and his advice.

So our relationship continued to be warm and constructive throughout the period of my Presidency, and he went out of his way to give me his best advice. And I was incredibly impressed with the energy and the vigor and, frankly, the rigor that he brought to analyzing this issue.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:03 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. The related proclamation of April 22 and Executive order of April 23 are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress on the Death of President Richard Nixon
April 22, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my sad duty to inform you officially of the death of Richard Milhous Nixon, the thirty-seventh President of the United States.

Born in 1913, he was first elected to the Congress in 1946, a member of that historic freshman class of World War II veterans that also included John F. Kennedy. He was elected to the Senate in 1950, and served two terms as Vice President of the United States between 1953 and 1961. His career in the Congress coincided with the great expansion of the American middle class, when men and women from backgrounds as humble as his own secured the triumph of freedom abroad and the promise of economic growth at home.

He remained a visible presence in American public life for over half a century. Yet through all those years of service to his country, in the military, in the Congress, in the Presidency, and beyond, he cherished his life as a private man, a family man. He was lovingly devoted to his wife, Pat, to their daughters Patricia Cox and Julie Eisenhower, and to his four grandchildren.

His lifetime and public career were intertwined with America's rise as a world power. His faith in America never wavered, from his famous "kitchen debate" with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev through all of the debates that followed. We Americans and our neighbors abroad will always owe him a special debt for opening diplomatic doors to Beijing and Moscow during his Presidency, and his influence in world affairs will be felt for years to come.

Richard Milhous Nixon lived the "American Dream." Now, he rests in peace.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

April 22, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 23. The related proclamation of April 22 and Executive order of April 23 are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
April 23, 1994

Good morning. I'm happy to report to you today that we're closing in on a top priority for the American people: winning a crime bill that will make our homes, our schools, and our streets safer.

This week the House followed the Senate and passed a comprehensive crime bill. We can thank the leadership of Speaker Tom Foley who, true to his word, put this legislation on the front burner. In doing that, he's helping to break almost 5 years of partisan gridlock over this crime bill as Democrats and Republicans join to pass it by an overwhelming majority.

But the hard work isn't over, not yet. The leaders in the House and the Senate now must hammer out their differences. This is their top priority. On that I have their pledge. And as soon as they produce a bill that the American people deserve, I'll sign it, and then we'll implement it quickly and well. That's my pledge.

While I congratulate the Congress, the real credit for forcing this legislation along must go to you, the American people. It was you who sounded the alarm over crime, you who told your lawmakers that the greatest nation on Earth should not also be the place where 90 percent of all youth homicides are committed, should not be a place where one in 20 teenagers carry a gun to school, should not be a place where gang members are often better armed than the police. In short, the greatest nation on Earth should not also be the most violent.

And Washington finally got the message. It heard the anguish of the American people over the fate of young Polly Klaas, who was abducted and murdered by a repeat violent offender; and over James Jordan, the father of Michael Jordan, killed in a robbery; and over mass murderers with assault weapons in an office building in San Francisco, on a train in Long Island, at a fast-food restaurant outside Chicago. Each time they were visited by this kind of violence, Americans felt a sense of common civility, security, and humanity wither just a little more.

But now we're on the verge of doing something concrete to change it, and we can't waste a minute. The leadership of the House and the Senate have agreed to work toward getting a bill to my desk by Memorial Day. I want that bill to have the best from both the House and the Senate, and that means more police, more punishment, and more prevention.

I want 100,000 more police officers for community policing. The House voted for 50,000 but that's not enough. As we've seen in cities from Los Angeles to Houston, putting more officers on the street, working with people in their communities prevents crime and lowers the crime rate. I want the House to join the Senate to ban the weapons of war that plague our streets: assault weapons. I want both Houses to tailor a provision to put away repeat violent offenders and put them away for good, "three strikes and they're out."

Earlier I mentioned Polly Klaas, a tragic reminder of how overdue this law is. Her father, Marc Klaas, is here with me today, and he's been a strong leader in the effort to get this "three strikes" law on the books. I know he would join me in saying, we need it, we'll fight for it, and the Congress has to pass it.

I also want to help the States to build the prisons they'll need to close the revolving door and stop letting criminals go free after serving, on average, less than half their sentence time. The legislation I sign will fight crime against women, and it will take on youth crime. It will institute boot camps to shake up the first-time offenders and give them another chance at life before going to prison. It will set up drug courts to get drug abusers treatment so they won't be repeat criminals. And it will give young people something to say yes to: more constructive recreational activity, things like midnight basketball, and more job programs in areas where the teenage unemployment rate is often 50 or 60 percent. We need to give young people who want to play by the rules the chance to get ahead.

This is the most sweeping crime bill ever, the first to put extra police on the street, the first to include crime prevention. On this we cannot cut corners, and we don't have to. We will pay for it through a violent crime reduction trust fund. This fund will cut the Federal bureaucracy by 252,000 positions over the next 5 years and use all the savings to fight crime.

I think that's a good trade for the American people.

I'm asking Congress to move quickly on this. And if it does, I'll cut through the red-tape and put the first 20,000 extra police officers on the street within a year. Americans are weary of picking up the paper and reading about attacks like the one that occurred just this week in Norristown, Pennsylvania, a working-class community outside Philadelphia: A 12-year-old girl shot in the face with a semiautomatic handgun in broad daylight as she was getting off the school bus, surrounded by classmates. The person arrested for the crime was 13 years old.

Americans have the right to know that when their child goes to school, the other children are packing books, not guns. Our legislation bans juvenile ownership of handguns.

We are a country with the greatest freedoms on the face of the Earth. But we must accept that with those freedoms come greater personal responsibilities. And our common responsibility now is to reclaim a part of America where freedoms do not trample on our greater liberties. We can never be free if we live in fear.

This is not a time for partisanship, for politics, or for posturing. It's a time to do what's right by America by passing this crime bill.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:08 p.m. on April 22 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 23.

Remarks at the White House Correspondents Dinner

April 23, 1994

Thank you very much, George. And to you and Ken Walsh, I've had a wonderful evening sitting with you both and looking out at your wonderful families and cheerleaders. I want to congratulate tonight's award recipients and thank you all for another chance to be with you.

I'd like to begin with a couple of serious remarks. It's easy for us, when we fight in Washington, to forget how much we have in common. And sometimes, I think we have to have these dinners where we can laugh at ourselves and at one another to fulfill the admonition of Proverbs that a happy heart doeth good like medicine, and a broken spirit dryeth the bones. Sometimes I think we forget that. And we can too easily get carried away with our honest differences, doing our honest jobs, so that we lose the fundamental humanity of people who are at odds with us. I have been thinking about this a lot in the last 24 hours as I have reflected on the death of President Nixon and the life that he lived after he left the White House and in particular the rather unusual but, for me, a prized relationship that I enjoyed over these last 15 or 16 months.

The thing that impressed me about him was that he had a tenacious refusal to give up on his own involvement in this country and the world and his hopes for this country and the world. And he continued it right down to the very end, writing me a letter a month to the day before he died about his recent trip to Russia and his analysis of other places in that part of the world.

I say that because I think we should all try to remember, when we are tempted to write off anybody because of our differences with them, that we share a common humanity and we all have the capacity of doing better and doing more.

Tonight in this audience there is a wonderful poet, Maya Angelou, who wrote a wonderful poem for my Inauguration. She wrote profoundly about this subject when she said, "History, despite its wrenching pain, cannot be unlived and, if faced with courage, need not be lived again."

Tonight I know that our thoughts and prayers are with President Nixon's family. And many of us, each in our own way, have relived as many of his 50 years in public life as we also experienced, some of us in opposition, some of us in support. But it is worth remembering what binds us together as Americans and as people.

Now, having said that, I liked Garrison Keillor a lot better than Al Franken. [*Laughter*] There

for a while, I thought he was going to bring Wobegon to me tonight. [*Laughter*]

A couple of weeks ago, the Vice President got a huge response at the Gridiron Club when he was wheeled out in a handtruck. You know, I've learned a lot from Al Gore, and so I had a very different plan for my entrance tonight, but we couldn't find just the right canoe. [*Laughter*] I also couldn't figure out whether I wanted to go up this particular creek with or without a paddle. And so, here I am just standing alone.

But I haven't been alone. Over the last few months I've gotten a lot of telegrams from people offering me their advice and best wishes in this very difficult time. I brought a few of them here with me tonight. I thought I would share them with you. Here's one from my pollster, Stan Greenberg: "I don't have a clue what people want from you." [*Laughter*] "Trust your instincts, but send the check anyway." [*Laughter*] "Take notes; save them. You can even get even with the press when you're 85," signed Barry Goldwater. Here's one that really touched me: "I support you 100 percent in this so-called Whitewater scandal. Furthermore, I do not believe it has even been conclusively proven that there is, in fact, a White River in Arkansas," signed James Johnston, president, R.J. Reynolds. [*Laughter*] "Dear Bill, can I list you as a reference?" David Gergen. [*Laughter*] And here's one I especially prize: "Bill, remember, it's never too late to pull out of the '92 election." Ross Perot. [*Laughter*]

Now, I've learned something in these last several weeks. One thing I've learned is that I should no longer assign the worst motives to reporters and to news organizations that cover me. I've been wrong about that. I am now convinced there is no deliberate conspiracy among the press corps; you just can't help yourselves. Hunting in packs is a matter of pure instinct to you. [*Laughter*]

On the other hand, I do want to defend you. You know, some people in the national press corps have been pretty rough, but there is this general feeling that the press has really been tough on me. And I used to think that, but everything is relative. And I started doing some research, and I discovered that, in fact, the opposite may be true. In fact, I've discovered that you've been holding back. I got my hands on some magazine covers that were actually rejected for being too tough. You'll be happy to know you don't have to cover the White House to get leaks; you can actually work here. So I want to show you some of what might have happened to me if the press had been as mean as I once thought they were.

Scoop, can we show those rejected magazine covers?

Look at this one. This is a cover photo of the First Couple in U.S. News. It says, "1994 Tax Tips." [*Laughter*] Look, here's a Consumer Reports that almost made it to the newsstand; it's a picture of me and Bobby Ray Inman. It says, "Rating the Clinton Nominations"—in Consumer Reports. [*Laughter*] That's the Whitewater edition of Field and Stream with Hillary and me. [*Laughter*] Motor Trend has also applied for a White House press pass. Look at there. That's me and my Mustang. It says, "Recall?" on it. Then, Gourmet Magazine did this cover of the White House chef. You can't see it, but it's Ronald McDonald there. One magazine almost ran this profile of my most senior advisers; that's Modern Maturity with Lloyd Cutler, Lloyd Bentsen, and Warren Christopher sitting on a bench together. [*Laughter*] Sports Illustrated came within an inch of making this the swimsuit cover. [*Laughter*] And as soon as I put my clothes back on, Runner's World smelled a scandal. [*Laughter*]

Now, this is not a new phenomenon. We found this old magazine lying around from the Reagan administration. This is the National Review, 1984, with David Gergen, Man of the Year. And this year, Mother Jones named David Gergen the Man of the Year. I'm bitter because some people have gotten good magazine covers. I got this Land's End catalog in the mail with Jim Leach as the new sweater boy. [*Laughter*]

Now, I want to try to illustrate to you—I know that you think these are all made up. I'm going to show you some actual covers to show you how much better the press has been to me. Here's an interesting comparison. Let me show you a Time magazine cover that actually ran during the campaign. God, I hated that. [*Laughter*] But look what their first choice for a cover was. The headline says, "We just don't like this guy." [*Laughter*] And you remember this Time magazine cover from last year? I abhorred that until I saw the one they thought of running. [*Laughter*] That's me as a sumo wrestler there, "The Incredible Growing President." And I know all of you remember this cover, which will go down in history for journal-

istic integrity, the "deepwater cover" of Time that managed to capture George Stephanopoulos' joy about being on the cover of Time magazine. Everybody now knows that cover was not about Whitewater, it was an old and cropped photo. But you cannot be mad at Time; they actually cut me a lot of slack on this. I don't imagine anybody here's actually seen the original photo. I'm grateful for Time that they never showed it, but I think we'll show it to you. That's Roseanne Arnold still in the picture. [*Laughter*] Now, it's not quite what you think, George and I were not proposing to her, but Time didn't believe it.

The point is, all these rejected covers show not meanness but courageous restraint and collective good judgment on the part of the Washington press corps. And I just thought the American people deserved to know that about you.

And as somebody who's been working to overcome my own image problems, I thought I ought to help you do a little of that; so tonight I extend the hand of peace and offer you my advice on how the press might work to improve its image. Now, you might ask, why do I want to help you? Why do I want to help you? [*Laughter*] Message: I care. [*Laughter*] Anyway, here's my advice: Get booked on Larry King; go around the President and speak directly to the American people; pray that Columbia Journalism School will get a basketball team that will go to the Final Four. [*Laughter*] Learn to play a reed instrument; do not borrow money; do not lend money; do not make money—[*laughter*]—and for goodness sakes, do not lose money. [*Laughter*] As a matter of fact, the only safe thing is the barter system. Next advice is, never get too busy for a good haircut. [*Laughter*] And finally, in consultation with the Vice President, since all of you are going through the White House trash anyway, please separate glass, paper, and plastic. [*Laughter*]

Be consistent, for goodness sakes; you're always telling me that. I mean, the Wall Street Journal criticizing my wife for making money trading commodities is like Field and Stream criticizing somebody for catching fish. [*Laughter*]

And you should be more positive. I mean, instead of characterizing me as "beleaguered," characterize me as "somber" and "courageous" and "Lincolnesque." And remember, if you really want a friend in this town, get yourself a dog. I wish somebody had told me that before I showed up with a neutered cat. [*Laughter*]

I'm giving you this good advice because, as you've heard me so many times say, we are all in this together. I mean, the hits the American people have taken are nothing compared to the hits you've taken. And you've got a tough job ahead trying to restore your good image now.

So besides my advice, I've come up with a couple of things I could do to help you. I'm going to stop jogging with Congressmen and spend more time with the people who really matter in this town: you. [*Laughter*] Beginning tomorrow morning at 6 a.m., Jack Germond and I are going on a 3-mile run. [*Laughter*] I am going to start delivering my speeches exactly as written. That way you'll never have to sit and listen to another one. [*Laughter*] I promise never again to get mad when Andrea Mitchell or Rita Braver or Brit Hume refer to me as the "current" President. [*Laughter*] And even if I do lose my patience once in a while, you don't have anything to worry about with this White House. Ask Jay Stephens; we don't get even, we just get mad. [*Laughter*]

I also know that I need to help you get through the slow news days; I know how tough they are. So we're going to give you, just on background, details of potential scandals that you can use at your leisure: overdue library books from law school, the seeds of grapes I've eaten in supermarkets, the discrepancy between my actual weight and the weight on my driver's license, up until now the absolutely secret lab tests done on the Astroturf in my pickup. [*Laughter*] And there will be a blanket statement to go along with each one saying that I am sorry I didn't tell you that before.

Now, this is serious—I do want to take an opportunity to come clean on a statement I made earlier this week. In an appearance on MTV, I was asked a question about my undergarments, more specifically, whether I wore boxers or briefs. I answered, "I wear briefs," which is a true statement that speaks to the current facts. [*Laughter*] Now, at the moment I uttered this answer I could tell there was immediate skepticism among the media and a real desire that I prove the truth right then and there of my brief assertion by making immediate, full disclosure. [*Laughter*] I did not show my briefs at that time out of an exaggerated and wholly inappropriate sense of my zone of personal pri-

vacy—[*laughter*]—which I drug up here with me from Arkansas. I want you to know tonight that I regret that deeply, and like my wonderful wife, I have been rezoned.

Therefore, I must also acknowledge that for a short time during my youth, I did in fact also wear boxer shorts. It was actually a brief period of time, and this semantic coincidence may have been the source of my confused response on MTV. [*Laughter*] The number of boxer shorts totaled six pair in all: three white, two striped, one baby blue with a Razorback hog and little red hogs. [*Laughter*]

Now, I was reminded of this fact, which I had clearly forgotten, while reading a passage about doing the laundry in my mother's book. And I am taking this opportunity to make a full and complete disclosure. I have turned all my underwear over to Mr. Fiske's office—[*laughter*]—including the receipts from their donation to charity and the tax deductions I took for them in 1962: $3.38. I'm also making copies of my underwear available to the news media. [*Laughter*] Now, naturally, since the special prosecutor has all my current underwear, I will need to buy some more. When I do that, I will keep you fully apprised as to the type, size, brand name, national origin, and fiber content. I have no further statement at this time. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:16 p.m. at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to George Condon, president, and Kenneth Walsh, vice president, White House Correspondents' Association; humorist Garrison Keillor; comedians Al Franken and Roseanne Arnold; Steven (Scoop) Cohen, Staff Assistant to Director of Communications; journalist Jack Germond; correspondents Andrea Mitchell, NBC News, Rita Braver, CBS News, and Brit Hume, ABC News; and Special Counsel Robert Fiske.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Bosnia
April 25, 1994

The President. Good morning. I'm on my way, as you know, to Fort Myer, to the service, so I can't stay and answer a lot of questions. But I did want to make a brief statement about the situation in Bosnia.

It appears that the pressure brought to bear by NATO and the U.N. has worked and that the cease-fire is holding, that the withdrawal is continuing. We will continue to monitor the situation very closely as the next day unfolds.

I do want to say it's now clearly time to get the diplomatic initiative going again while we maintain our vigilance. But I am pleased by the progress of the last 48 hours.

Q. Have things been worked out with the U.N., Mr. President?

The President. I think so. I think so.

Q. Does that mean no air strikes?

The President. No. Oh, no. I think he was just referring to the situation on Saturday. Yes, I think so.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Memorial Service Honoring Victims of the Iraq Helicopter Tragedy at Fort Myer, Virginia
April 25, 1994

Today in this chapel built for heroes, we come to mourn the lives and to celebrate the lives of those who died on April 14th. To all the families who are here present and the families who are not here, I think it should be clear that in addition to the distinguished leaders of

our military, the clergy, and the friends, the spirit of all Americans is in this chapel today. The hearts of all Americans have gone out to these families.

When we joined 3 years ago with Britain and France and Turkey to protect the Kurds of northern Iraq, to shelter them from air attacks, to sustain them with shoes and coats and food and fuel and medicine, the world took note of something continually special about our great Nation and what drives us.

The lives of the Americans and their 11 compatriots who were lost reflected that spirit, those values, that heart, that hope that brought us to protect the Kurds in the first place. They were literally part of a mission to provide comfort. They have honored us all with their compassion and courage and, ultimately, with their sacrifice.

We know, as has already been said, that those who enter the military understand clearly that they assume great risks, that even though the world has changed, that the specter of the cold war is fading, the way of life we cherish as Americans and our hopes for the rest of the world still depends upon their skills, their sacrifice, their courage, and their clear willingness to undertake those risks.

And yet, I have to say that as President and as an American, when it becomes the job of those of us in positions of responsibility to explain loss to these wonderful families that came about through a terrible accident, the burden of reminding all of us that all who served undertook those risks is still very great.

We must remember not only those who died for their service to their country but for how they were loved. We must, all the rest of us in America, pray for these families: for the husband and the father whose young child will now have to learn about him through photographs and stories, for the family of an ambitious young man who wished to go to college and become an artist, for a distinguished American veteran of more than two decades whose soldiers loved him for his steel and his heart, for the wonderful daughter and sister who lifted those around her with her vigor and promise, or the young pilot who grew up with his heart set on the skies, and for all the others.

Their lives were suddenly taken from their beloved families and from our Nation and our service and their important mission. No one's words can wipe away the grief, the pain, the questions. It is our duty, first, to continue the mission for which they gave their lives; second, to find the answers which they rightfully seek; and third, to pray that together they will find the strength as the days go forward to ease their grief and lean on their faiths.

The Americans we honor today represented the best in our country. In a tragic irony, all who were involved in this accident, including the pilots of the two jets, were there on a common mission, to save the lives of innocent people. We know that just as we are all proud of their ability and their bravery, their readiness for any challenge, their devotion to their families, we all understand that they, like we—none of us are immune from error, from tragic circumstance.

One of the fathers, himself an Air Force colonel, said that he thought his daughter was a hero. Well, they're all heroes. And we owe it to them to honor their lives and their service, to answer the questions of their families but more than anything else, to remember when words fail that we are taught over and over again in the Scriptures, things will always happen that we can never fully understand. And as President Lincoln said, "The Almighty has his own purposes," that the faith which sustains us, according to the Scripture, is the assurance of things hoped for, the convictions of things unseen.

As I look out into the faces of mothers and fathers and wives and sons and daughters and brothers and sisters, I say on behalf of a grateful nation, we honor your sacrifice. And we will do our best to live every day with the memory of your sacrifice. And we pray for you that time will give you the strength and the faith to remember the very best and finest of the lives of your loved ones, to be always grateful for what they did and never cynical, even in the face of this tragedy, for there are things which happen to us all which can never be fully understood. What is clear and beyond any doubt is that they loved their country and they swore an oath including a willingness to give their lives for their country. They did it in a very noble cause.

We share your grief. We honor their lives. We pray for you and for their souls.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:56 a.m. in the Memorial Chapel.

Remarks Honoring the 1994 Victim Service Award Recipients and an Exchange With Reporters

April 25, 1994

Thank you very much, Attorney General Reno, Secretary Bentsen, ladies and gentlemen. Before I go any further, because they had to introduce other people, I don't know that we appropriately thanked Lieutenant Bean and Steve Sposato for their—just their sheer courage for coming here and telling their stories. And I think we ought to recognize that.

As has already been said, just before we came out to the Rose Garden I was in the Oval Office, proclaiming this week National Crime Victims' Rights Week and, again, recognizing the 11 people who have already stood up and been recognized for what they've done in the cause of victims' rights. I want to wish all of them well and encourage them to continue their important work. I want to assure them that the Justice Department and the Office of Victims' Rights and Aileen Adams, the new Director, we're all going to do everything we can in this regard.

The visit of the victims' rights advocates is especially important here today because, as everyone has already said, we are at a pivotal point in the fight for the crime bill. One of the reasons that I ran for President—I was glad to hear Mr. Sposato say he was a registered Republican—because one of the reasons I ran for President is I couldn't imagine how it seemed to me from a distance every problem in Washington became a subject of partisan dispute, no matter how much it seemed to all of us who lived out there in the hinterland to be a human problem that ought to bring people together, not divide them.

It took 7 years to pass the Brady bill after Jim Brady was nearly killed with President Reagan. It's already beginning to save lives, because the background checks do make a difference. For 5 years the crime bill has been paralyzed and defeated time after time in the 11th hour because of some partisan dispute. Now it appears clearly that gridlock has been broken. The crime bill passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the Senate in its first forum and then another bill in the House also with a bipartisan majority.

We think we're closing in on a bill that will make our streets, our homes, our schools, our lives safer. Victims' concerns are a centerpiece of the crime bill. They include the development of State registries for convicted child abusers, the expansion of programs to combat violence against women, the imposition of life sentences for three-time repeat violent offenders.

But I also say to you today that we should take this opportunity to end the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction on our streets. People say the President should stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the world. Why don't we start with the streets of the United States of America?

I have asked Attorney General Reno, a former prosecutor, and Secretary Bentsen, an ardent hunter who's also in charge of registering the gun dealers of this country—the licensed gun dealers—to spearhead this effort. I have asked our Drug Policy Director, Lee Brown, who just came in and is a former Chief of Police in Atlanta, in Houston, in New York City, to reach out and mobilize the law enforcement support that we need. It's not just Lieutenant Bean, every major law enforcement organization in this country has said we should ban semi-automatic assault weapons. And most importantly, I want to ask the law-abiding citizens of this country to tell Congress that it's okay to vote for this and take these kinds of weapons off our streets.

I know there are those who oppose any effort to ban assault weapons. I've heard all the arguments. There's the camel's-nose-in-the-tent argument: "Today the assault weapons, tomorrow my .22." There's the argument that, "Yes, there are a million of these weapons in circulation and 80-some percent of them belong to criminals, but what about the other 10 or 12 percent?" There's the argument that, "Well, maybe it'll save some lives, but all those people will go out and get a revolver and kill somebody."

I hate to be crass about it, ladies and gentlemen, but I'll bet you if Steve could get up here and say again, he would gladly trade his wife's chances for that maniac with a six-shooter revolver over what she and the lawyer and all the other people in that office building had to

face. I mean, who are we trying to kid? There is an air of unreality about this debate in Washington that has very little to do with the reality of what Lieutenant Bean and his deceased partner and all the other law enforcement officials in this country face day in and day out on the street, every single solitary day.

Do I believe that there's a right to keep and bear arms in this country? You bet I do. I also believe there's something wrong with our country being the site of 90 percent of the youth homicides in the entire world, don't you? I think there's something wrong when one in 20 teenagers carriers a gun to school and 160,000 a day—a day—stay home because they are afraid to go to school. I think there's something wrong with that. I think the American people have a right to be safe and secure. How can we pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness if we don't have the most elemental security?

The weapons of choice for drug traffickers, gang members, paramilitary extremist groups are these assault weapons. This ban in the bill, as the Secretary of the Treasury said, specifically excludes from banning over 600 sporting weapons, including Remington and Browning rifles that have a semi-automatic firing mechanism with relatively few shots that are exclusively used for hunting. This is a very carefully drawn piece of legislation. It does not include protections for the AR–15, the AK–47, and the Uzi, to name just a few. These weapons were designed for the battlefield, not for the streets of America.

This is a real test for us. What will the Members of the House be thinking of when they vote on this bill? The letters they will surely get if they vote for it, Secretary Bentsen described, or will they think of the man who had a modified AK–47 who went into a schoolyard at recess time in Stockton, California, 5 years ago and in less than 2 minutes killed 5 kids and wounded 29 others? Will they think of what happened to Steve Sposato's wife and the other people who were in that building? Will they think of the 23 people who were killed in that cafeteria in Killeen, Texas, or the 4 Hasidic students who were shot on the Brooklyn Bridge?

You know, we have a lot of freedom in this country. And I was always raised to believe that with that freedom goes responsibility. I would argue to you, my fellow Americans, that as a people, individually and through our elected representatives, we have been woefully irresponsible in permitting the spread of these kinds of weapons to make police officers outgunned and ordinary citizens in more danger than they would have been anyway.

Now, this crime bill also contains a prohibition on the ownership and possession of handguns by minors unless they are under the supervision of a responsible adult, out for an approved legal purpose. If we can do that, surely we can do this. This is a big deal, not only because of the weapons involved but because it will tell us whether we are really going to continue to keep working on this problem. The crime bill will make a difference. The police will make a difference. The prevention money will make a difference. The victims' assistance efforts will make a difference. The tougher penalties will make a difference. But we have to change the rules of the game.

Today, in a free and open society, the presence of these assault weapons drastically tilt the rules of the game against the innocent and the law-abiding and the law-enforcing. And it is wrong.

Let me just close very briefly with this story. In 1992, early in the year, I was in New York one night to give a speech to a dinner which had been organized in behalf of our campaign. And I was going through the back way of this hotel and through a kitchen, and one of the gentlemen who was on the hotel staff came up to me and told me he was an immigrant. And he said, "In the country where I came from, we were very poor, and I was glad to come to America where I do better. My 10-year-old boy is a student in school, and he is studying this election. He thinks I should vote for you. But before I say I will, I want to ask you something. I want you to make my boy free." He said, "You see, we have more money here than we had at home, but at home we were free." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "How is my boy free when he cannot walk to school by himself, when there is a beautiful park across the street from our apartment, but he cannot play there alone unless I am there with him? So if I give you my vote, will you make my boy free?"

Freedom is an empty word to people who are not even gifted with elemental safety. And I urge you to help us make sure that when the Members of the United States House of Representatives vote on this bill, they are thinking about that freedom for all Americans.

Thank you all very much.

China

Q. [*Inaudible*]—think you'll grant MFN to China now that they've released the dissident Wang Jontao?

The President. Well, I'm very pleased about that. I'm very pleased about it. And it's a good step.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you satisfied with the chain of command now in Bosnia after the confusion over the weekend? And exactly what was that confusion, and did the White House contact Boutros-Ghali to try to get it straightened out?

The President. Let me answer the first question first. I believe that the chain of command and more importantly the understandings about what would or would not trigger air strikes are in proper order now. And I think what happened over the weekend, I believe, was reported essentially at the time the ultimatum took effect. There's no question that there was still some shelling going on in violation of the ultimatum. The U.N. forces on the ground there felt that there had been some command-and-control problems on the part of the Serbs, but they did intend to comply and they would in fact comply. And therefore they—it was their judgment that there should be a delay even though the ultimatum was enforced to see if they were right.

And that is why they delayed. There was not a big argument about what the rules were or the conditions were. All were agreed on the fact; all were agreed on the rules. They believed that the Serbs did intend to comply and had gotten strict instructions not just from their political but also from their military commander within Bosnia. And of course, as it turned out at least to date, that seems to be the case. I think we're all together from here on in.

Q. So you don't think this bolsters the argument of some that this is too cumbersome a chain of command, that it's too bureaucratic?

The President. Well, it's somewhat cumbersome—it's a little less cumbersome than it was before—that is, we hammered out some better procedures. But I think—we'll continue to try to work to streamline and improve the procedures. But we're, after all, all of us trying to do something that has not before been done: put NATO in the service of preserving the peace in Europe outside the NATO membership area for the first time ever and to work with the United Nations when the United Nations forces are on the ground, but not combatants themselves. So this raises a whole series of delicate and not easy questions, difficult questions.

I think that things are in proper order at this time. I have no reason to believe they're not and absolutely no reason to believe that the U.N. is anything but strongly supportive of the NATO air strike ultimatum there. I think that progress is being made.

Q. And the Serbs shouldn't take any comfort in——

The President. Absolutely not. It is exactly what I said, nothing more, nothing less. U.N. people on the ground said I believe they've had—[*inaudible*]—on their side. I believe they're going to stop. I believe they're going to withdraw. And of course, in effect, that's what happened during the course of the day. And that's all there was. There was not a difference of policy at all. And I think we're completely together now.

Anticrime Legislation

Q. Mr. President, why won't you take a position, your administration, on the racial justice act in the House version of the crime bill?

The President. I think that we—I was under the impression we had. We're going to have a position on everything in the House crime bill and some other things as well.

I think we have some people—working on a racial justice—[*inaudible*]. We think that you can absolutely have a racial justice provision that will do some good. I'm not—I don't want to get into—this is a complicated piece of legislation, with two competing bills. But we will have positions on all those issues, so—I don't think it's accurate to say that we've not taken a position.

Q. Mr. President, why would the assault weapons ban work better separately than part of the overall crime bill?

The President. The administration liked it as part of the overall crime bill. We liked what the Senate did.

Q. Well, why—now that it's no longer part of the crime bill?

The President. Because we'll make it part of—[*inaudible*]—process separately in the House, then the conferees will put it into the crime bill.

Q. Realistically, politically, sir, what are the prospects?

The President. I don't know yet. We're working it. We couldn't—because the House was unwilling to consider it together, we had to work the crime bill and get it through before we could work the assault weapons bill, because they had made a decision to vote them separately. So I can't answer your question now because we're just now getting pounced in trying to get our teeth into the effort.

Q. So you don't know yet whether the tide is turning on that?

The President. I think we're in a lot better shape than we were a week ago. But I don't know yet that it'll pass. I'm working on it. I think—it certainly should pass, and we're in better shape than we were a week ago. We'll just keep working. I feel pretty hopeful about it. If these people are heard from, it will pass.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:40 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Randy Bean, whose fellow police officer was killed during a routine traffic stop; Steven Sposato, whose wife was killed by a gunman in a San Francisco law office; James Brady, former White House Press Secretary who was wounded in the 1981 assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan; and former political prisoner Wang Jontao. A reporter referred to United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. A tape was not available for verification of the exchange portion of this item. The proclamation on National Crime Victims' Rights Week is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the International Fishing Conservation and Management Agreement

April 25, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith the Agreement to Promote Compliance With International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas, which was adopted at Rome by consensus by the Conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization ("FAO") on November 24, 1993.

This Agreement was negotiated largely on the initiative of the United States, in response to the fisheries crises that have arisen in many corners of the world. In my view, it represents a significant breakthrough and offers the international community an opportunity to develop responsible fishing practices on a global basis. The Agreement once implemented, will begin to resolve many of the problems that have undermined the sustainability of high seas fishing resources. By becoming party to this Agreement, the United States would continue to demonstrate its commitment to preserving these resources and the livelihoods that depend on them.

The Agreement sets forth a broad range of obligations for Parties whose fishing vessels operate on the high seas, including the obligation to ensure that such vessels do not undermine international fishery conservation and management measures. Parties must also prohibit their vessels from fishing on the high seas without specific authorization and must take enforcement measures in respect of vessels that contravene requirements flowing from the Agreement.

The Agreement also creates an important role for the FAO as a clearinghouse of data relating to high seas fishing. Through the collection and dissemination of such data, it will be possible to improve our knowledge of all high seas fisheries, which is of critical importance if the international community is to protect these valuable resources successfully.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreement and give its advice and consent to acceptance.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 25, 1994.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Haiti

April 25, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

1. In December 1990, the Haitian people elected Jean-Bertrand Aristide as their President by an overwhelming margin in a free and fair election. The United States praised Haiti's success in peacefully implementing its democratic constitutional system and provided significant political and economic support to the new government. The Haitian military abruptly interrupted the consolidation of Haiti's new democracy when in September 1991, it illegally and violently ousted President Aristide from office and drove him into exile.

2. The United States, on its own and with the Organization of American States (OAS), immediately imposed sanctions against the illegal regime. The United States has also actively supported the efforts of the OAS and the United Nations to restore democracy to Haiti and to bring about President Aristide's return by encouraging and facilitating a political process involving all the legitimate Haitian parties. The United States and the international community also offered material assistance within the context of an eventual settlement of the Haitian crisis to support the return to democracy, build constitutional structures, and foster economic well-being.

In furtherance of these twin objectives—restoration of constitutional democracy and fostering economic recovery—as discussed in section 10 below, the United States has taken additional measures to block the U.S.-located assets of persons (civilian as well as military) whose conduct, or material or financial support, has assisted the illegal maintenance of the illegitimate regime in Haiti, including persons obstructing the U.N. Mission in Haiti or the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement, and persons perpetuating or contributing to the violence in Haiti. In addition, in an effort to stabilize employment and minimize economic hardship for the local populace in Haiti, U.S. persons currently licensed to deal with the vital Haitian assembly sector have received reauthorization through May 31, 1994.

3. This report is submitted to the Congress pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c), and discusses Administration actions and expenses since my last report (November 13, 1993) that are directly related to the national emergency with respect to Haiti declared in Executive Order No. 12775, as implemented pursuant to that order and Executive Orders Nos. 12779, 12853, and 12872.

4. Economic sanctions against the *de facto* regime in Haiti were first imposed in October 1991. On October 4, 1991, in Executive Order No. 12775, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by events that had occurred in Haiti to disrupt the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government of that country (56 *Fed. Reg.* 50641). In that order, the President ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Haiti (including the Banque de la Republique d'Haiti) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person, including its overseas branches. The Executive order also prohibited any direct or indirect payments or transfers to the *de facto* regime in Haiti of funds or other financial or investment assets or credits by any U.S. person, including its overseas branches, or by any entity organized under the laws of Haiti and owned or controlled by a U.S. person.

Subsequently, on October 28, 1991, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12779, adding trade sanctions against Haiti to the sanctions imposed on October 4 (56 *Fed. Reg.* 55975). This order prohibited exportation from the United States of goods, technology, services, and importation into the United States of Haitian-origin goods and services, after November 5, 1991, with certain limited exceptions. The order exempted trade in publications and other informational materials from the import, export, and payment prohibitions and permitted the exportation to Haiti of donations to relieve human suffering as well as commercial sales of five food commodities: rice, beans, sugar, wheat flour, and cooking oil. In order to permit the return to the United States of goods being prepared for

U.S. customers by Haiti's substantial "assembly sector," the order also permitted, through December 5, 1991, the importation into the United States of goods assembled or processed in Haiti that contained parts or materials previously exported to Haiti from the United States. On February 5, 1992, it was announced that specific licenses could be applied for on a case-by-case basis by U.S. persons wishing to resume a pre-embargo import/export relationship with the assembly sector in Haiti.

5. On June 30, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12853 that expanded the blocking of assets of the *de facto* regime to include assets of Haitian nationals identified by the Secretary of the Treasury as providing substantial financial or material contributions to the regime, or doing substantial business with the regime. That Executive order also implemented United Nations Security Council Resolution ("UNSC Resolution") 841 of June 16, 1993, by prohibiting the sale or supply by U.S. persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of petroleum or petroleum products or arms and related materiel of all types to any person or entity in Haiti, or for the purpose of any business carried on in or operated from Haiti, or promoting or calculated to promote such sale or supply. Carriage of such goods to Haiti on U.S.-registered vessels is prohibited, as is any transaction for the evasion or avoidance of, or attempt to evade or avoid, any prohibition in the order.

6. As noted in my previous report, apparent steady progress toward achieving the firm goal of restoring democracy in Haiti permitted the United States and the world community to suspend economic sanctions against Haiti in August 1993. With strong support from the United States, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 861 on August 27, 1993, suspending the petroleum, arms, and financial sanctions imposed under UNSC Resolution 841. On the same day, the Secretary General of the OAS announced that the OAS was urging member states to suspend their trade embargoes. In concert with these U.N. and OAS actions, U.S. trade and financial restrictions against Haiti were suspended, effective at 9:35 a.m. e.d.t., on August 31, 1993.

These steps demonstrated my determination and that of the international community to see that Haiti and the Haitian people resume their rightful place in our hemispheric community of democracies. Our work to reach a solution to the Haitian crisis through the Governors Island Agreement was however seriously threatened by accelerating violence in Haiti sponsored or tolerated by the *de facto* regime. The violence culminated on October 11, 1993, with the obstruction by armed "attaches," supported by the Haitian military and police, of the deployment of U.S. military trainers and engineers sent to Haiti as part of the United Nations Mission in Haiti. The Haitian military's decision to dishonor its commitments made in the Governors Island Agreement was apparent. On October 13, 1993, the United Nations Security Council issued Resolution 873, which terminated the suspension of sanctions effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., October 18, 1993.

As a result, effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., October 18, 1993, the Department of the Treasury revoked the suspension of those trade and financial sanctions that had been suspended, so that the full scope of prior prohibitions was reinstated (58 *Fed. Reg.* 54024, October 19, 1993). In addition to the actions I took in Executive Order No. 12853, the reinstated sanctions in the Haitian Transactions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 580 (the "HTR"), prohibit most unlicensed trade with Haiti, and block the assets of the *de facto* regime in Haiti and the Government of Haiti. Restrictions on the entry into U.S. ports of vessels whose Haitian calls would violate U.S. or OAS sanctions had they been made by U.S. persons were also reinstated.

Also effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., October 18, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12872 (58 *Fed. Reg.* 54029), authorizing the Department of the Treasury to block assets of persons who have: (1) contributed to the obstruction of UNSC resolutions 841 and 873, the Governors Island Agreement, or the activities of the U.N. Mission in Haiti; (2) perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or (3) materially or financially supported either the obstruction or the violence referred to above. This authority is in addition to the blocking authority provided for in the original sanctions and in Executive Order No. 12853 of June 30, 1993, and ensures adequate authority to reach assets subject to U.S. jurisdiction of military and police officials, civilian "attaches" and their financial patrons meeting these criteria. A list of 41 such individuals was published on November 1, 1993, by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of

the Department of the Treasury (58 *Fed. Reg.* 58480).

On October 18, I ordered the deployment of six U.S. Navy vessels off Haiti's shores. To improve compliance with the ban on petroleum and munitions shipments to Haiti contained in UNSC resolutions 841 and 873, my Administration succeeded in securing the passage of UNSC Resolution No. 875. UNSC Resolution 875 calls upon the United Nations Member States acting either nationally or through regional agencies or arrangements to halt inward maritime shipping for Haiti in order to inspect and verify that the Haiti-bound cargo does not contain UNSC-prohibited petroleum or arms. A multinational Maritime Interdiction Force that includes elements of the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Coast Guard has been established and now patrols the waters off Haiti.

7. The declaration of the national emergency on October 4, 1991, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency declaration was reported to the Congress on October 4, 1991, pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). The additional sanctions set forth in Executive Orders Nos. 12779, 12853, and 12872, were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c), and represent the response by the United States to the United Nations Security Council and OAS directives and recommendations discussed above.

8. Since my report of November 13, 1993, FAC, in consultation with the Department of State and other Federal agencies, has issued General Notice No. 3, "Notification of Blocked Individuals of Haiti." The Notice, issued January 27, 1994, identifies 523 officers of the Haitian Armed Forces who have been determined by the Department of the Treasury to be Blocked Individuals of Haiti. General Notice No. 4, issued April 4, 1994, identifies an additional 27 individual officers of the Haitian Armed Forces and one civilian who have been determined by the Department of the Treasury to be Blocked Individuals of Haiti. These are persons who are members of the *de facto* regime or are blocked pursuant to Executive Orders Nos. 12853 or 12872. (A comprehensive list of Blocked Individuals of Haiti was published on April 7, 1994 (59 *Fed. Reg.* 16548)).

U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in transactions with these individuals and with all officers of the Haitian military (as members of the *de facto* regime), whether or not named in General Notice No. 3 or No. 4, unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. Additionally, all interests in property of these individuals that are in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches, are blocked. U.S. persons are not prohibited, however, from paying funds owed to these entities or individuals into the appropriate blocked account in domestic U.S. financial institutions. Copies of the comprehensive list and of General Notices No. 3 and No. 4 are attached.

A policy statement, effective January 31, 1994 (59 *Fed. Reg. 8134*, February 18, 1994), was published to extend until March 31, 1994, the expiration date for all current assembly sector licenses issued by FAC pursuant to the HTR, and a second policy notice, effective March 29, 1994, was published on April 1, 1994 (59 *Fed. Reg.* 15342), extending these licenses through May 31, 1994. These licenses have provided an exception to the comprehensive U.S. trade embargo on Haiti under which the "assembly sector" has continued to receive parts and supplies from, and supply finished products to, persons in the United States. Copies of the policy statements are attached.

Assembly sector trade with the United States accounted for a significant portion of Haiti's imports, and a substantial majority of its exports, prior to the institution of the OAS-requested embargo in November 1991. Although initially suspended due to the embargo, assembly sector imports from and exports to the United States were allowed to resume on a case-by-case basis beginning in February 1992 in order to keep poorer segments of the Haitian population employed and to reduce their incentive to attempt illegal and dangerous immigration by sea to the United States and other countries. However, the continuing uncertainties of the Haitian situation have led to a sharp decline in assembly sector activity, where employment is now estimated to be no more than 10 percent of pre-embargo levels.

9. In implementing the Haitian sanctions program, FAC has made extensive use of its authority to specifically license transactions with respect to Haiti in an effort to mitigate the effects of the sanctions on the legitimate Government of Haiti and on the livelihood of Haitian workers employed by Haiti's assembly sector, and to ensure the availability of necessary medicines and medical supplies and the undisrupted flow of humanitarian donations to Haiti's poor. For example, specific licenses were issued: (1) permitting expenditures from blocked assets for the operations of the legitimate Government of Haiti; (2) permitting U.S. firms with pre-embargo relationships with product assembly operations in Haiti to resume those relationships in order to continue employment for their workers or, if they choose to withdraw from Haiti, to return to the United States assembly equipment, machinery, and parts and materials previously exported to Haiti; (3) permitting U.S. companies operating in Haiti to establish, under specified circumstances, interest-bearing blocked reserve accounts in commercial or investment banking institutions in the United States for deposit of amounts owed the *de facto* regime; (4) permitting the continued material support of U.S. and international religious, charitable, public health, and other humanitarian organizations and projects operating in Haiti; (5) authorizing commercial sales of agricultural inputs such as fertilizer and foodcrop seeds; and (6) in order to combat deforestation, permitting the importation of agricultural products grown on trees.

10. During this reporting period, U.S.-led OAS initiatives resulted in even greater intensification and coordination of enforcement activities. Continued close coordination with the U.S. Customs Service in Miami sharply reduced the number of attempted exports of unmanifested, unauthorized merchandise. New FAC initiatives are expected to result in more effective coordination of Customs Service and Department of Justice activities in prosecution of embargo violations. During the reporting period, the multinational Maritime Interdiction Force that contains elements of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard, continued to patrol offshore Haiti and to conduct ship boardings, inspections of cargoes bound for Haiti, identification of suspected violators, and referrals for investigation. The Maritime Interdiction Force has boarded 612 ships and diverted 38 of these ships for various reasons (inaccessibility of cargo for inspection, items prohibited by the United Nations Security Council embargo on board) from its inception to March 30, 1994. Actions have been taken to counter embargo violations as they have developed. There have been high-level discussions with the Government of the Dominican Republic to encourage its stated desire to cooperate with the United Nations in increasing the effectiveness of the enforcement of the sanctions on that country's common border with Haiti across which fuel smuggling is occurring. Other steps have been taken to control sales of bunker fuel by ships in Haitian ports and smuggling of fuel in Haitian-Dominican coastal waters.

The Department of the Treasury, in close coordination with Department of State and the intelligence community, continues to designate "Blocked Individuals of Haiti," blocking the assets of persons (civilian as well as military) whose conduct meets the criteria of Executive Orders Nos. 12755, 12853, and 12872, including persons obstructing the U.N. Mission in Haiti or the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement and persons perpetuating or contributing to the violence in Haiti. The list was last expanded on January 27, when the entire officer corps of the Haitian Armed Forces was blocked as part of the *de facto* regime in Haiti, and on April 4, when one additional civilian was added to the list. As others subverting democracy in Haiti and additional members of the officer corps are identified by name, these names will be incorporated into the list of "Blocked Individuals of Haiti."

Since the last report, 35 penalties, totaling in excess of $146,000, have been collected from U.S. businesses and individuals for violations of the Regulations. Eighteen violations involved unlicensed import- and export-related activity. As of March 4, 1994, 12 payments of penalties assessed against the masters of vessels for unauthorized trade transactions or violations of entry restrictions totalled about $53,000. A significant penalty collection during the reporting period was from American Airlines for its direct payments of taxes and fees to the *de facto* regime in Haiti.

11. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 4, 1993, through April 3, 1994, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Haiti are estimated at about $3.4 million, most of which represent wage and salary

costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

12. I am committed to the restoration of democracy in Haiti and determined to see that Haiti and the Haitian people resume their rightful place in our hemispheric community of democracies. Active U.S. support for United Nations/OAS efforts to resolve the Haitian crisis has led to the maintenance and enforcement of sweeping economic sanctions. Our diplomatic efforts complementing these sanctions are designed to encourage and facilitate participation by all legitimate Haitian political elements in a broad-based political process that will bring about the fulfillment of the undertakings they made in the Governors Island Agreement so that Haitian democracy can be restored and President Aristide can return to Haiti. Such a political process will enable the lifting of sanctions and the start of Haiti's economic reconstruction and national reconciliation. The United States will continue to play a leadership role in the international community's program of support and assistance for the restoration of democracy and return of President Aristide to Haiti.

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 25, 1994.

Remarks on the South African Elections and an Exchange With Reporters
April 26, 1994

The President. This delegation from the House and Senate is here to report on the trip that they took to South Africa a couple of weeks ago. And I'd like to just begin by offering the congratulations of the United States to the people of South Africa for beginning the election process today.

I'm sure many of you have already seen some of the pictures that are coming in. They're very, very moving. There was one older lady who had to wait for a few hours. And she said that she'd been waiting all of her life, that a couple hours more was no problem for her.

I think it is a—especially in light of the extra round of violence that the people have endured in the last few days, that the renewed determination of the people there to claim their democracy and to have this multiracial election is really a wonderful thing. The United States is committed to this process and its success. And we'll be there as your partner when the elections are over.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you confident the Serbs will meet the deadline this evening?

The President. Well, we expect them to. And of course, we're following it very closely today.

Q. Are you confident you've worked out the problems with the United Nations in case they do not?

The President. I believe that we have. We worked hard on it last weekend. And as I told you, I believe that we have.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, are you going to have to scale back your welfare plan because you've decided against any taxes to pay for it?

The President. Well, in the beginning we knew that, based on the CBO budgeting rules, we wouldn't have—we couldn't raise enough money anyway to guarantee a job, publicly funded job, for every person on public assistance that might not have a job within the 2-year time period. So we'll have to phase that portion of it in. But it'll still be quite an extensive program.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:50 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a meeting with congressional leaders. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the South African Elections
April 26, 1994

On behalf of all Americans, I want to congratulate the people of South Africa on the start of the 3-day elections now taking place in their country. Today's images of South Africans—black and white—going to the polls in the face of intimidation by vicious opponents of democracy inspire the imagination and are a stern rebuke to the cynics of the world.

South Africans are taking control of their own destinies and preparing to tackle the fundamental challenges of establishing a government of national unity, restoring stability and prosperity, and improving the lives of the South African people. I am proud of the role so many Americans have played in the struggle against apartheid. I can assure South Africans that we will be just as involved in helping to build the nonracial democracy that can come in its wake.

Memorandum on Environmentally Beneficial Landscaping
April 26, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Environmentally and Economically Beneficial Practices on Federal Landscaped Grounds

The Report of the National Performance Review contains recommendations for a series of environmental actions, including one to increase environmentally and economically beneficial landscaping practices at Federal facilities and federally funded projects. Environmentally beneficial landscaping entails utilizing techniques that complement and enhance the local environment and seek to minimize the adverse effects that the landscaping will have on it. In particular, this means using regionally native plants and employing landscaping practices and technologies that conserve water and prevent pollution.

These landscaping practices should benefit the environment, as well as generate long-term costs savings for the Federal Government. For example, the use of native plants not only protects our natural heritage and provides wildlife habitat, but also can reduce fertilizer, pesticide, and irrigation demands and their associated costs because native plants are suited to the local environment and climate.

Because the Federal Government owns and landscapes large areas of land, our stewardship presents a unique opportunity to provide leadership in this area and to develop practical and cost-effective methods to preserve and protect that which has been entrusted to us. Therefore, for Federal grounds, Federal projects, and federally funded projects, I direct that agencies shall, where cost-effective and to the extent practicable:

(a) use regionally native plants for landscaping;

(b) design, use, or promote construction practices that minimize adverse effects on the natural habitat;

(c) seek to prevent pollution by, among other things, reducing fertilizer and pesticide use, using integrated pest management techniques, recycling green waste, and minimizing runoff. Landscaping practices that reduce the use of toxic chemicals provide one approach for agencies to reach reduction goals established in Executive Order No. 12856, "Federal Compliance with Right-To-Know Laws and Pollution Prevention Requirements;"

(d) implement water-efficient practices, such as the use of mulches, efficient irrigation systems, audits to determine exact landscaping water-use needs, and recycled or reclaimed water and the selecting and siting of plants in a manner that conserves water and controls soil erosion. Landscaping practices, such as planting regionally native shade trees around buildings to reduce air

conditioning demands, can also provide innovative measures to meet the energy consumption reduction goal established in Executive Order No. 12902, "Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation at Federal Facilities;" and

(e) create outdoor demonstrations incorporating native plants, as well as pollution prevention and water conservation techniques, to promote awareness of the environmental and economic benefits of implementing this directive. Agencies are encouraged to develop other methods for sharing information on landscaping advances with interested nonfederal parties.

In order to assist agencies in implementing this directive, the Federal Environmental Executive shall:

(a) establish an interagency working group to develop recommendations for guidance, including compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, 4331–4335, and 4341–4347, and training needs to implement this directive. The recommendations are to be developed by November 1994; and

(b) issue the guidance by April 1995. To the extent practicable, agencies shall incorporate this guidance into their landscaping programs and practices by February 1996.

In addition, the Federal Environmental Executive shall establish annual awards to recognize outstanding landscaping efforts of agencies and individual employees. Agencies are encouraged to recognize exceptional performance in the implementation of this directive through their awards programs.

Agencies shall advise the Federal Environmental Executive by April 1996 on their progress in implementing this directive.

To enhance landscaping options and awareness, the Department of Agriculture shall conduct research on the suitability, propagation, and use of native plants for landscaping. The Department shall make available to agencies and the public the results of this research.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks at the Funeral Service for President Richard Nixon in Yorba Linda, California

April 27, 1994

President Nixon opened his memoirs with a simple sentence, "I was born in a house my father built." Today we can look back at this little house and still imagine a young boy sitting by the window of the attic he shared with his three brothers, looking out to a world he could then himself only imagine. From those humble roots, as from so many humble beginnings in this country, grew the force of a driving dream, a dream that led to the remarkable journey that ends here today where it all began, beside the same tiny home, mail-ordered from back East, near this towering oak tree which, back then, was a mere seedling.

President Nixon's journey across the American landscape mirrored that of his entire nation in this remarkable century. His life was bound up with the striving of our whole people, with our crises and our triumphs.

When he became President, he took on challenges here at home on matters from cancer research to environmental protection, putting the power of the Federal Government where Republicans and Democrats had neglected to put it in the past. In foreign policy, he came to the Presidency at a time in our history when Americans were tempted to say we had had enough of the world. Instead, he knew we had to reach out to old friends and old enemies alike. He would not allow America to quit the world.

Remarkably, he wrote 9 of his 10 books after he left the Presidency, working his way back into the arena he so loved by writing and thinking, and engaging us in his dialog.

For the past year, even in the final weeks of his life, he gave me his wise counsel, especially with regard to Russia. One thing in particular left a profound impression on me.

Though this man was in his ninth decade, he had an incredibly sharp and vigorous and rigorous mind.

As a public man, he always seemed to believe the greatest sin was remaining passive in the face of challenges. And he never stopped living by that creed. He gave of himself with intelligence and energy and devotion to duty. And his entire country owes him a debt of gratitude for that service. Oh yes, he knew great controversy amid defeat as well as victory. He made mistakes, and they, like his accomplishments, are part of his life and record.

But the enduring lesson of Richard Nixon is that he never gave up being part of the action and passion of his times. He said many times that unless a person has a goal, a new mountain to climb, his spirit will die. Well, based on our last phone conversation and the letter he wrote me just a month ago, I can say that his spirit was very much alive to the very end. That is a great tribute to him, to his wonderful wife, Pat, to his children, and to his grandchildren whose love he so depended on and whose love he returned in full measure.

Today is a day for his family, his friends, and his nation to remember President Nixon's life in totality. To them, let us say, may the day of judging President Nixon on anything less than his entire life and career come to a close. May we heed his call to maintain the will and the wisdom to build on America's greatest gift, its freedom, to lead a world full of difficulty to the just and lasting peace he dreamed of.

As it is written in the words of a hymn I heard in my church last Sunday, "Grant that I may realize that the trifling of life creates differences, but that in the higher things, we are all one." In the twilight of his life, President Nixon knew that lesson well. It is, I feel certain, a faith he would want us all to keep.

And so, on behalf of all four former Presidents who are here, President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and on behalf of a grateful nation, we bid farewell to Richard Milhous Nixon.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 5 p.m. at the Richard Nixon Library and Birthplace. This release also included remarks by Rev. Billy Graham, who conducted the service; former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger; Senator Robert Dole; and Gov. Pete Wilson of California.

Nomination for United States District Court Judges

April 27, 1994

The President today nominated the following seven individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court: Harold Baer, Jr., Denise Cote, John G. Koeltl, and Barrington D. Parker, Jr. for the Southern District of New York; Rosemary S. Pooler for the Northern District of New York; John Corbett O'Meara for the Eastern District of Michigan; and Robert J. Timlin for the Central District of California.

"I am pleased to nominate these distinguished individuals to serve on the Federal bench," the President said today. "Each has an outstanding record of achievement in the legal community and public service."

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

Remarks to the National Council on Aging

April 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Jim and Dan, and ladies and gentlemen. What a way to start the day. I am so grateful for the opportunity to be with you today and grateful to the National Council on Aging for your early and continued support.

I want to acknowledge so many of you who are here. I've already mentioned Jim and Dan and Charles Schottland, who was Commissioner of Social Security under President Eisenhower; Bill Bechill, Commissioner of Aging under President Johnson. I want to thank, especially, my good friend Arthur Flemming, who has been such a tireless advocate for what we are trying to do.

You know, yesterday I had the moving responsibility as President to go to California to participate in the funeral of President Nixon. And in preparation for that event, I had asked my staff to get me copies of the last three books that he had written, and I read in all of them and almost completed in its entirety the last book. The message of all of them was that we would never be a strong nation at home unless we were strong abroad, unless we continued to lead the world. I believe that.

I also believe that you cannot lead the world from this country unless we are strong at home, unless the American people are self-confident and united. In a way, that is more true today than ever before; our destinies at home and abroad are intertwined. Very frequently, when we ask our partners, people we wish to be our friends around the world, to avoid the proliferation of weapons or to improve their practices on human rights, they will say, "Well, what about all the people you have in prison, and what about your murder rate? What about the things that go wrong in America?"

This is becoming a very small world. But in the end, it is clear that the strength of every nation beyond its borders, fundamentally, is rooted in the ability of nations to be strong within their borders. And in a great democracy like ours, that means that we have to have a country where we're moving forward and where we're coming together, where we are not divided by age or gender or race or region or walk of life, and where there is a sense of fairness and a strong sense of the future.

When I ran for President, I did it because I thought we needed to change our direction, to get the country moving again, and to pull the country together again. We meet at a time when the country is showing persistent signs of economic improvement.

We just got this morning the information on growth for the first quarter of the first 3 months of this year. It was 2.6 percent; that's a moderate level of growth. But that follows 7 percent growth from the last 3 months of last year, and that is in spite of a very bitter winter. I also should tell you that, consistent with my commitment to bring the deficit down, Government spending went down, but growth in the private sector was over 4 percent, which is very, very brisk indeed.

These are numbers on line with our projections for growth, and they're enough to keep the deficit moving down and job creation moving up. This is a very important thing: more jobs, more growth, lower deficit. Those are the things that I campaigned to the American people on. We have tried to face this difficult issue. After a decade and more in which the American debt quadrupled, in which the annual deficit tripled, by next year our deficit will be a smaller percentage of our annual income than that of any other advanced economy with which we compete. And I am very proud of that.

I say that as a prelude to discussing the health care issue, because it was not easy to pass the economic plan. I remind you, it passed by only one vote twice in both Houses. As the Vice President often reminds me, every time he votes in the Senate we win. [*Laughter*] The more you think about that, the funnier it gets. I hope I don't have to see him vote too often. [*Laughter*] It was not easy to do that. People said, well, the sky would fall, this would happen, that would happen. The truth is, the economic program, just as we said, raised income tax rates for the top 1.2 percent of our country, that this year, about one in six working Americans will get a tax cut because they're working, they have children, and they're hovering just above the poverty line. And we want to encourage them to work, not go on welfare. We want to reward their struggles to be good parents and good workers at the same time.

There are real, new incentives there for small businesses to reinvest in their businesses and lower their taxes—90 percent of the small businesses eligible for tax cuts under this program—real incentives for people to invest in the new technologies of the 21st century and relentless budget cuts. We eliminate 100 Government programs in our plan. We cut 300 more so we can invest more in education and technology and in the future of this country. These are important.

But I want to say, we are on this course because this administration took on a tough fight, won it by a narrow margin, and gave the

country a chance to grow again and get out of the paralysis that had been gripping us.

Now we face such a fight in health care. And we have difficult decisions to make. People say to me all the time, "Why do you just keep taking on these things? Why don't you just stay with the economic program and tell everybody how well you did and let it go and work on that? Why take on tough issue after tough issue after tough issue?" I'll tell you why. Because, first of all, in the end, as a country, we cannot go forward economically and come together unless we recognize that all these issues are related one to another. And secondly, we will never have a sense of fairness and security which is necessary for us to be strong as a people until we deal with our thorniest difficulties: whether it's crime and violence or the problems with the tatters in our health care system. So I ask you to think about that today.

Change has always been difficult. And over the last six decades, every President, or most Presidents, at least since Franklin Roosevelt, have sought to do something about the health care problem. Roosevelt and Truman, Johnson and Carter and Richard Nixon all tried to find a way to provide for universal coverage so that everybody could have health care security. And always along the way, the interest groups who were afraid of the change were able to block it.

At the same time, a lot of good things happened. Franklin Roosevelt created Social Security, and we are keeping it strong and we are continuing to do that. In this session of Congress, I am convinced that the Congress will vote for a bill, and I will sign it, to set up Social Security as an independent agency that will be able to do the things that need to be done. Within the next few years, every American will get a statement every year of their Social Security account, what they have paid in, what has happened to the money, what the benefits should be coming out. This is of fundamental importance, and it has changed our country for the better forever.

President Kennedy and President Johnson worked to create Medicare. And it has done a world of good. People complain about Government medicine. Well, Medicare is a private program in the sense that you choose your doctors and your providers, but it's paid for with a payroll tax. It has an administrative cost of about 3 percent, which is dramatically lower than the administrative costs of the 1,500 different insurance companies with their thousands of different policies, creating nightmares of who's covered and who isn't. So, Medicare has worked pretty well. But we should also note that, even there, there are problems. We built Social Security and Medicare on the fundamental belief that work should be rewarded, that when people do their part as Americans they are entitled to something in return. I was raised to believe that. The idea for younger people was that if you worked hard and you got a good education and you did the right things, you would have a better standard of living than your parents.

The idea for older people was that we would eventually find a way to make one's later years not shrouded with the threat of poverty. And in 1985, for the first time since we have been keeping such numbers, there was a lower poverty rate among people over 65 than among people under 65. It was a great achievement brought about by decades of effort.

But still, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that over the last 20 years, the link between work and reward has begun to weaken, partly because of the loss of high-paying manufacturing jobs that Americans could get with hard work but without a lot of formal education. That meant that, for two decades, more and more Americans worked harder for the same or lower pay. And as health care benefits at work began to erode or began to cost more, that also drove down the standard of living. Now we know a family can lose its home or its savings if there's a serious illness. And we know that 81 million of us live in families where someone's had a preexisting condition so that they either can't get health insurance or they pay way too much for it or they can never change their job, because if they do, they'll lose their health insurance.

At the same time, even the pillars of our health care system, like Medicare, have shown some strains with the cost of Medicare going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And still, now you have people over 65 paying a higher percentage of their income out-of-pocket for health care than they did in 1965 when Medicare came in.

So for us to sit here and say that there is nothing for us to do on health care or we need to be just doing a little here and a little there and leave large pockets of this issue unanswered, it seems to me is a flight from responsibility,

responsibility to our children and grandchildren, and responsibility to our parents and grandparents.

I have tried to reestablish the connection between work and reward, between shoring up work and shoring up the family, between all the different peoples in this great country to build a stronger American community. That's why I worked so hard for the Family and Medical Leave Act; I didn't think you ought to have to lose your job if you had a sick parent or a newborn baby, and why I believe in—[*applause*]—and it's why I believe in things like the tax cut we gave to the working poor and people on moderate incomes.

We have somehow got to find a way in this country, in the midst of all of these international global economic pressures, not only to generate more jobs but to give our people who are working and are doing the right thing a greater sense that they're part of a community in which they can have fairness and security if they do their part.

So a lot of what is behind this health care reform effort is designed to do that. And yet, in order to do that, as with every community effort, everyone has to pay a part and play a part. Today, millions of working families are being short-changed by this health care system. It is stacked against them. Today, so many millions of Americans are subject to the fine print in insurance coverage. They are denied coverage because of preexisting conditions; they can have their benefits cut off because of lifetime limits just when they need it most. Three out of four Americans are under health insurance policies with lifetime limits, which is just fine if you have a normal experience in you and your family. But if you have a couple of kids in a row with very serious conditions, or even one who is fortunate enough to live but is terribly ill, you can run out of those benefits when you need it the most. And no one is immune. Millions of Americans have coverage for themselves at work but no coverage for their spouses or children simply because their employers cannot afford it under the present system.

Now, this is not because there are a lot of bad people in this system, it's because the system is nonsensical. There are many fine insurance agents, for example, that do the very best job they can giving insurance to the small business that they provide coverage for, the 20- or 30- or 40-person small business; they give them the best deal they can. It's just that they can't give them a better deal when small businesses are insured in small pools and one serious illness, one AIDS case can bankrupt the pool. You can't ask people to go into this enterprise and lose money.

The problem is it is poorly organized. It is organized in a way that is guaranteed to have excessive administrative costs, unlimited problems from a bureaucratic standpoint, and huge numbers of people who have no coverage or inadequate coverage.

Now, that's what people have to face in this country today. As has been noted by many politicians in campaigns in the last couple of years, if a person goes to jail, they get guaranteed health care. If a person goes on welfare, you get guaranteed health care. If you get out of jail and take a low-wage job or you get off welfare and take a low-wage job, you may be paying your taxes to provide health care for the people who are still in jail or the people that have to be on welfare, but you lose your own.

Now, how anybody in the wide world can defend that is beyond me. And some people would say, "Oh, Mr. President, that's not fair. I don't defend it, I just don't want you to change it if I have to play a role in it." [*Laughter*] I think every one of us would agree that our children deserve the opportunity to grow up in an America that is strong and fair, an America that gives our young people the opportunity to strike out continuously for new jobs or take a different opportunity in a different city, an America that at least recognizes that in this global economy the average 18-year-old will change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime and, therefore, we have a vested interest as a people in seeing that all those folks are well-trained, continually retrained, and never denied the opportunity to change simply because of the absence of health care for themselves or their children.

There are some people who say, "Well, okay, this is a problem, but the President's wrong about how to solve it. We should not ask all employers to make some contribution to their employees' health care. And for those employees that have no health insurance at all, we should not ask those employees to do it in just that way in this partnership."

Now, keep in mind, 9 out of 10 people who have private insurance get it through the workplace. And 8 out of 10 people who don't have

any insurance are in families with at least one person working. So my proposal is not a Government takeover of the health care system, it is to extend the system that we have now that has worked for many, is beginning to work for more as big groups of employers are able to control their costs. I just want to take that and apply it to everyone.

But there are some who say, "Well, that's not right." Instead of asking employers to take responsibility, they say we ought to either raise taxes or take money from Medicare or do both to help working families without insurance.

Now, I don't think that's such a hot idea. I do think we can save money from the Medicare program because it's going up to 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. But if we save money from the Medicare program, since it's paid for by payroll taxes under the understanding it will go to the benefit of the elderly people in this country, that savings ought to be put into providing for community-based, long-term care and prescription drugs for elderly people.

Again, people say to me who disagree with this, "Well, but we can't—we don't want to face the heat," or "We can't somehow get the votes together to ask all employers to make a modest contribution to their employees' health care. And so isn't this the second best thing?" And my answer is no. Why? We have studies that show that all of us would be better off over not just the long-run, but the medium-run, if elderly people who use 4 times the prescription drugs that non-elderly people do had access to a prescription drug benefit on Medicare.

Why should a person—again, this goes back to the welfare and jail analogy—if you're in your senior years and you have worked hard and you've saved all your life and you've provided the best you can for yourself, why should you be forced to spend yourself into poverty to qualify for Medicaid to get prescription drugs? I just don't think it's right.

And of course, we know that's usually not what happens. What usually happens is people just don't get all the prescription drugs they should have. That's usually what happens. And so what happens then? We're being penny wise and pound foolish. We save a little money as a country for a while. We avoid these expenditures and then, sooner or later, the consequences of not following the prescribed medical treatment are felt, and the person often has a much more expensive problem going to the hospital. You can spend more money in 3 days in the hospital than on a year of rather expensive prescription drug treatment. So, we would actually save money, and there are studies which show this.

Secondly, with regard to long-term care, I think it's important to note that people over 65 are the fastest growing part of the population—and within that group, people over 80 are growing faster still—that all of us have a vested interest in seeing that all of the rest of us live as long and as well and as independently as we can, but that if you look at the numbers, there is no way in the wide world we could afford as a society, nor should we, send everybody who needs some sort of help in long-term care to the most expensive long-term care, namely that in a nursing home.

So community-based long-term care is—whether we deal with this or not now—we can run away from this and pretend that this whole problem is like an ingrown toenail we don't want to deal with. But if you look at the population trends of this country, we will be forced to deal with this sooner or later. We cannot walk away from this. The numbers are clear. The numbers of us and our parents who will be alive and well and doing well and sharp as a tack in their eighties, but who will need some form of long-term care in their eighties, many times in their nineties, are going to be overwhelming. We must not walk away from this.

So I say, if we're going to bring some rationality to this system, if we're going to have more competition, if we're going to allow people to buy health care in bigger groups and so that there'll be all kinds of ways we can save money, take the Medicare savings and prepare the way for a better life for our senior citizens and a stronger society for all of us by putting it into prescription drugs and long-term care. Don't use it for coverage.

Let me also say again that in order to do this, we are going to have to find a way to cover the people who don't have health care coverage now. Under our plan, we do two things. We ask all employers who don't provide coverage now or who provide very limited coverage to pay a fair share of a comprehensive package that includes primary and preventive health care benefits. We also ask workers who have no coverage now or have inadequate coverage to pay a fair share of that. And for small businesses with low average payrolls, we offer

discounts in those premiums so that no business will go broke. Now, it seems to me that is a fair thing to do.

In addition to that, we provide ways for small businesses and self-employed people to join together in big pools so that they can buy health care at the same prices that those of us who work for the Federal Government or people who work for big businesses can.

Now, I have heard all this business about—the big attack on our program is that Government is trying to take over the health care system, and it's one-seventh of the economy. It's just not so. That is not what this plan does. This plan does not even finance the coverage of people without coverage through Medicare, which most Americans think is a pretty good deal, and they forget it's a payroll tax. But otherwise, it's a totally private system.

All we do is to build on what has worked now by saying, let's have all employers do something for their employees. Let's have the employees that don't have any insurance provide something for themselves. Let's give discounts to people who are most vulnerable, the small businesses with low average payrolls, and then, let's put everybody in big pools so they can afford to buy health care at decent prices. That is the fundamental outline of our plan. It makes a lot of sense.

And I am convinced that it is the best thing for the future. Because of the way we raise funds and because of the savings that will come to very large companies under this plan, we ask them to help to contribute, along with a rising cigarette tax, to the discount fund, to increases for medical research, and for improvements in public health, because there are so many people, particularly in rural areas and some inner cities who wouldn't have access to health care, even if they had insurance, without stronger public health and because we simply cannot turn away from our obligation to keep America in the forefront of medical research.

Now, let me just say what will happen if we don't do this. What will happen if we don't do this is that you will have more and more people every month losing their health insurance, you'll have more and more people in small business being angry and frustrated because they'll have higher deductibles and higher copays and less coverage than others, and the system will slowly, slowly, slowly start to creak. Now, right now there is a lull because medical inflation has dropped so much. Medical inflation has dropped so much because a lot of folks have gone into these big pools and are buying better—buying health care on better terms and because, frankly, medical inflation always goes down when the President starts talking about covering everybody. It's happened every time it's happened, every time this has ever occurred.

But if you look at the long run, it is clear that we have to do it. And let me just say another word, and again, I know I'm preaching to the saved on this issue, but this long-term care time is a big deal. We can't provide this—all this coverage overnight. You know we phase it in gradually. But if you think about the number of people with Alzheimer's, you think about the need to provide for respite care for family caregivers, just in that one case, this is going to be a huge deal. If we want to encourage people to keep their loved ones at home, we're going to have to give them a break so they can do it and not neglect all their other family responsibilities and not neglect the quality of their own lives.

I also want to say something about another group of Americans, and that's the millions of Americans with disabilities. We know that if you make two changes in the health care reform system, if you provide long-term care in community-based settings to people with disabilities, as well as the elderly, you provide for community rating so that people with disabilities don't have to pay a whole lot more and their employers don't have to pay a lot more to insure them because they're all in huge pools, we know that we're going to get something out of that as a society. That will make it possible for millions of disabled people to live more fruitful, fuller lives, more productive lives, to contribute not only to themselves but to the rest of us as well. And believe me, they will pay back what it costs the rest of us to have long-term care and insurance reforms. They will pay it back, because they will go to work, they will earn money, they will pay taxes, they will make this a stronger country. And we need them—we need them to do that in this country.

I want to say again how grateful I am to all of you for your help. I'm grateful for the legacy that's been left to us by people like Arthur Flemming and my great and departed friend Claude Pepper, and so many others who have worked for the reforms that have gone before. We just have to decide whether we're

going to follow in their footsteps or to be defeated once again by the forces of inertia.

Sure this is a hard fight. And you can't change this system without breaking some eggs. That's what omelets require. [*Laughter*] But I do want to make again the main point: Don't let anybody tell you this is a Government-run program; it's not. It's an extension to the system we have now with private insurance and private health care. Number two, what the Government does is to require everybody to do something, so that everybody will have some coverage, and then to give small businesses and self-employed people the opportunity to get together so that they can buy on the same terms people in big businesses and Government can. Number three, we provide funds for a discount pool for the small businesses and people on low wages so they can get a discount in those small businesses so they won't go broke. And we provide a pool for funds for medical research and technology and for the major teaching institutions of the country so we can stay ahead of the rest of the world and lead the world in the development of medical science and medical technology, something I think you all want us to do. We organized this system so that we can begin to provide a prescription drug benefit for people who need it and community-based long-term care. That's what the Government does. It seems to me that is an entirely appropriate thing for the Government to do. It is entirely consistent with what has happened before.

I want to make two other points. No one who has a better deal than the deal in our health care system need lose it. We do not set a ceiling. So for the working people out there whose employers pay all their benefits, they can go on and do it. We don't set a ceiling, but we do set a floor below which people cannot fall. And that is important.

The second thing I want to say is we do not restrict choice, we increase choice. We give choice of providers back to the employees themselves. And we let them make it, a choice from at least three different kinds of plans every year. And every year they get to revise their choice if that is what they wish to do. If we do not pass this plan, then the trend which exists in the American work force today will continue, where today, already, fewer than half the Americans who are insured at work have a choice of providers. That is the case today.

So there is an air of unreality about a lot of the debate, and I think it's important to cut through. But the truth is, the big debate on Capitol Hill is over whether all American employers and their employees who either have no insurance today or woefully inadequate insurance will have to assume some responsibility for providing this health care, even though they will get discounted prices if they're small businesses with low average payrolls.

Now, I say that to this group to make this point: I want you to go to Congress and lobby for long-term care. I want you to go to Congress. I want you to go to Congress and lobby for the prescription drug benefit. But if we do not sell the fundamental point, which is that we don't cover everybody and provide health security to all because unlike all the countries with which we compete we have not adopted one of the very few options available to cover everybody, if we don't do that, then we won't get to the prescription drugs and the long-term care. If we don't adopt this fundamental statement of our responsibility to each other, to the working families, to the children, and to the future of America, then we won't get to step two. It is setting in place a system in which finally, finally we join the ranks of the other advanced nations and say, "We are going to give health security to all families. That little child does never have to worry about whether there will be health care." If we don't do that, we don't get to the next steps.

And so I ask you, lobby this Congress. Go back home and lobby your friends and neighbors, tell them that the rap on what we're trying to do, that it's some Government takeover of health care; that it's some bureaucratic nightmare, is just not so. That when you get down to the bottom line, we are asking everybody to take some responsibility for the health care security of country. That is, after all, how we finance Social Security, how we finance Medicare. Everybody took responsibility for doing the adequate thing so that all of us could go forward together.

This is a great test of whether we are going to sensibly face one of the most significant human problems, one of the most significant financial problems that we will ever face. It is defining us as a people. Do we have the courage to do this? Or are we once again going to say, "Well, this is something everybody else can do, but we can't figure out how to do it." I want

you there when we sign a bill to provide health care security for all Americans. But you have to make sure we can do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, James Sykes, chairman of the board, National Council on Aging, announced that Hillary Clinton was the 1994 Ollie Randall Award recipient and asked the President to deliver the award to her.*]

The President. Now, this is a mission I can fulfill. [*Laughter*]

Jim, let me thank you and all of you for this award. It is one I know that Hillary will treasure. Selfishly, obviously, I think it's one she very much deserves. A lot of fine Americans have won this award, among them President Johnson and my dear friend and colleague Senator David Pryor. I can tell you that I have obviously known my wife a good long while, and I think I know her pretty well. I have never seen her work as hard or care as much about anything she has ever done as she does this great endeavor. And the ultimate award, as I said, will be seeing your smiling faces when we sign the bill that is the cause of this effort. Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Daniel Thursz, president, National Council on Aging; Arthur Flemming, chair, Save Our Security; and the late Claude Pepper, Member of Congress and senior citizen advocate.

Exchange With Reporters
April 28, 1994

The Economy

Q. Have you had a chance to look at the—[*inaudible*]—numbers?

The President. I'm positive about it.

Q. Do you think it calmed the market fears about inflation?

The President. It certainly should. You look at this—the job numbers are still very good. This is the job numbers for the 4 years before our administration. Here are the private sector job numbers just for January of '93 through March of '94.

So this rate of growth is enough to keep the deficit coming down and jobs coming into the economy. And it certainly should send a clear signal to the markets saying we don't have an inflation worry.

I think that if you look at the pattern of the last few years, this means we'll have growth in the range of 3 percent this year, which means more jobs, steadily growing economy, more and more opportunity. So I feel good about it. But it ought to also send a clear signal that inflation is going to be at or below 3 percent. There is no inflation worry in this economy.

Social Security

Q. So why separate the Social Security Administration? Why is that necessary?

The President. Oh, I think that, first of all, that the Administration will tend to work better. The reinventing Government program under the Vice President almost recommended it. But there has also been a feeling, I think, among the constituencies of the senior citizen groups for years that if the Social Security Administration were separate, that would help to guarantee the integrity long-term of the Social Security program, the Social Security fund, and that there would be more responsiveness to the specific concerns of people on Social Security.

And I'll just give you one—we're going to start, as soon as we can, on a limited basis sending out statements to the American people. But within the next 4 or 5 years, we'll be able to send out statements to everybody in the country every year on their Social Security account: here's what you've got in it; here's how much money it's earned; here's what you can look forward to getting out. It will be a statement that every American who's stockholder, if you will, in Social Security will get every year. And it's all part of this effort to ensure that Social Security is there well into the next century even though our population is aging.

Q. Is the integrity——

The President. No, it's not at all.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:08 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at a "Take Our Daughters to Work" Luncheon
April 28, 1994

Well, first, let me join the First Lady and the Vice President in welcoming you here. It's delightful to look out at this sea of faces, to see the daughters of members of the White House staff, people who work for the National Government, people who work for the press, people who have come in from various schools around the Washington area and from other places. I know we've got a group here from Chicago over here, and I just had some pictures taken and shook hands with them.

When I was a much younger man, I was Governor of my State. And my daughter went to school one day, and she was 5 or 6 years old, and they said, "What does your father do for a living?" And she said, "He makes speeches"—which she pronounced "peaches" then—[*laughter*]—"drinks coffee, and talks on the telephone." And you know, that's about it. [*Laughter*] That's a pretty good description of it. And that's when she told me she wanted to be a scientist. [*Laughter*]

I am so pleased to see all of you here, and I especially want to thank the people who've come in from other places, too, to bring their children. I thank the Ms. Foundation and People magazine and everyone who is responsible for this lunch. The real message of this day, I think, is twofold: One is that we have to find a way to make it possible for all Americans to be successful as workers and successful as parents at the same time. We don't want there to be a division between our obligations to our children and our obligations to our work. And the second is, we want to say to the young women of our society: You can grow up to do anything, to be anything, to achieve anything that your imagination and your effort and your talent will let you achieve.

And so, I hope you have a wonderful day today. I hope this is something you'll always remember. And at the very least, I can say what this young lady, who is the daughter of one of our White House photographers and is working here—I said, "Are you having a good day today?" She said, "Sure, I got out of school." [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 12:45 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks on Presentation of the Presidential Awards for Design Excellence
April 28, 1994

Thank you very much. I'd like to first acknowledge the work of the jury, including the chair, Michael Vanderbyl, and the Members of Congress who have supported this endeavor, including Senator Pell, Congressmen de la Garza, Regula, Swett, and Yates.

We are here to honor the genius and skill of men and women whose work represents the highest level of excellence in American design, which consists of more than mere beauty; it is also at its best inspirational, enduring, functional and cost-effective. Design, at its best, can enrich our lives, beautify our surroundings, improve our productivity and performance, and even help to effect social change.

We see these qualities reflected in Federal design projects all across our Nation, from the wonderful monuments here in the Nation's Capital, to the simple elegance of Dulles Airport, to the highways of the Southwest, the day care

centers in Baltimore, the secure telephones in Federal agencies, even to some of our Government catalogs.

The Federal Government is the largest purchaser of design services in the world. And the designs we commission should reflect not only the best artistic execution available but also taxpayers' money well spent. Each of the eight projects chosen for the Presidential Awards for Design Excellence combine beauty, utility, and economy in a truly unique way.

The Army Corps of Engineers' novel navigational channel system, Bendway Weirs, will save millions of dollars every year on dredging and reduce navigational delays along a 180-mile stretch of the Mississippi River. That's something, because of my previous life, I know a little about.

The Farmers Home Administration's Mer Rouge low income rural housing was cited for, quote, "its poetic and uplifting architecture, and its cost-saving construction." Why can't we do that with all publicly supported housing?

EGIS explosives detector, commissioned by the State Department and the Federal Aviation Administration, is a brilliant design that showcases handsome artistry along with modern innovation and technology.

By blending nature, science, technology, and human expression, these and the other designs we honor today will be lasting monuments to the innovative spirit of Americans, and to the diversity and breadth of our culture. I salute the designers of these outstanding Federal projects and recognize those Departments who had the foresight to commission and oversee them. And I'm especially glad to see the Secretary of Agriculture here today, Secretary Espy, thank you very much.

At this time, I'm also pleased to announce the call for entries for the next round of Presidential Design Awards. I hope there will be many more entrants; I hope we will be able to highlight them. I can't help but say that I think that if we could get these award winners that we're recognizing today and the next round of entrants widely publicized around the United States, it could have a dramatic impact on having the American people feel that their tax dollars are being better spend. It could have in the aggregate a really positive way of connecting the American people to their Government again. And if you can do that, after all we have been through over these last decades that have alienated the American people from their Government, you will have helped us to do something profoundly important.

I'd like now to call upon the Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts to implement the awards program. She has done a terrific job, and I'm sure this will be one of her more enjoyable duties. Ms. Jane Alexander.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:40 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Vanderbyl, chair, Presidential Design Awards.

Statement on the Presidential Awards for Design Excellence

April 28, 1994

Quality design is essential if we are to compete effectively in the world marketplace, create more jobs, make our cities more livable, protect our environment, and enrich our cultural life.

The Nation is indebted to the designers and the Federal Government partners responsible for these exemplary projects. As we strive for first-rate quality for every tax dollar spent, theirs is an example of excellence we want others to emulate.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the recipients of the Presidential Awards for Design Excellence.

Remarks to the National Conference of Black Mayors
April 28, 1994

Thank you so much. I didn't know where Henry was going with that story. I thought it was going to get down to where he couldn't think of anything to thank me for but giving his brother a good job. [*Laughter*] My imagination was running wild, and so was yours. [*Laughter*]

Mayor Kelly, thank you for being with us and for giving such leadership to what is now my hometown. I've enjoyed being a citizen of Washington, DC, and going to schools and walking streets and doing things that Presidents often overlook. You can be in a cocoon here and forget you live in a city full of people and promise and problems. I've enjoyed that.

I want to thank Mayor Espy for his leadership and for his friendship. I want to say a special word of appreciation to Secretary Cisneros, who's agreed to be our administration's main link to you, for the outstanding leadership he has provided at Housing and Urban Development, the things that he's doing that have needed doing for so many years, some of which have immediate payoffs, some of which may have years to go before we fully see the benefits of them. But we have somebody in that job now who's full of ideas and heart and who works hard, who spent 2 nights in the public housing projects in Chicago so he could see what the people were going through up there.

I want to thank my longtime friend Carroll Willis and my friend Loretta Avent for the work they've done with this organization and keeping up with you. Sometimes you keep up with them and give them plenty to do, and I appreciate that. Give them a hand there, yes. [*Applause*] I knew I wanted Loretta to come to work for this administration when she worked in the campaign. And then after I got elected President, she moved into the Governor's Mansion, where we were getting literally hundreds of gifts and things a day. And we couldn't keep up with them all, couldn't box them up, couldn't keep up with them, and people streaming in there all the time. Loretta—I don't think Loretta ever went home before 2 o'clock at night, never got there any later than about 6:15 in the morning, and I figured anybody that needs less sleep than I do needs to be working in the White House. [*Laughter*] It's hard to have, you know—we had 24-hour-a-day security at the Governor's Mansion without the Secret Service and without even spelling Loretta; she was just there all the time. [*Laughter*]

I also want to say a special word of thanks to the members here who have been my friends for many years. I see a lot of you out there I've known for such a long time, and especially to the people from my home State who did a lot of work to help make it possible for me to get in a position to run for this job.

This is a remarkable week. We are seeing the unfolding of the first genuine multiracial elections in South Africa. We are seeing people who have been denied the vote for 350 years willing to stand in line in record numbers. And when they started this whole process, your country—I'm proud of this—put up about $35 million to help the people of South Africa learn how to conduct elections and how to participate and all that. I'm very proud of them.

You ought to see their ballot; they've got, I think, 18 different parties, maybe more, maybe 21; anyway, a big old number running for the various seats in the Parliament. And those people, they've got it figured out. There's one party called the Soccer Party, and there are little symbols of soccer balls just in case you forget who you want to vote for. If you like soccer, you can vote for them. They've got one party called the Kiss Party, and their symbol is a lipstick kiss, in case you're feeling romantic on election day. [*Laughter*] The man who got at the top of the ballot has got his picture up there. He looks remarkably like Nelson Mandela. In case you make a mistake, he wants your vote. [*Laughter*] It's very impressive, really. The whole thing has been astonishing. But the most impressive thing has been the way the people have showed up in record numbers, poor people, old people, people who never learned to read, people who just want to be a part of this.

And I couldn't help thinking that the struggle which started in this country with the Voting Rights Act three decades ago now, which made it possible for us today to have 355 black mayors across America and which required a lot of our

fellow citizens to risk their lives, it's now being replayed on the world stage in a stunning spectacle in South Africa. And I know a lot of you take a lot of pride in that and know that in your own way, in your own lives and careers, you helped to pave the way for this important day. And I thank you for that.

I'd like to make a couple of remarks that Henry's already mentioned, some of the issues I wanted to touch on. I came to this job, as those of you who have known me a long time know, with some very clear convictions about what our country was doing wrong and what it would take to change it. I believed very strongly that we needed a different economic policy and we needed to try to get this economy growing again, connected to the world economy in a positive and good way. I believed very strongly that we needed to try to bring the American people together again because it's obvious that we're going up or down together. And I thought we were coming apart when we ought to come together. And I'm trying to do that, and I think we are making some headway in that direction. And I think that the statements that have been made by some of the people in our administration have really helped. I think when Secretary Cisneros, for example, refused to tolerate what was going on in Vidor, Texas, and insisted that people, without regard to race, have a right to live wherever they wanted to live, I think that was the sort of thing that was very important to be done.

And I also felt that the Government needed to work in a different way, that what we were doing was just not working, that in a way, the way we were doing our business was not very well suited to the challenges of the world we're facing and the world toward which we're all moving. And so I wanted to try to change the way we do that. I wanted a better partnership between the White House and the Governorships and the mayoralties. And we're moving toward that.

I wanted the White House to have a partnership where we heard a broad spectrum of voices in America. We're having tomorrow—I'm so excited about this—for the first time in the history of the United States, the President of the United States tomorrow on the lawn of the White House will meet with the leaders of every federally recognized Native American tribe in the entire United States. And I'm excited about that.

I wanted us to change the way we do our business up here, and I've tried to support efforts to reform congressional procedures. And we are going to get a campaign finance reform bill out of this Congress. And I think we're going to get a good lobby reform bill out of this Congress which will restrict some activities and, most importantly, disclose others, which I think is very, very important to try to balance the scale. There's nothing wrong with lobbying; everybody, we're all lobby groups when we want something that somebody else has to decide on and we don't. But it needs to be done in an open and balanced and completely forthright manner so that everybody has a chance to have their fair share and their fair say.

So we're working on changing those things. The Vice President's reinventing Government initiative has been very, very important. It's enabled us, for example, without firing anybody, to give incentives to Federal employees to take early retirement and to phase down the size of the Federal Government and to reform our procedures over a period of 5 years by about a quarter of a million people. So that 5 years from the date I became President, we'll have fewer than 2 million people working for the Federal Government for the first time since 1960. We will do it by phasing down, not by putting people in the streets, giving people incentives for early retirement, and we will take all that money and put it in a trust fund and pay for this crime bill to put police officers back on the street.

So those are the things that I wish to do. And I wanted us to blend our policies at home with our policies abroad so that—we realized we couldn't be strong abroad unless we were first strong at home, that it is the power of our example and the success of our efforts that gives us real influence abroad, and that we can never fully rebuild ourselves at home unless we were involved with other nations around the world.

We have an interest in what happens in South Africa. South Africa rekindles the whole spirit of democracy and the spirit of free enterprise all across the southern part of Africa, as it has the potential to do. We, the United States, are in the best position, perhaps, of all the advanced countries to trade with and benefit from that revitalized South Africa and its neighbors.

So these are the things that I wanted to do. And in pursuit of that, I hope you have been

pleased with the progress we have made in just the first 16 months. We've had over 2.3 million private sector jobs come into this economy, more than twice as many as in the previous 4 years. We are looking at steady growth, steady decline in the deficit, and a strong outlook for the future.

We recognize that that alone will not provide jobs or raise incomes in a lot of most distressed urban and rural areas. We have seen a lot of our places suffer when the economy was good as well as when the economy was bad. So we've tried to do some special things, the creation of the empowerment zones and the enterprise communities that Secretary Cisneros has worked so hard on, the creation of a community development bank bill to try to establish these community development banks all across America to make microenterprise and small business loans in places and to people who otherwise would not get them.

We have worked on reforming the community reinvestment act to ensure that there will be more reinvestment in our cities and in our small towns and rural areas. We've tried to have a dramatically streamlined operation for getting loans for community-based business start-ups through the small business administration.

We've changed the tax laws. This year, one-sixth of our working people who work for modest wages and have children in their home will be eligible for income tax cuts because they're trying to do what everybody in America says they want: They are people who are choosing work over welfare. They are people who are choosing to be good parents and good workers. And our tax system should reward them. We should have a tax system that says, hey, if you're willing to go out there, even taking a low-wage job and trying to take care of your family and pay your taxes and be a good citizen, we ought to use a tax system to lift you out of poverty, not put you in it. And I think that is a very important thing.

This administration has worked hard in the area of education and training. The Goals 2000 bill that I just signed sets world-class standards of educational excellence but supports grassroots reform. We have a school-to-work bill, which I'm going to sign pretty soon, which will help States to establish systems to move children who don't want to go to 4-year colleges but do need further education and training in the systems that give them a chance to get good training so they can get good wages and good jobs, not dead-end jobs.

We're going to reform the unemployment system of this country to try to make it a reemployment system. You know in your own communities that the unemployment system doesn't work anymore because usually when people go on unemployment, they do not get called back to their old jobs like they used to. So there's no point in letting them just draw unemployment until it runs out and then figuring out what to do. People should be able to start retraining programs the minute they become unemployed, not after they exhaust their unemployment. This will make a significant difference.

In the area of health care, we're working hard, as I'm sure all of you know, to expand early childhood health, along with the expanded Head Start program. We have an immunization initiative which will provide more free vaccines to poor children and people who need it but which will also help to set up systems which will enable us to reach all the children of this country. Only two-thirds, actually slightly less than two-thirds of our kids, get all their recommended shots by the age of 2. There are lots of third world countries that have a higher rate of immunization than we do. And we need your help in that. We want you to be a part of that. It can make a big difference. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I just want to mention two issues in closing. One is the crime bill, and the other is health care, because they relate to and embody so much of what I've been trying to say. How do you get the country moving in the right direction? How do you get people together, instead of drifting apart? How do you make this work again so that it makes a difference in people's lives?

First of all, with regard to the crime bill, we do provide more police officers in small towns and big cities. And that will make a difference if they're community police officers, if they know their neighbors, if they know how to work with people, if kids trust them, if they can work to prevent crime as well as to catch criminals. This will work. I have seen it drop the crime rate dramatically in city after city where it has worked. So I urge you to participate in this, not just to get more people on the payroll but to make sure they're well trained, connected to the folks, and doing the

right things. In other words, we owe it to the American people to prove what we already know, which is that we can lower the crime rate if we use these resources in the right way.

The second point I want to make is—and Henry mentioned this—we passed the Brady bill last year. Some people argued against it because they said, "Well, the Brady bill will only work against honest people; they'll have to wait longer to get their guns because crooks will go buy them off the street." Well, do you realize we would never do anything, we would never take one positive step in our personal or public lives if we listened to people who said, "Well, if you do this, it won't solve all your problems." Well, the Bible says nothing we can do will solve all our problems, right? I mean, we'd never do anything. If the test was, will this solve everything, we would never get anything done.

The Brady bill has already helped to save lives. It has caught people trying to buy guns who had criminal records, who had mental health histories, who had stolen weapons in the past. It is beginning to work. In this crime bill, I am doing my best to get the House to agree with the Senate that we ought to ban a large number of these assault weapons. We can put police on the street, but if they're outgunned by the gang members, it's pretty tough to deal with it. It's not right.

The Senate bill actually protects—because a lot of you come from rural places, and I know a lot of you've got constituents and over half of them have a hunting license now. So this Senate bill actually protects almost 700 kinds of hunting weapons and sporting weapons specifically, in the bill. This does not outlaw guns, it outlaws assault weapons, the purpose of which is to kill people, not shoot ducks or quail or deer or squirrel. And I think it's real important that you take this opportunity to be in Washington to let your Representatives know that you would like it if they would adopt the assault weapons ban. And tell them to go on and adopt the protection for the hunting weapons, too, so that no one can really say—who looks at the bill—that this is designed to undermine people's ability to hunt. It's designed to undermine people's ability to hunt other human beings in large numbers. That is what we're trying to do.

The last point I want to make about the crime bill is this. In this crime bill, we give the States some more money to build prison space where they need it, but we spend more money than has ever been spent by the Federal Government giving communities and States prevention funds, everything from opportunities for schools to open early and stay open late, for communities to have midnight basketball leagues, for rehab programs to have drug treatment for everybody who needs it, for—we're going to try something a lot of you will like—we'll have enough money in this bill to give a respectable number of communities significant funds to hire, provide jobs for unemployed young people. I don't want to mislead you, it's not a national jobs program, but a part of this prevention strategy requires us to identify some communities and give them enough money to really take a dent in the youth unemployment problem and just see what happens to the crime rate. If the crime rate drops in half, then what's anybody else going to say about it? We'll then know what we can do to lower the crime rate.

I want to make this point: There will be a big argument, again, not by the law enforcement officials, but maybe—and the politics of this over the next week is, well, should we build more prisons and do less prevention? And my own view is: If you listen to the law enforcement people, they'll say you can build prisons from now til kingdom come, and you need to stop kids before they do these things. So, what I want to urge you to do is to say, "We want the 100,000 police, and if you give us the police, we'll do it right." That's your responsibility, make sure they're well-trained, well-connected and they do it right.

We'll support the law enforcement provisions in here and the tougher punishment, but we want you to take the assault weapons off the streets, and we want you to give us the prevention funds, and we will prove that we can reduce the crime rate. We have to give our young people something to say yes to as well as tell them what to say no to. This is an astonishingly important bill. It's the biggest and most serious anticrime bill ever considered by the Congress. The Brady bill took 7 years to pass. They've been fighting about a crime bill for 5 years. We're going to get it, but this is a big chance. We ought to do it right.

The last point I want to make is about health care. And I'd like to make two or three points about it. A lot of you know—I look out across this crowd, and I know the communities from which a lot of you come. There are people here who represent towns with 300 people. Some

of them I built sewer systems in and water systems when I was a Governor. There are people here who represent massive cities and all in between.

You face essentially three or four big problems in the health care system. You've got a lot of folks who still don't have health insurance. They do get health care, but they get it when it's too late, too expensive. They show up at the emergency room, then they either pass the cost along to the rest of your folks, or they can't pass the cost along in which case they risk going out of business. So you've got a lot of rural hospitals and some urban hospitals at risk of going out of business, partly because of no uncompensated care.

Then you have a lot of people, particularly in rural areas, who do not have access to health care because there aren't any doctors out there anymore or properly trained nurse practitioners and people working with them. Our health care bill attempts to resolve all those things by providing for guaranteed private insurance for all Americans, by strengthening the public health networks in urban areas and rural areas, too. In my State now, 85 percent of the immunizations are being given out in the public health clinics. The children of wealthy citizens of my State are getting their shots in the health clinics. We have to strengthen the public health networks. And this is a terribly important thing. And the emphasis on covering primary and preventive services, breast cancer tests for women, cholesterol tests for men, giving these kids their shots early when they need them, these things are terribly important.

And I can say that it is necessary to preserve the network of health care in America. It is necessary to give Americans the health care they need. It is also entirely necessary, if you want me to keep bringing the deficit down and still have some money to spend, working with you to build America, because the only thing we are really increasing spending on overall now is health care.

We're bringing down domestic spending. We're bringing down defense spending. We've stabilized interest on the debt because we're bringing the deficit down, but we're still increasing spending on Medicaid and Medicare by 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, largely because of the system we have in America. And you know, people are trying to say, "Well, Clinton wants to impose a Government-run system on America." That's not true. It's guaranteed private insurance. And they're trying to say, "Well, it's not fair to small business." But what about the small businesses that do cover their employees?

Our plan says every employer and employee without insurance or without adequate insurance should make some effort but we'll give a discount to the small businesses with low-average wages so they don't go out of business. It is a private plan where Americans have choice. And it will work if we have a chance.

I say that because while a lot of you don't run public health programs—unless you're in a big city, you probably don't have anything to do with the public health program—our ability to work with you to build this country is directly related to our ability to guarantee a healthy population, to give people the security they need.

Every one of you has got somebody living in your city, even if you live in a really small town, who's had somebody in their family that's been sick. So they've got what's called a preexisting condition, which means they can't get insurance or they pay too much for it or they can never change their job because they'll lose their health insurance. Every one of you does. Isn't that right?

So, again, I would ask you to ask your Members of Congress not to let this year go by without solving this health care problem. There's no reason in the wide world America is the only wealthy country in the world that can't figure out how to provide health care security to all its people.

People talk to me about reforming the welfare system all the time. You think about this. If somebody gets out of jail and goes into a low-wage job without health care, right, they're working for a living, paying taxes so that they're giving health care to people who are still in jail while they got out. If somebody gets off the welfare rolls and takes a lower wage job without health care, they're then working hard, paying taxes, going home at night looking at their kids without health care, and their taxes are going to pay for people who stayed on welfare so they and their kids could get health care.

Now, you don't have to be Einstein to figure out that doesn't make a lot of sense. And I just simply refuse to believe that we are the

only country in the world that can't figure out how to fix that. I believe we can.

So I ask you, please, while you're here and when you go home, tell your Members of Congress, it's a new day in America. We're changing things. We're facing our problems. We're seizing our opportunities. And you'll stick with them if they have the courage to make the tough decisions: health security for all and a crime bill that really gives us a chance to lower the crime rate and make the American people safe again.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:17 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly of Washington, DC; Mayor Henry Espy of Clarksdale, MS; Carroll Willis, senior adviser to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Loretta Avent, Special Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs; and Nelson Mandela, president, African National Congress.

Interview With Larry King
April 28, 1994

Virginia Kelley

Mr. King. We're with Dick Kelley and James Morgan. And joining us now by phone from Washington is the son of Virginia Kelley, the President of the United States, Bill Clinton.

Are you there, Mr. President?

The President. Hi, Larry.

Mr. King. How are you?

The President. I'll tell you what, are those two guys telling you the truth tonight?

Mr. King. They are telling the truth——

Dick Kelley. You know if I didn't, I'd really get hell from you. [*Laughter*]

Mr. King. Have you read the full book, Mr. President?

The President. I have read it. I read it twice, as a matter of fact.

Mr. King. And?

The President. I think she did a terrific job. I want to thank Jim for all the work he did on it. And after Mother died, I had to do a little work just checking some of the facts, but I was amazed at how candid and forthright she was. And she turned out to be a right good storyteller. It's a terrific book. I think a lot of folks will really enjoy reading it, and we'll see a portrait of a remarkable person during an important time in our country's life. I was really proud of her for doing it.

Mr. King. Last time we were together, we spoke about your loss. Wasn't it difficult to read it?

The President. It was. Or the first time, before it was actually published in book form, it kind of helped me deal with the loss. But I tell you, it still makes me a little sad. Last week when I finished reading it the second time, I found myself fighting back the tears a little bit, but that's one of the things that makes the book so wonderful. I've even had total strangers come up to me and say that they cried when they read it, too.

James Morgan. The lawyer at Simon and Schuster, who's going over the legal checking with me, told me that she cried. And I figured if you can make a New Yorker cry, it's some book.

Mr. King. What was her most, Mr. President, remarkable aspect to you?

The President. I think her resilience. You know, she was just a person driven by love and loyalty and an incredible desire to keep living. And she couldn't be beaten down. I mean, she was widowed three times. When Dick asked her to marry him, she reminded him that she'd been widowed three times and asked him if he had considered odds of what he was trying to get into.

But no matter what happened to her, she just bounced back. And I think that's probably the most important lesson she imparted to me and to my brother, just don't give up.

Mr. King. They've discussed the difficulty of when Roger had his troubles and how she held up during that time, during your only defeat, how she held up during that time. Was she a strength source, was she a place—most people figure their mothers as a safe place to go.

The President. Well, I think she really plainly was not only a safe place to go, but she really did always convince us that we could do better tomorrow. When I lost that race in 1980, I had the distinguished record of being at that time the youngest former Governor in the history of the entire United States. I was out of a job; I didn't know where my next nickel was coming from. And within 3 or 4 days she decided that I could be reelected Governor. And when my brother had his drug problem, it was awful for her, much tougher, of course, than any election loss. And she, as she says in the book, had a lot to learn about drug addiction, about what those of us who were in the same family had done by not confronting my brother. And she finally came to understand, as Dick said earlier, that getting arrested and actually being forced to go to prison may well have saved my brother's life. And he's come back; he's made a good life; he's made a wonderful marriage; he's about to become a father. And I think a lot of that happened because my mother never quit believing in him and was brave enough to face the truth about what happened and then, at her age, was willing to learn whatever it took to learn to help get him over it and working him through it and do her part.

Mr. King. And she sure would have had a good time touring for this book, wouldn't she?

The President. Yes. I was thinking about that today. This thing would be a stomp-down best-seller if she'd lived, because she'd have had so much fun promoting it. She had a good time doing everything she did. She learned to be a politician rather late in life. You know, before I got in politics, she voted, but that was about it. And then by the time I'd been through a campaign or two, she was the best organized person I knew. She had 300 to 400 names on a file card in our hometown, and all the local politicians were half afraid of her. She just got into things, and her enthusiasm took over. I really regret that she's not stomping around the country selling this book and not on your program and not answering questions.

Mr. King. Do you remember the night when you were running for office and you and Al Gore were on, and she called in from Vegas?

The President. Yes, I do.

Mr. King. You asked her, "Where are you?" "Vegas."

The President. Where she belonged. She loved Las Vegas, and she loved those race tracks.

Richard Nixon's Funeral

Mr. King. I know. One other thing, Mr. President. Everyone is complimenting you today on the eloquence yesterday at another tragic day in the lives of all Americans, the death of a President. Was that a difficult moment for you? Funerals are never easy. Was that particularly difficult?

The President. It was in some sense because, you know, the other people who were speaking, Secretary Kissinger and Senator Dole and Governor Wilson, they'd all played an important role in President Nixon's life. They'd been a part of his successes; they'd been part of his difficult times. And funerals are really a time for family and friends. But he was, after all, the President of this country. I am now—and it was an appropriate thing, I think, for me to do my best at his funeral. And I was deeply honored that his family asked me to speak. And it was difficult, but I hope I did right by him. I'm very grateful to him for the incredibly wise counsel he gave me in the last 16 months. And frankly, just today I had a problem, and I said to the person who was working with me, "I wish I could pick up the phone and call Richard Nixon and ask him what he thinks we ought to do about this."

Virginia Kelley

Mr. King. I bet there are times you wish you could call Virginia Kelley, too.

The President. Amazing number of times. When I came in from the trip I took to Europe and to Russia, right after she died, it was a Sunday evening, and almost without thinking I went right into the kitchen and got halfway to the phone before I realized that I couldn't call her on Sunday night. That's when I used to call and check in with Mother and Dick, see how they were doing. And it was almost like a shock. And a lot of people who lose a mother or a father or a husband or a wife will tell you that they find themselves almost talking out loud. I do that a lot. Just looking at your films here of Mother mean a lot to me.

Mr. King. Thanks, Mr. President. Thanks for joining us.

The President. You guys have a good night. Thanks again, Jim, for all the wonderful work you did on this book. And tell the truth, Dick. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The telephone interview began at 9:20 p.m. The President spoke from the Residence at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dick Kelley, his mother's husband, and James Morgan, coauthor of her autobiography, "Leading With My Heart."

Nomination for a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority
April 28, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Phyllis N. Segal as a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

"Phyllis Segal is uniquely qualified to fill this important role at the Federal Labor Relations Authority," the President said. "She has a keen understanding of the issues facing the organization and Federal labor management relations. Her varied background will be an asset at the Authority."

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

Remarks to Native American and Native Alaskan Tribal Leaders
April 29, 1994

The President. Thank you very, very much. Chief Wilma Mankiller and to all the other distinguished leaders here today, let me first welcome you here on behalf of the First Lady and Vice President and Mrs. Gore. All of us are honored by your presence. I also wanted to especially thank those who have spoken and participated to this point and those who will participate in the remainder of this program. I have listened carefully and learned a lot.

This is, as all of you know, a time of great challenge and transition for our beloved country and for the world. As I travel across this country and talk to the people about the problems that all Americans share, whether it's crime or health care or the economy, I find a concern that goes deeper even in these specific matters.

There is a great yearning in this Nation for people to be able to reestablish a sense of community, a sense of oneness, a sense of cooperation, of shared values and spirit. Americans are searching for the chance to come together in friendship, instead of coming apart in anger and distrust. There is a yearning for us to be able to live together so that all of us can live up to our God-given potential and be respected for who and what we are.

It is in that spirit and with great humility I say to the leaders of the first Americans, the American Indian and Alaska Natives, welcome to the White House. Welcome home.

So much of who we are today comes from who you have been for a long time. Long before others came to these shores there were powerful and sophisticated cultures and societies here: yours. Because of your ancestors, democracy existed here long before the Constitution was drafted and ratified.

Just last week, people all around the world celebrated the 24th annual Earth Day. Yet for thousands of years, you have held nature in awe, celebrating the bond between Earth and the Creator. You have reminded people that all of us should make decisions not just for our children and their grandchildren but for generation upon generation yet to come.

I believe in your rich heritage and in our common heritage. What you have done to retain your identity, your dignity, and your faith in the face of often immeasurable obstacles is profoundly moving, an example of the enduring strength of the human spirit.

We desperately need this lesson now. We must keep faith with you and with that spirit and with the common heritage so many of us cherish. That is what you came to talk to me about and what I would like to respond to today.

In every relationship between our people, our first principle must be to respect your right to remain who you are and to live the way you wish to live. And I believe the best way to do that is to acknowledge the unique government-to-government relationship we have enjoyed over time. Today I reaffirm our commitment to self-determination for tribal governments. I pledge to fulfill the trust obligations of the Federal Government. I vow to honor and respect tribal sovereignty based upon our unique historic relationship. And I pledge to continue my efforts to protect your right to fully exercise your faith as you wish.

Let me speak for a moment about religious freedom, something precious to you, something deeply enshrined in our Constitution. For many of you, traditional religions and ceremonies are the essence of your culture and your very existence. Last year, I was pleased to sign a law that restored certain constitutional protections for those who want to express their faith in this country.

No agenda for religious freedom will be complete until traditional Native American religious practices have received all the protections they deserve. Legislation is needed to protect Native American religious practices threatened by Federal action. The Native American free exercise of religion act is long overdue. And I will continue to work closely with you and Members of Congress to make sure the law is constitutional and strong. I want it passed so that I can invite you back here and sign it into law in your presence.

And to make certain that you can obtain the ritual symbols of your religious faith, in a moment I will sign a directive to every executive department and agency of Government, not just the Department of Interior, instructing them to cooperate with tribal governments to accommodate wherever possible the need for eagle feathers in the practice of Native American religions.

This then is our first principle: respecting your values, your religions, your identity, and your sovereignty. This brings us to the second principle that should guide our relationship: We must dramatically improve the Federal Government's relationships with the tribes and become full partners with the tribal nations.

I don't want there to be any mistake about our commitment to a stronger partnership between our people. Therefore, in a moment I will also sign an historic Government directive that requires every executive department and agency of Government to take two simple steps: first, to remove all barriers that prevent them from working directly with tribal governments and, second, to make certain that if they take action affecting tribal trust resources, they consult with tribal governments prior to that decision. It is the entire Government, not simply the Department of the Interior, that has a trust responsibility with tribal governments. And it is time the entire Government recognized and honored that responsibility.

Part of being better partners is also being better listeners. The Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice have never before joined together to listen to the leaders of the Indian nations. It's time to change that. Next week, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, both Attorney General Reno and Secretary Babbitt and many of their sub-Cabinet officials will meet with you for 2 days at the first National American Indian Listening Conference. I'm looking forward to hearing their specific ideas from the conference on ways to move our nations forward together.

The same applies to the unprecedented series of 23 meetings that the Department of Housing and Urban Development, under Secretary Cisneros, will have with tribal governments by September to improve housing and living conditions in tribal communities and to listen to you about how you can take the lead in doing it.

All governments must work better. We must simply be more responsive to the people we serve and to each other. It's the only way we'll be able to do good things with the resources we have. I know that you agree with that. More and more of you are moving to assume fuller control of your governments. Many are moving aggressively to take responsibility for operating your own programs. Each year the Bureau of Indian Affairs is providing more technical services and fewer direct services.

One avenue for greater tribal control is through self-governance contracts. There are about 30 self-compacting tribes today. We're working with Congress to raise that number by 20 tribes every year. We'd like self-governance to become a permanent program. But we must ensure services will still be provided to the smaller tribes that do not choose to participate.

What is the goal of a better and more equal partnership, and more empowered tribes and more efficient government? Ultimately it must

be to improve the living conditions of those whom we serve. And that must be our third and final principle.

Together we must position American Indians and Alaska Natives to compete economically as we move toward the 21st century. I invited the leaders of every recognized tribe here today. But I'll be the first to acknowledge that not all have been able to join us because they simply don't have the resources to come. And I know well that many of you have come here at great personal sacrifice to yourselves and the members of your tribes. That only underscores the importance of our work. Let us dedicate ourselves to making certain that the next time we all meet together, conditions will be different and better and all of our brothers and sisters will be able to join us.

We must do more to create jobs, raise incomes, and develop capital for new businesses. I know there are more success stories in Indian country every year but not nearly enough as the people who bore witness to your conditions here today so eloquently said. Strengthening tribal economies will require new thinking and the courage to change. It will require investing in the health, the education, and the skills of American Indians and Alaska Natives, as we must do for all Americans.

To the extent that some of the building blocks can be put in place here in Washington, we are working to do that. Our empowerment zone legislation, for example, contains at your request special new incentives for investing in reservations. This is only part of the solution. We can continue to enforce the regulations of the Community Reinvestment Act to make sure local banks invest and lend in Indian communities. We've brought more tribal leaders than ever together with bankers to improve mortgage loans, financial services, and to cut regulations. We must make these efforts permanent and more effective. And we know a more comprehensive approach is necessary.

At my direction, the Vice President has established a working group on Indian economic development as part of our Community Enterprise Board. I've asked them to study the recommendations from last year's National Indian Economic Summit and to consult fully with you every step of the way. Our goal is clear: to work with you to enhance economic development in every tribe. I'd like to emphasize that what I have asked them to do in this issue, I asked them to do on all issues. This great, historic meeting today must be the beginning of our new partnership, not the end of it.

I'd like to make a point about economic development that has to do with gaming. As a former Governor, I understand some of the concerns that the Governors have raised. But as President, I know that gaming gives you a competitive edge when you've had precious few. And the benefits often extend to surrounding communities in full measure. Some of you are now able to invest more in housing and health care and child care and infrastructure and taking care of your elders. I know that gaming is controversial, even among tribes. As many of you have acknowledged, it's also important that tribal governments continue to diversify their economies. Many of you are working with congressional leaders, Governors, and Secretary Babbitt to resolve tough issues.

My goal is this: I want the tribes to continue to benefit from gaming, and I want current disputes over the 1988 gaming regulatory act to be worked out. I strongly support the process now underway to achieve that goal. But just as with the national economy, we know we can't solve every problem overnight. The important thing is to create policies that give every tribe the chance to have a strong economy in the long run, to develop the will and the consistency to stick with those policies over time, and to keep working and talking together.

Last year, you were kind enough to invite the First Lady to the Indian Health Summit. You asked her to make certain your treaty rights to health care and your rights under the Indian Health Service be preserved and made a part of our health care proposal. Because we worked together and because of you and your input, only one of the health care plans now before the Congress addresses these issues and ensures that tribal members will receive the same high-quality health care as everyone else. That is our plan, thanks to you.

There has been a great deal of debate this year about the budget of the Indian Health Service. It was mentioned earlier. The fact is that we are operating under the tightest spending limits in memory. In our efforts to bring the deficit down, I have recommended the total elimination of 100 programs and cuts in 200 others. And that is contributing to the country's economic revival. But I believe the health needs of tribal communities and families and children

clearly require special attention. Therefore, I have amended next year's budget to restore more than $120 million in funding for the Indian Health Service.

Finally, as we heard so eloquently today, there is in America, across the lines of race and class and region, a profound concern for our children. Too many are poor or sick or unsupervised. Too many are likely to use violence or be the victims of violence. Too many are unprepared intellectually for life or work. Yet nothing is so striking in tribal communities as your love of family and extended family and your devotion to your children. Every segment of our society could well take a lesson from you. But in spite of your best efforts, too many of your children also suffer from poor health and inadequate education. And we are trying hard to address these problems. You mentioned Head Start; our budget calls for continued, substantial increases and expansions of the Head Start program, as well as the Women and Infants and Children program.

Our education plan, called Goals 2000, for the first time sets world-class education standards for every school and all our children and gives local communities the grassroots support they need to achieve those goals. Goals 2000 contains millions more next year for BIA-funded schools and schools serving Native Alaskans. And these funds cannot be spent until the education goals of your community are considered.

In the 1980's, our Nation fell behind many Third World countries in the rate at which we immunized children against communicable diseases. I know the Indian Health Service does a good job of immunizing children. Beginning this year, under the Vaccine For Children program, every Indian child, no matter where he or she lives and regardless of whether they are fortunate enough to live near an IHS facility, will be eligible for free vaccine.

The Great Law of the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy contained this advice: "In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decision on the next seven generations." We are stewards; we are caretakers. That standard will keep us great if we have the vision of your forefathers.

As we look back on the American journey, the test ahead is always whether we are moving in the right direction of more tolerance, wider justice, and greater opportunity for all. It is the direction that counts, always the direction. And our choices will set that direction.

Of course, as you well know, our history has not always been a proud one. But our future can be, and that is up to us. Together we can open the greatest era of cooperation, understanding, and respect among our people ever. I know that we will. And when we do, the judgment of history will be that the President of the United States and the leaders of the sovereign Indian nations met and kept faith with each other and our common heritage and together lifted our great nations to a new and better place.

Thank you all.

[*At this point, the President signed the memorandums. The President and Mrs. Clinton and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore were then presented with gifts.*]

The President. Before we go, I wanted to make a brief announcement to thank you, on behalf of the First Lady, the Vice President, Mrs. Gore, and our Cabinet for being here and for giving us a chance to be with you and for the wonderful gifts we have received.

In keeping with a tradition that goes back to the early days of our Republic, I want each of you, in leaving, to receive a miniature replica of the Jefferson Indian Peace Medal. On the front is a picture of our third President, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and one of the chief architects of our democracy. When you receive your medal, you will see on the back two hands clasped, one with a cuff showing three stripes and three buttons, the other wearing a bracelet engraved with an eagle. The hands join with the inscription "Peace and Friendship."

As we pray and as we leave, let us hope that this is the beginning of true peace, true friendship, and true progress.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:40 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chief Wilma Mankiller of the Cherokee Tribe in Oklahoma. The memorandums on eagle feather distribution and relations with tribal governments are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Letter to Americans With Disabilities
April 29, 1994

Greetings to everyone gathered in our nation's capital to voice your support for providing health security to all Americans. I am delighted that so many of you have come together for this exciting event.

Now is the time to act on our awareness that disabilities are a natural part of the human experience. Having a disability does not diminish one's right to participate in any aspect of mainstream society. With the shared strengths of all those participating in this rally, you send a powerful message—the key to improving the quality of life for millions of Americans with disabilities and their families is passing a comprehensive health care plan that meets the needs of each one of our citizens.

The active participation of groups like ADAPT, the National Council on Independent Living, and the Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities is essential in meeting this crucial goal. I commend you for working toward making health care reform a reality. Your knowledge and expertise are helping to advance the rights of and services for all Americans, especially those persons with disabilities, and I thank you for your leadership and dedication. Working together, we can build a health care system that moves our nation from exclusion to inclusion, from dependence to independence, and from paternalism to empowerment.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a successful rally.

BILL CLINTON

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

Letter to Hunters and Sportsmen
April 29, 1994

An Open Letter to Hunters and Sportsmen:

I have been a hunter since I was 12. Where I come from, it's a way of life. And I will not allow the rights of hunters and sportsmen to be infringed upon.

But I know the difference between a firearm used for hunting and target shooting and a weapon designed to kill people. The 19 specific types of assault weapons that would be banned by the proposal currently being considered in Congress have no place on a deer hunt, in a duck blind, or on a target range—and they certainly don't belong on our streets, in our neighborhoods, or on our schoolyards.

But they are on our streets, in our neighborhoods, and on our schoolyards—they're the weapons of choice for drug dealers, gangs, and terrorists. And every year they kill children and police officers, mothers, and fathers.

Our crime bill will make a big difference in stopping the violence in our neighborhoods, by putting 100,000 new police officers on the streets and putting tough penalties like three-strikes-you're-out on the books. But we've got to keep Uzis and Street Sweepers out of the hands of criminals. Every major police organization wants us to—and nearly 80 percent of the American people feel that way too.

High-paid lobbyists argue that the assault weapons ban will infringe on our right, as hunters and sportsmen, to own guns. But what they don't tell you is that the proposal I support specifically safeguards hunters' rights. It explicitly protects more than 650 hunting and recreational rifles from the ban.

So that's why I'm writing you for your help. Call your representatives, and tell them that you know the difference between a hunting rifle and a weapon that was designed for the battlefield. Tell them you support the proposed ban on assault weapons—because it protects your rights and it doesn't protect criminals.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

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

Nomination for the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
April 29, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Michael Knacht, Amy Sands, and Lawrence Scheinman as Assistant Directors for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

The President said, "I am pleased to name experts of the caliber of Drs. Sands, Knacht, and Scheinman to work on arms control and nonproliferation, issues to which I am personally committed. I believe they will help a revitalized ACDA play a leading role in building a safe and more secure world."

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

Appointment for the National Transportation Safety Board
April 29, 1994

The President today appointed Jim Hall to be Vice Chair of the National Transportation Safety Board. Mr. Hall was previously confirmed by the Senate a member of the National Transportation Safety Board on October 14, 1993.

"Jim Hall has had a distinguished career in government and in the private sector," said the President. "I am very glad to be appointing him as Vice Chair of this board today."

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

Appointment for Coral Sea Week Representatives
April 29, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Jack H. Watson, Jr., and Ambassador Edward J. Perkins to represent the United States in Australia during the celebration of Coral Sea Week.

"I am pleased to appoint Jack Watson to join Ambassador Perkins as the U.S. representatives on this momentous occasion," the President said. "I have known Jack for many years. As President Carter's former Chief of Staff, he understands particularly well the important relationship between the United States and Australia, and I am confident he will represent the United States well. We join them in celebrating our friendship with Australia and look forward to continuing our excellent relations across a range of economic, political, and global issues."

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

The President's Radio Address
April 30, 1994

Good morning. This week all of us watched with wonder as South Africa was reborn. Young men carried their elderly fathers on their backs to the polling booths; black voters came on crutches and in wheelchairs, traveling for miles and waiting for hours in this great march to freedom. The miracle of South Africa's rebirth as a nonracial democracy is an inspiring testament to the courage and vision of its citizens. And I'm proud of America's role in helping to make the miracle happen.

Private citizens, religious leaders, and Members of Congress worked for years to rally public opinion and impose economic sanctions against Johannesburg. When Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk reached their agreements to dismantle apartheid, we were one of the first countries to lift sanctions so we could help fuel the recovery of a new South Africa. Just in the last year we have supported unprecedented voter education and election monitor training programs. And this week I'll be announcing a substantial increase in our aid to South Africa to help it navigate a new course for all of its people.

This morning I want to talk about why this kind of vigorous American engagement and leadership remains vital not only in South Africa but around the globe. Consider the former Yugoslavia, where American engagement today is essential. The breakup of that country, inflamed by Serbian aggression, has resulted in 3 years of bloodshed and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and elsewhere.

We have clear interests at stake in helping to bring a peaceful end to the Bosnian conflict, an interest in preventing a wider war in Europe, an interest in preventing a flood of refugees, an interest in maintaining the credibility and effectiveness of NATO as a force for peace in the new post-cold-war era, and clearly an interest in helping to stop the slaughter of innocent civilians. That's why we've been working to spur negotiations among the warring parties, and it's why we've harnessed NATO's power in the service of diplomacy.

In February, at the initiative of the United States, NATO issued an ultimatum to Bosnian Serbs against the further shelling of the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo. Today, Sarajevo is relatively quiet. It's citizens are emerging from the rubble to begin rebuilding their lives.

Just last week, we and our NATO allies extended a similar ultimatum to the besieged town of Gorazde and to five other Muslim majority towns the U.N. has designated as safe areas. After weeks of relentless shelling, the Serbs have backed off and withdrawn their guns from around Gorazde. While new challenges lie ahead in Bosnia, our determination to take action along with our NATO allies in support of the U.N. mission there clearly generated new progress toward peace.

In March, Bosnian and Croat leaders came to the White House to sign a peace agreement. Since then we've stepped up our diplomatic efforts to engage the Serbs as well. As I've said, if the parties in Bosnia can negotiate a viable settlement, I will work with the Congress to deploy U.S. troops through NATO to help enforce that peace.

There are other threats today that also demand our active engagement, from North Korea's nuclear program to the efforts of Iran and other backlash states to sponsor terrorism. We're meeting those threats with steadiness and resolve.

At the same time, we recognize we've entered an age of historic opportunity. South Africa's elections offer vivid proof. In the Middle East age-old enemies have extended handshakes of reconciliation. In the former Soviet Union we're helping to dismantle nuclear weapons once aimed at us. And just today, Russia and Latvia signed an historic agreement to withdraw remaining Russian military forces from Latvian territory by the end of August. These and other promising developments were made possible in part by American support and resolve.

But such engagement requires resources commensurate with our challenges. With the cold war behind us, we've been able to reduce spending on defense and foreign affairs. We've put those programs under tight budgetary constraints. But now we're at the razor's edge of a resource crisis. We cannot afford to shortchange our national security. That's why I'm working hard against further cuts in our defense budget and why I'm working with Congress to

make sure we adequately fund peacekeeping and other international efforts that promote the security and prosperity of our own people.

As we approach the 50th anniversary of the D-Day invasion this June, we should recall the spirit of sacrifice and common cause that mark that great crusade for freedom in World War II. In 5 weeks I'll travel to Europe to commemorate D-Day and to honor those in the Second World War who fought to defend our democratic way of life. The world is different now, better because of their courage. And we owe it to them to build a better future for the next generation.

As we salute the veterans who will be landing by the thousands in Normandy this June and as we celebrate South Africa's elections today, let us remember that American leadership in a changing world requires sustained commitment. Together, let us shape this new world to our lasting benefit.

Thanks for listening.

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

Radio Address on the Situation in Rwanda

April 30, 1994

The horrors of civil war and mass killings of civilians in Rwanda, since the tragic deaths of the Rwandan and Burundian Presidents 3 weeks ago, have shocked and appalled the world community.

On behalf of all of the American people, I call on the Rwandan army and the Rwandan Patriotic Front to agree to an immediate ceasefire and return to negotiations aimed at a lasting peace in their country.

I applaud the efforts of regional leaders actively engaged in the quest for peace. I reaffirm the American commitment to participate in renewed negotiations under the Arusha framework.

The pain and suffering of the Rwandan people have touched the hearts of all Americans. It is time for the leaders of Rwanda to recognize their common bond of humanity and to reject the senseless and criminal violence violence that continues to plague their country.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 10:12 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House for later broadcast.

Statement on Signing the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995

April 30, 1994

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2333, the "Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995." This Act authorizes critically needed appropriations and provides important authorities for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency (USIA), the Peace Corps, and the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (USACDA). I appreciate the Congress' cooperation in passing a bill that maintains many of the Administration's requests and provides management authorities that will improve the operations of the Department of State and related agencies during a period of fiscal constraint.

I am especially pleased that this legislation includes language authorizing implementation of the Administration's international broadcasting reorganization plan. The plan, to be implemented over 2 fiscal years, will achieve projected savings of approximately $400 million over 4 years, while preserving and enhancing the program quality, effectiveness, and professional integrity of U.S.-funded broadcast services. These services include the Voice of Amer-

ica, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, Radio and Television Marti, WorldNet, and a new Radio Free Asia operation.

I very much appreciate that the funding authorizations for the Department of State, USIA, and other agencies are sufficient to cover appropriations for this fiscal year, and for the levels requested by the Administration for fiscal year 1995. I also appreciate the authorizations for Contributions to International Organizations and Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities, which are at the Administration's request level, plus an additional $670 million in authorization provided for a portion of the anticipated shortfall in fiscal year 1994 peacekeeping funds.

However, earmarks in the Department of State's main operating accounts for activities not requested by the Administration will severely restrict the Department's ability to meet planned levels for critical investments in its information system and other infrastructure improvements. As part of the Department's streamlining efforts, and with a constrained budget, the Secretary of State needs the flexibility to allocate scarce resources where they are needed most.

I am pleased at the inclusion of authorities necessary to implement the Department of State's reorganization plan. I regret, however, the provision that interferes with the Secretary's plan to merge the Office of the Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism into the proposed Bureau of Narcotics, Terrorism, and Crime, where this activity would receive the coordinated, high-level attention that I believe would be the most effective in fighting terrorism.

The bill also contains many useful authorities that will assist the Department in improving the efficiency of its operations both domestically and overseas. These include a new visa fee to be used for upgrading consular systems and expanded authority to hire U.S. citizens at posts abroad. Despite these and many other useful authorities contained in this bill, I have serious reservations concerning a number of its provisions.

Section 141 would require the Department of State to allow local guard contracts awarded to U.S. firms to be paid in U.S. dollars in certain countries. Because many countries require that payment for services rendered locally be paid in local currency, this provision could force the United States to violate both host country law and its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. I will seek to implement this section in the manner most consistent with U.S. obligations under international law.

Other provisions raise constitutional concerns. Article II of the Constitution confers the Executive power of the United States on the President alone. Executive power includes special authority in the area of foreign affairs. Certain provisions in H.R. 2333, however, could be construed so as to interfere with the discharge of my constitutional responsibilities.

For example, section 412 (reforms in the World Health Organization), section 501 (protection of refugee women and children), section 527(b) (loans by international financial institutions to governments that have expropriated property of U.S. citizens), and section 823 (loans or other payments by international financial institutions for the purpose of acquiring nuclear materials by non-nuclear states), purport specifically to direct the President on how to proceed in negotiations with international organizations. These provisions might be construed to require the Executive branch to espouse certain substantive positions regarding specific issues. I support the policies underlying these sections. My constitutional authority over foreign affairs, however, necessarily entails discretion over these matters. Accordingly, I shall construe these provisions to be precatory.

Section 221 (the establishment of an office in Lhasa, Tibet), section 236 (an exchange program with the people of Tibet), and section 573 (an Office of Cambodian Genocide Investigation, the activities of which are to be carried out primarily in Cambodia), could also interfere with the President's constitutional prerogatives. I am sympathetic to the goals of these provisions. However, they could be construed to require the President to negotiate with foreign countries or to take actions in those countries without their consent. I will, therefore, implement them to the extent consistent with my constitutional responsibilities.

As with the resources allocated to the Department of State, I appreciate the appropriations authorizations provided for USIA for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. There are, however, certain earmarks, particularly in the exchange programs, that inhibit the flexibility that USIA needs to meet changing priorities. In addition, I understand that the 1994 appropriations authorizations provided for USIA for salaries and expenses in-

cludes the authorization for administrative and staff costs for the "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs."

I regret the repeal of the Voice of America broadcast charter language (P.L. 94–350). My Administration will work with the Congress to address this issue further.

Section 401 requires certain withholdings from U.S. assessed contributions for the United Nations (U.N.) regular budget, and from the fiscal year 1994 supplemental until the President makes the requisite certification that the U.N. has established an office of and appointed an Inspector General, empowered with specified authorities. Section 404 also sets forth ceilings on assessments on the United States for peacekeeping contributions. Although I share the Congress' goal of encouraging U.N. reform and broader cost sharing, I cannot endorse the method proposed by these provisions because they could place the United States in violation of its international treaty obligations if reform is not achieved within the stated time.

Section 407 sets forth new reporting and notification requirements, including a requirement for 15-day advance notification (with no waiver provision) before the United States provides certain in-kind assistance to support U.N. peacekeeping operations. It is understood that the Congress, however, does not consider this provision to be subject to the regular procedures on reprogramming notifications. It is imperative at times to provide such assistance on an urgent basis to further U.S. foreign policy interests. I will, therefore, construe these reporting and notification requirements consistent with my constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities as Commander in Chief and head of the Executive branch. I also note the understanding reached with the Congress that this notification process will not include congressional "holds" on assistance when notification does occur.

The conference report accompanying H.R. 2333, with respect to section 525(a), Free Trade in Ideas, purports to describe the Administration's policy with respect to restrictions on travel or exchanges in the context of economic embargoes. We will carefully consider the sense of the Congress as we complete our review of the standards for general and specific licenses under embargo programs. We have not, however, committed as a matter of policy to broad regulatory or administrative changes to remove restrictions affecting travel or exchanges for informational, educational, religious, cultural, or humanitarian purposes or for public performance or exhibitions. Nor have we initiated any action with respect to visa or currency restrictions.

Title VII, the Arms Control and Nonproliferation Act of 1994, reflects the principle that the USACDA must be a key participant on arms control and nonproliferation matters. The conference report accompanying H.R. 2333 calls for a presumption that the President should direct the USACDA to have primary responsibility for nonproliferation matters absent compelling reasons to do otherwise. It also suggests specific areas of responsibility in the nonproliferation field that should be shifted to the USACDA. I do not accept either the stated presumption or the suggested shift, since such limitations would infringe on the discretion of the President in carrying out foreign affairs.

Title VIII contains provisions that raise significant constitutional concerns. Section 824 would require an "opportunity for a hearing on the record" prior to a Presidential determination to impose sanctions on any person contributing to nuclear proliferation through financial transactions. It would also subject this determination to judicial review under the Administrative Procedures Act. These are extraordinary and unwarranted procedural requirements for a Presidential determination in the area of foreign affairs, and they raise serious constitutional concerns. The delay in holding hearings and the possibility of delay pending judicial review would severely undermine the effectiveness of these sanctions. They would also eliminate the flexibility needed to impose sanctions quickly to address urgent foreign policy problems and interfere with our nonproliferation efforts. Nor is it clear how these procedures could function in view of the classified nature of much of the material involved. In addition, the broad reach of section 824 (which covers any person, not just financial entities) would complicate Federal enforcement of the proposed sanctions and raises additional constitutional questions when coupled with the extent of the specified sanctions (i.e., a complete prohibition on the conduct of any new business activities).

The juxtaposition of these elements in section 824 makes the provision essentially unworkable. I have been assured that this provision will be corrected in a manner acceptable to the Administration at the earliest possible date. Pending these corrections, and particularly in light of the

constitutional problems, I will interpret the statute as providing me discretion to make the determinations provided for in this section.

Finally, section 134 provides that whenever the Department of State enters into a lease-purchase agreement involving foreign countries, the Department shall account for such transactions "in accordance with fiscal year obligations." The Administration's interpretation is that this provision does not waive the scoring rules governing lease-purchases under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
April 30, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 2333, approved April 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–236.

Statement on the Agreement To Withdraw Russian Military Forces From Latvia

April 30, 1994

I applaud today's agreement signed by Latvian President Guntis Ulmanis and Russian President Boris Yeltsin that will lead to the withdrawal of Russian military forces from the territory of the Republic of Latvia by August 31, 1994. I have contacted both leaders to offer my personal congratulations for their vision and statesmanship in concluding this historic accord.

Since the early days of my administration, among my highest foreign policy priorities has been promoting agreement on an orderly withdrawal of Russian forces from the Baltic countries. I discussed this frequently with President Yeltsin and President Ulmanis. The United States has played an active role with both parties during the course of the Latvian-Russian negotiations. I believe that our engagement with both sides, along with the support provided by other countries, in particular Sweden, has played a constructive role in bringing this agreement to a successful conclusion.

Over the course of their negotiations, both the Latvian and Russian Governments displayed a pragmatic approach to resolving their differences. The understandings that this document embodies, including the continued operation of the radar installation at Skrunda as a civilian facility, are testimony to the determination of both sides to conclude an agreement that responds to Russian concerns while affirming Latvia's full and unrestricted sovereignty and promoting its integration into the world community.

The agreement between Latvia and Russia now opens the door to a more normal relationship between the two countries. It constitutes an important contribution to overall stability in the Baltic region and to European security as a whole. I hope that this agreement also will help stimulate a speedy conclusion of the troop withdrawal negotiations between Estonia and Russia.

Remarks to Americans With Disabilities

May 2, 1994

Well, thank you, Stephanie and Denise, and thank you all for being here. I want to thank ADAPT; the National Council for Independent Living; the Consortium of Citizens With Disabilities; recognize my good friend Tony Coelho; Marca Bristo, the Chair of the National Council on Disabilities, pending confirmation. I'm honored to be given this book of signatures of genuine American heroes who are fighting every day for their own rights and for genuine health care reform for all Americans. I want to say a special word of thanks to Justin Dart, who has risen above partisanship to provide an example for all of us about what it really means to keep

fighting the good fight—not only for Americans with disabilities. This is a fight for all Americans who are touched by these problems. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Kate Miles and her family for being here today, for her determination, her courage, her love, and for her ability to get up here and tell their very moving personal story.

I say this to make a special point. The issues affecting Americans with disabilities—they say, "Well, there are 49 million Americans with some sort of disability, and there are 255 million of us total." But if you consider all the family members of all of the Americans with disabilities, you're getting very close to a majority of us who would be affected in a positive way by the provisions of the health security act that help Americans with disabilities, just those provisions. And in a very, moving and human way, Kate Miles and Robert and their children—husbands, all the families they stand for all across America, they have reminded us what this is all about.

The theme of your rally today is "Bridge to Freedom," and I want to talk a little about that. The Americans with disability law was a bridge to freedom. But it's only part of the equation. It's only part of the equation. What about economic freedom? How many Americans with disabilities are denied the chance to do work they are able to do not because of discrimination per se but because of the way the health care system works. This is not just a health care issue, it's a work issue. How much better off would the rest of us be if every American with a disability who was willing to work, could work because of changes in the health care system? It's self-defeating to say to the Americans with disabilities, "You can have health benefits, but only if you spend yourself into poverty, and above all, you must not work."

Forty-nine million Americans with disabilities, 24 million with severe disabilities, half with no private health insurance—the health care system is failing Americans with disabilities, but in so doing is failing us all, is making us less productive than we would otherwise be, less strong than we would otherwise be. It is costing more tax dollars and robbing us of taxes that would come to America's treasury, not from higher tax rates but from more Americans working and paying taxes in the ordinary course of their lives. We had better fix it now.

After all of the incredible debates, after all of the amazing ads where—and Justin just referred to one of them—you know, these ads where they say—somebody calls up and says, "Well, we'll have to call the Government and see if you can get your doctor," all these incredibly bogus ads. We had better do this now. We had better do this now. Otherwise, the forces of disinformation, organized disinformation, will think that the American people actually prefer to have the most expensive, wasteful, bureaucratically cumbersome health care insurance financing system on the entire face of the Earth, that they prefer that as opposed to giving a decent break to this fine family and to all of you. I don't believe the American people prefer that, and we had better make sure that no one draws that historic lesson from this health care debate.

There's a lot of talk today about the whole term "empowerment." It risks becoming a buzzword. There is an empowerment television network. But frankly, I like it. It encaptures something that is uniquely American: the idea that people ought to be able to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities and that the Government should facilitate people fulfilling themselves, not just be a paternalistic Government doing things for people. I have believed in that for years. Long before I ever became President, I worked on things that I thought would promote empowerment: more choices for parents and children in education, tax breaks for lower income working people, some of the things that we've also promoted here in Washington. The Family and Medical Leave Act here in my Presidency was an empowerment bill that enables people to be good parents and good workers at the same time, the empowerment zone concept that we passed through the economic program last time, lower student loans—lower interest rates for student loans and better paybacks—is an empowerment notion. National service is an empowerment notion: Let people have the strength at the grassroots level to solve their own problems.

Empowerment involves work and family and self-fulfillment in a responsible way. How can we empower the American people when 81 million of us live in families with preexisting conditions; when the average American, in the normal course of an economic lifetime, now will change jobs eight times; when this fine man cannot change a job, even if he gets a better job offer,

because he can't insure his child? Is that empowerment? No, it is the very reverse. So when we try to fix it, what do our adversaries say? "They're trying to have the Government take over the health care system." False. Private insurance, private providers, empowerment for this man, this woman, these children, their families, and their futures. [*Applause*] Can you stay around here until this is over? [*Laughter*] You're great.

Now, they say—let's not kid ourselves, if this were easy, it would have been done already, right? Somebody would have been—people have been trying to do it for 60 years. What is the nub of this? The nub is the question of how to cover everybody and then how to give small businesses the same market power in buying insurance that big business and Government have. Because all across America, Government and big business are downsizing, and small businesses are growing. I might say, that means we better fix this now, because 10 years from now you'll have a smaller percentage of people working for Government and big business and a larger percentage of people working for small business. And if we do not fix this now, this is going to get worse, not better.

We already have about 100,000 Americans a month losing their insurance permanently. In the future, if we're going to be caught up in the kind of a world that I want, where we have open borders and we trade and we have these churning, fascinating, ever-changing economies, we had better fix it now, because people will change jobs more often, not less often.

This is a profoundly important issue. But we cannot do it unless we find a way for everyone to have access and actually be covered by insurance. Nine out of 10 Americans who have private insurance today have it at work. Eight out of 10 Americans who don't have insurance, like this fine young man here, are in families where there is at least one working person. Therefore, it makes logical sense to say that people who do work should be covered through work with a combination of responsibility, just as this family has, from employers and the employee. And then people who are not working should be covered from a public fund. That is our plan; hardly a Government takeover of health care.

And it makes sense for the Government to empower small business to be able to afford this by providing the opportunity to be in buyers' co-ops so that small businesses, self-employed people, and farmers can buy insurance on the same term big business and Government can, and thereby can afford to hire persons with disabilities. Because they will be insured in big pools so that if there is one big bill for this young man here, the insurer does not go broke.

And furthermore, it makes sense to give small businesses a discount because a lot of them have financial burdens and lower profit margins, and so we do that. That is the role of the Government in this: require people who don't provide insurance to their employees to do it in partnership with their employees; let small businesses go into big buyers' co-ops so they can buy insurance on the same terms that the President and the Congress can and people who work for big companies can; eliminate discrimination so that people can move from job to job by removing the problems of preexisting conditions; and finally, face the fact that if you look at the aging population and the disabled population, we must do something to support long-term care that is community-based and home-based.

This is empowerment. This plan helps a person with a disability to be able to take a job by including a tax credit for personal assistance services worth 50 percent of what he or she earns. That's empowerment. But home and community-based long-term care is also empowerment. And it also, over the long run, will be less expensive. Does it cost more in the short run? Yes, it costs some extra money. But if you look at the population trends in this country, if you look at the people with disabilities who are surviving and having lives that are meaningful, if you look at the fastest growing group of Americans being people over 65, and within that group the fastest growing being people over 80, this is something we have to face as a people. We will either do it now in a rational way, or we will be dragged kicking and screaming into it piecemeal, Band-Aid-like, over the next 10 years. But, make no mistake about it, we cannot run away from this, because we cannot afford either to have everybody in the world forced into a nursing home or living in abject neglect. We can't do one of the two things.

So I say to you, all of you know that there is no perfect solution, no easy solution. All of you know that our bill, in order to pay for it, phases some of these services in. But it recognizes the reality of who we are as a people and what we need. We need the work of every

American who can work. We need the respect, the dignity of every American. And we need to provide the opportunity for every American to live up to his or her capacity in the least restrictive environment that that person might choose. We need to secure for the American economy the services of every person who wishes to be and is capable of being a successful worker. We need to stop seeing Government health care expenditures go up 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation every year to pay more for the same health care. We need to stop spending more money on paperwork and administrative costs, because of the health care financing system in this country, than any other country in the world.

We can do all of that and keep the doctors, the nurses, the health care system we have. That's why there are so many thousands and thousands, indeed millions now, of nurses, health care providers, and physicians who have supported our cause.

And so I ask you, the real problem with this, I am convinced, is that there is no way, to use the political vernacular, to "kiss" it, to "keep it simple, stupid." That's what people always tell me, you know. [*Laughter*] The real problem here is that we bear the burden of every move, those of us who want change, because we live in a system that is complicated. So it is not simple to fix it.

So I plead with you: A lot of you will contact Members of Congress who voted for the Americans with Disabilities Act who are not yet prepared to vote to make sure every American has health insurance and who do not understand yet that you cannot eliminate preexisting conditions and you cannot eliminate other discriminatory practices and you cannot afford to begin to provide long-term care that is community-based and home-based unless you set up a system where everybody has health care insurance, where small businesses can buy on the same terms big business and Government can and where insurers insure in big enough pools so that nobody goes broke when they do insure a family where a member has a disability and where small businesses get a discount. Those are the things we try to do with the power of Government. It is a legitimate thing to do. But when you strip it all away, what we're really trying to do is to empower the families of this country to live in dignity, to work in dignity, and to fulfill themselves. And in a strange way, this is a battle that the disability community, known so well to the Members of Congress, being so successful in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, this is a battle that you may be able to lead for the rest of America that they do not understand.

So I ask you to do that, be an agent of change, an agent of empowerment. Never forget that you are carrying on your shoulders now not only your own cause but ours as well. We cannot, in the end, fully unleash the forces of all human Americans until we do this. And we cannot do this with all the resistance and all the organized opposition, with the sheer intellectual difficulty of the tasks unless people like you can break through. You can break through to those Members of Congress. You can do it. You can do it. And we need you, all the rest of America, we need you to do it.

Good luck, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Stephanie Thomas, co-operator of the Austin, TX, chapter, American Disabled for Attendant Programs Today; Denise Figueroa, president, National Council on Independent Living; Tony Coelho, Chair, and Justin Dart, former Chair, President's Committee on the Employment of People With Disabilities; and Kate Miles, mother of a disabled son and advocate for long-term care and health care reform.

Remarks on Legislation To Ban Assault Weapons

May 2, 1994

Thank you very much, Chief. He's come a long way from Wisconsin to bring a little Middle Western common sense to the Nation's Capital.

When the House of Representatives votes this week on Thursday, they shouldn't forget the tragedy that the chief just talked about. Think

about it, a 30-year veteran of the police department killed by an M1–A1 assault rifle after a bank robbery, two other police officers and a hostage also wounded. These things can be prevented.

I also want to thank John Magaw for what he's said. He's done a fine job as Director of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division. And before that he was the Director of the Secret Service. I think you could tell his heartfelt concern there. He has two sons and a son-in-law, all in law enforcement. They deserve a chance to do their job with less danger, not more.

I thank Secretary Bentsen for his sterling leadership. We joked a lot of times about whether there will be somebody blocking his entrance to his ranch when he goes quail hunting this fall—[*laughter*]—but I don't really think so.

One of the things that I've learned since I've been here, even more than when I was a Governor, is that very often a lot of these organized interest groups don't always represent the members, their unorganized members, and what they really feel in their heart of hearts.

I want to thank the leaders of the law enforcement organizations that are here today: Bob Scully, the director of the National Association of Police Organizations; Sylvester Daughtry, the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police; John Pitta, the vice president of the Federal Law Enforcement Association; Mark Spurrier, the director of the Major City Chiefs; and Chuck Wexler, who's with the Police Executives Research Forum.

I want you all to think about what all you've heard. There are a lot of people in this audience today who have experienced a loss of life in their own family. And I realize that here today, in a fundamental way, we're sort of preaching to the saved. But what we hope to do here is to energize you to talk to those last few Members of the House. We need to put this bill over the top, to tell them this is not about gun control; it's about crime control.

You know, I would never do anything to infringe on the rights of sportsmen and women in this country. I have—I guess I was 12 years old the first time I fired a .22 or a .410. But I think to hide behind the rights of sports people to justify the kind of unconscionable behavior that takes place every single day on the streets of this country is an unforgivable abuse of our common right to be hunters. It is an abuse of that.

All over the world today, all you have to do is pick up the newspaper, any given day, and you see how we are worried about the disintegration of civic life in other countries. We read about the horror of Bosnia, and we say, "My God, why can't the Muslims and the Serbs and the Croats just get along?" We read about bodies being thrown into the river in Rwanda and say, "Good Lord, why are those people doing that to each other?" We read now about the rise of organized crime in Russia, and it breaks our heart. They finally get rid of communism and they try to go to a more entrepreneurial society, and a new group of dark organizations springs up and commits murder. We worry about what's happening in our neighboring country south of our border, especially to our friends in Mexico, when we hear about what's being done there by people running drugs.

And we worry, we worry, we worry, and we don't look around and see we have more people behind bars already in this country, a higher percentage of our population, than any country in the world, already. And when we come up with a bill like this, they say you ought to put more people in jail and keep them there longer. Well, some people ought to go to jail longer, and our crime bill does that.

But our disintegration, my fellow Americans, is in the streets of our cities where, as John Magaw says, we have suffered a breakdown of family and work and community, and where that vacuum has been filled by guns like this and people who use them in a very well organized way.

Will this solve all of the problems in America? No. Like John said, this is a puzzle. We're trying to fill in the puzzle with the crime bill. And in the end, the puzzle has to be filled by people like this fine chief out there on the streets of our cities, and whether the people who live in his community will work with it to take their streets back. But I'm telling you: This is an amazing—it's amazing to me that we even have to have this debate. I mean, how long are we going to let this go on?

San Francisco last summer, a gunman carrying two TEK–9's killed eight people and wounded six others. Last week, when we had an event for this bill, I'm sure a lot of you saw the husband of one of the women who was killed in that tragedy, Steve Sposato, who now is raising

his beautiful daughter by himself. Yes, that guy was crazy, and maybe he'd have gone in there with that old six-shooter and killed somebody. But Steve Sposato would like to have his wife's chances back.

Five years ago, a gunman using an AK-47 killed five elementary school kids. This happens every day. We lost two people and had three more wounded outside the CIA headquarters last year, remember that, with a gunman with an AK–47.

So I say to you, I'm sorry to be so frustrated, but sometimes it seems that the President's job ought to be dealing with things that are not obvious. I mean, at least health care is a complex subject. It's obvious we need to do something about it, but it's complicated. I concede that; I welcome these debates.

How can we walk away from this? Especially when this bill protects over 650 specific hunting weapons? I mean, I don't understand why the organizations aren't saying, "Well, hallelujah, this is the first Federal explicit protection we ever had for the means of hunting."

And I really—I was proud of what Mr. Magaw said, talking about the only color—I mean, I have heard people with a straight face saying, "Well, there are some adults that like to go target practice with these things." Well, they need to read a good book—[*laughter*]—or take up bowling or just follow—or, you know, you can hunt nearly 12 months out of the year if you hunt everything. [*Laughter*]

This is—it is imperative. We just have a few days left. And I urge you to spend less time with each other and more time putting the hammer of your feelings into the deliberations in the House of Representatives. And something else: No good Member of the House or Senate, no Republican or Democrat, no rural legislator should ever fear losing their seat for voting for this bill. And something else you ought to do is tell every office you call: "If you do this, I will fight for you for voting for this; I will—there may be differences over other issues, but I will do everything I can to see that nothing diminishes your standing because of this."

This is not a complicated issue. And we will have more issues like this. Every great society is going to face, for the foreseeable future, these incredible tensions between our freedom and our abuse of our freedom, between the need for liberty and the need for order, between our desire to have an entrepreneurial, free-flowing society and the absolute need for some discipline that enables us to live as human beings civilly together and give our children a chance to grow up.

And some of the decisions we'll have to make will be more difficult than this. But this is a lay-down no-brainer—[*laughter*]—and the Congress must not walk away from it. Please help us to pass it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:37 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to David Steingraber, Menomonee Falls, WI, police chief and head of the Wisconsin Police Chiefs Association.

Message to the Congress Reporting a Budget Deferral

May 2, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budget authority, totaling $7.3 million.

The deferral affects the Department of Health and Human Services. The details of the revised deferral is contained in the attached report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

May 2, 1994.

NOTE: The report detailing the deferral was published in the *Federal Register* on May 9.

Exchange With Reporters on Haiti
May 3, 1994

Q. Mr. President, are you going to send military advisers to Haiti? What is our Haiti policy, and are you thinking about military action or advisers or trainers, sir?

The President. Right now, what we're doing is to put in place a stiffer sanctions policy, consistent with what President Aristide has been asking for some months now. And we want to have a better enforcement of the sanctions we have as well as the stiffer sanctions. And I don't think it's useful to rule out any option, and I'm not ruling out any option.

But to use a phrase the Vice President made famous in 1992, "It's time for them to go." I mean, the military leaders of Haiti have abused their authority. They have begun to clearly kill more innocent civilians, people not even directly involved in the political life of the country.

I think the United States and the world is outraged by it. And we've tried other initiatives, and they have not worked. We have done our best to work through this, and the things we have done have not worked. So we're now doing this sanctions regime, as recommended by President Aristide and others, but we're not ruling out anything.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:15 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to the President's departure for Atlanta, GA.

Remarks to the Community in Atlanta, Georgia
May 3, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you for being here and in such large numbers and with such enthusiasm. Thank you, Mayor, for that wonderful introduction. Thank you, Governor and Mrs. Miller and Secretary of State Cleland, Commissioner, Congressman Lewis, Congresswoman McKinney, and ladies and gentlemen. Thank the Wings of Faith Choir and the Morehouse College Glee Club and all those who sang for us, thank you.

It is good to be back in Georgia and Atlanta again. I went running the other day with a number of members of the United States Olympic Team for the Winter Olympics. My wife and daughter represented us there in Lillehammer, and I could at least keep up with the winter Olympians. I don't think I can keep up with the summer Olympians, but I'll be here in 1996 to cheer them on along with you.

I want to thank all of you who came here with these "America Back On Track" signs. You know, I ran for President because I thought our country was not on the right track; because I was worried about my daughter growing up to be part of the first generation of Americans that did not do better than their parents; because I thought our country was being too divided by party, by race, by region, with arguments about what was right or left or liberal or conservative, obscuring the truth, the facts, and a way to the future.

Frankly, there is still a lot of that in our politics and too much of that in Washington, where people scream at each other across the divide and try to confuse you folks out here in the country with negative images and useless rhetoric. But there are some things that do not change. In the end, we will all be judged on whether we have done what is right to bring this country together and to move this country forward, to make it possible for every man and woman, every boy and girl to live to the fullest of their God-given capacities. That is our common obligation and our great opportunity. And I am doing my best to seize it for you as President of the United States.

I asked the United States Congress last year to pass an economic plan that would bring the deficit down and drive investment up, that would drive interest rates down, keep inflation down, create jobs, and move this country forward. And the Congress did it in the face of

withering, withering hot air and rhetoric. And all the people who were against it said, "Well, if you do this, all the middle class people in America will have their income taxes go up, and the economy will collapse." Well, what happened?

The economic plan passed. Interest rates went down; investment went up. Last year, in the first 14 months of our administration, 2½ million new jobs were created, more than the previous 4 years. And we are moving this country forward.

It is true that 1.2 percent of the American people paid more in income taxes, but it all went to pay down the deficit. And we cut even more in spending. And this year, one in six working families will get an income tax cut so that they will not fall into poverty and be tempted to choose welfare over work. We are going to choose work over welfare by not taxing people into welfare, but lifting them out for work.

And I have now presented a budget to the Congress which eliminates 100 Government programs, cuts over 200 more, has no tax increases, and if adopted, will give us 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States of America.

That is not partisan rhetoric, my fellow Americans. And that's not all that liberal and conservative talk in the air. That's just the facts. We are doing it. And what we need in America is more people to leave aside the hot air, roll up their sleeves, and go to work on the promise and the problems of this country in that way.

They said when I took office all the Democrats were for big Government. Well, let me tell you something. The budget I gave to the Congress does provide more money for Head Start, more money for new technologies and job training, more money for education and training our people in the future. But you know what? It still reduces domestic spending in everything but health care for the first time since 1969. No other President has been able to do that. If the Congress adopts it, we'll do it for the first time since '69.

This is not a partisan issue. It's a question of whether we're going to do what it takes to get this country going again so those little children will have a future. That is what is at stake.

And now we have many challenges before us. We must keep this economy strong. The economy of Georgia last year—in the last year—has produced 150,000 new jobs, the fastest growing economy east of the Mississippi River. You have benefited from this, and we have to keep it going.

If you look ahead to this year—I came here today to be part of a remarkable thing that CNN is sponsoring, making you the telecommunications capital of the world. Tonight I will be talking with people not only all across America but with 75 million people, at least, in over 100 other countries, people asking questions about what this world is going to be like and what America's role is in it. And I want to say something that you know here: We cannot withdraw from the world. Last year, we made more progress in opening America's borders to new trade, new investment, and reaching out to the rest of the world, than had been made in a generation. This year, the Congress has got to adopt the new world trade agreement. This year we have got to adopt new systems for educating and training our people so they can compete in that global economy. We're going to be challenged to do that.

Tomorrow I'm going back to the White House to sign a bill that will, for the first time, put in place a national system for all the young people in our country who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need more education and training, so they can move from school to work with high skills and better opportunity in the future.

And then we are going to take up a bill to totally change the unemployment system. You know, a lot of you here can identify with this. It used to be when people lost their jobs, they were just laid off for a while, and then they were called back to their old jobs. so the unemployment system gave them enough to live on while that happened. Now, most people who are laid off do not get called back to their old jobs; should not be allowed to wait month after month after month but instead should be able, from the day they are laid off, to immediately start a training program and a new set of job searches. And that's what we're trying to do with this reemployment system, instead of an unemployment program.

We are working on a crime bill in Washington which mirrors a lot of what Governor Miller and the legislature have done here: to put more police officers on the street; to help cities like Atlanta have community police officers who walk the streets, know the kids, know the neighbors,

and can reduce crime as well as catch criminals; one that has tougher penalties but also alternative punishments, like boot camps for first-time offenders; one that will give us a chance to have drug treatment as well as tougher punishment. These are the kinds of things that we need to do to make this country safe again. And we're going to do it this year in Washington, just as you've been trying to do it in Georgia.

Soon I will present to the Congress a welfare reform program designed to begin the process of ending the whole welfare system as we know it. And a lot of that welfare reform program is like what you are doing here in Georgia. People want to be independent, not dependent. People want to succeed as parents and workers. And we have to give them the tools, the incentives, and, if necessary, the requirements to do just that. And I believe we can. And I think the American people want us to do it.

Finally, let me say that when you look at all this, it all brings you back to the beginning. We are moving into a new and different and very exciting time in which the young people here will be able to grow up, if we complete our work at dismantling the nuclear arsenals of other countries, unafraid of nuclear war. I was so proud to be able to go to Russia and sign an agreement where we agreed that for the first time in decades we would no longer even point our missiles at each other. That is a good thing.

But if you look all over the world, with the end of the cold war and the opening up of new technologies and the increasing entrepreneurialism and the more rapid pace of change, there are dangers there, too. Because now countries instead of invading each other are fighting from within, from Bosnia to Rwanda. And even countries that are trying to promote democracy are made more vulnerable by high technology and organized criminal activity, from organized crime in Russia to the drug kingpins in Mexico and South America to the gangs that terrorize the streets of the United States of America.

We have great tests and challenges before us, each of us within our borders and across our borders. But the next century can be the best time America has ever known. And the young people in this audience can have the best life any group of Americans has ever known if we have the courage and the vision and the wisdom to cool down the traditional politics-as-usual, to reduce the gridlock, to reduce the hot air, to reduce the name-calling, and instead think about the people that live in this country and do something to bring them together and move them forward. That is my promise to you.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:12 p.m. in the CNN Center Atrium. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Bill Campbell of Atlanta; Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia; Max Cleland, Georgia secretary of state; and Thomas T. Irvin, Georgia agriculture commissioner.

Remarks on the Congressional Elections and an Exchange With Reporters in Atlanta

May 3, 1994

The President. [*Inaudible*]—the elections will help, because the elections will give an opportunity for the facts to come out. The Georgia economy's doing well. It's done much better since I've been elected President. The economic program, which we passed—a lot of the Republicans, including some of the prominent Republicans in Georgia, accused us of raising income taxes on everybody. Now they know, the American people know, only 1.2 percent of the American people paid higher income taxes. And this year, one in six working families will get a tax cut. We're reducing the deficit. And under our administration, we'll have 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Truman.

So the economy's doing better. We passed sweeping education and training reforms. We're passing the toughest crime bill in American history. We're going to pass welfare reform. We're dealing with the problems of America. And I think by election time that should be very helpful. That'll be a good environment in which

Democrats can run. We Democrats don't have the kind of machine, in a way—media machine—that the Republicans do, sort of spewing out all this venom and all this labeling and name-calling all the time. So we get down sometimes, but we'll get back up.

Georgia—Atlanta has benefited greatly from the trade initiatives of this administration, from the North American Free Trade Agreement, from the worldwide trade agreement, from our outreach to Asia. So I think the record—the economic benefits and the fact that we reflect middle class values and welfare reform, the crime initiative, and other things, all those things will help the Democrats by November.

Q. Do you take a fairly relaxed attitude about the fact that some Members of the Georgia delegation, congressional delegation, would just as soon stay in Washington and not right now come down and be with you?

The President. Sure, I take a fairly relaxed attitude about whatever they want to do. But I think the—you've got to understand, in the rural South where you've got Rush Limbaugh and all this right-wing extremist media just pouring venom at us every day and nothing to counter that, we need an election to get the facts out. So I really—I welcome the election—American people find out the truth, they're going to support people who didn't say no every time.

Essentially these Democrats, most of them have said yes to America. They've said yes on crime, yes on getting the deficit down, yes on getting the economy going, yes on moving the country forward. We have ended gridlock. It took us years and years and years to pass some of this anticrime initiatives and other things that we're doing now. And when the American people see the facts, even in the places which were tough for us, I think that the Democrats will do very, very well, because they'll have their own record to run on. So I'm kind of looking forward to it.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 3 p.m. at the CNN International Studio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Following a Meeting With President Jimmy Carter in Atlanta

May 3, 1994

Haiti

Q. President Clinton, is military intervention on the table?

President Clinton. I agree with what President Carter said. That's basically what I said this morning, and I believe that. After all, we had an agreement, the Governors Island Agreement, which was broken. And I think the military leaders are going to have to understand that we have been very patient. After they reneged on the Governors Island Agreement, we went back and spent a few more months trying to come up with some alternative formula. President Aristide did not dispute the fact that he had to broaden his political base in order to effectively govern. He was willing to do that. And we have worked on this for months now.

For the last several weeks we keep getting reports not only of Aristide backers but of civilians being not only murdered, but mutilated. And I think it's time for a new initiative. We're now, as you know, doing two things: We're going for stronger sanctions in the U.N. and stiffening the enforcement of the sanctions we have, consistent with what President Aristide has wanted all along. We're going to consult with all of our friends and allies in the region, and we're going to do our best to bring a conclusion to this before more people die innocently and continue to suffer. But we cannot remove the military option. We have to keep that as an option.

Q. It sounds like your patience is running out.

President Clinton. I think it has run out; maybe we've let it run on a bit too long. But we're—the United States is very sensitive to the fact that without our direct intervention, today, all governments in Latin America, Central America, and the Caribbean have elected leaders except two—Haiti has ousted theirs, and

Cuba. And we have done that in a spirit of partnership at its best in Latin America. When we have intervened in the past it hasn't worked out very well.

The work that President Carter has done in Central America on elections—he's about to go back to Panama—is an example of America at its best being a genuine good neighbor to those countries. And that's the best approach. But this is an unusual and in some ways unprecedented circumstance. We're going to keep trying to find other ways to do it, but we cannot remove the military option.

South Africa

Q. Mr. President, how much aid do you have in mind for the new government in South Africa?

President Clinton. Well, I'm going to talk about that a little tonight. We're going to roughly double what we had previously scheduled.

Q. Which was?

President Clinton. And I think it will be about $600 million over 3 years, something like that. I will have the figure tonight. I'm trying to—because I asked today, ironically that you asked this, for a little more information about some of the programs, and I'm going now to prepare for the program tonight. So I'll have it nailed down exactly about what we're going to do. But we're going to have a big increase in our aid, and I hope we'll be able to sustain it for some time, because if the South African miracle can be translated from an election into the lives of the people there, then the promise that that would have for lifting all of southern Africa and setting an example that others might follow is quite extraordinary.

I think the whole world has been moved by the size of the turnout, by the profound passion of the people, and by the rather miraculous partnership between Mr. Mandela and Mr. de Klerk, and the fact that Chief Buthelezi and the Inkatha Party came back in the 11th hour, participated, and apparently have done as about projected and will be a part of the government. So I'm hoping that this is all going to work out fine.

Supreme Court Appointment

Q. Mr. President, would you appoint someone on the Supreme Court without interviewing them yourself?

President Jimmy Carter. I would.

President Clinton. Did you hear what he said? He said, "I would." [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:23 p.m. at the Carter Center. President Jimmy Carter made welcoming remarks and answered reporters' questions prior to the President's remarks. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Interview on CNN's "Global Forum With President Clinton"

May 3, 1994

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Turner, and ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I want to welcome those of you who are here at the CNN conference and the millions more who are watching all across the world tonight. I also want to thank the Carter Center for hosting us for this pathbreaking discussion of world events.

Throughout the history of the United States and particularly after major conflicts, America has had to reexamine how we define our security and what kind of world we hope to live in and to leave our children and what our responsibilities for that world are. With the cold war over we have clearly come to another such moment, a time of great change and possibility. The specter of nuclear annihilation is clearly receding. A score of new democracies has replaced the former Soviet empire. A global economy has collapsed distances and expanded opportunity, because of a communications revolution symbolized most clearly by CNN and what all of us are doing this evening all around the world.

We are front-row history witnesses. We see things as they occur. I remember when I was a young man watching the news on television at night. There was only a small amount of coverage allotted to the world scene, and very often the footage I would see as a boy would

be a whole day old. Now we're impatient if we learn about things an hour after they occur instead of seeing them in the moment.

The Berlin Wall has been toppled. A handshake of hope has started the series of peace news that will be necessary at long last to bring peace to the troubled Middle East. And this week we saw these glorious and unforgettable scenes of millions of South Africans of all races lining up with joy and courage to give birth to their new multiracial democracy.

But all of us know that this era poses dangers as well. Russia and the other former Communist states are going through wrenching transitions. The end of the superpower standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union lifted the lid off a cauldron of smoldering ethnic hatreds. And there is now so much aggression within the national borders of countries all around the world. Indeed, all of us feel our humanity threatened as much by fights going on within the borders of nations as by the dangers of fighting across national borders.

There are regimes, such as Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, who persist in working to develop weapons of mass destruction. We see brutal human rights abuses from Haiti to Rwanda and dire humanitarian and environmental problems from the sweeping AIDS epidemic and desertification in Africa to deforestation in Latin America and Asia.

In the face of so much promise and trouble, we have a chance, a chance to create conditions of greater peace and prosperity and hopefully more lasting peace and prosperity, but only if the world's leading nations stay actively engaged in the effort.

With the cold war over, there are pressures here in America and in other nations around the world to turn inward, to focus on needs at home. Here at home for us that means things like job creation and reducing crime and providing health care to all our citizens. It is right, and indeed imperative, for us to address these needs. But the United States cannot turn our back on the world, nor can other nations. I know our engagement costs money, and sometimes it costs lives. I know well that we cannot solve every problem, nor should we try. But in an era of change and opportunity and peril, America must be willing to assume the obligations and the risks of leadership. And I am determined to see that we do that.

It is important that we have a clear road map in a new era based on our national interests and our clearly stated values, a road map that charts where we're trying to go. Tonight let me briefly sketch it out before taking questions.

Our highest priority and my highest priority as President must continue to be simply and clearly to protect our land, our people, and our way of life. That is the core of our national interest. We also must seize opportunities that will enhance our safety and our prosperity, acting alone when necessary, acting with others whenever possible.

We have an interest in continuing to serve as a beacon of strength and freedom and hope. For we are, after all, a unique nation. We are the world's most powerful arsenal, its oldest democracy, its most daring experiment in forging different races, religions, and cultures into a single people.

Since taking office, my strategy to advance those interests has been based on three priorities: first, developing policies to meet the security challenges of this new era and then shaping our defense forces necessary to carry out those policies; second, making our Nation's global economic interests an integral and essential part of our foreign policies; and third, promoting the spread of democracy abroad.

Let me discuss each of these briefly. First, ensuring that we have strong policies and ready defenses for a new security environment. Thankfully, we no longer face the prospect of Soviet troops marching into Western Europe. But the world is still a dangerous place, and the skill and the power and the readiness of our men and women in uniform remains a bulwark of our freedom and freedom in many places abroad.

Last year, we completed a sweeping assessment of what military forces we now need in order to meet this era's threats. We concluded that we must have forces that can fight and win two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously. These forces will cost less than what was needed during the cold war, but we must not cut too far. And I have fought against deeper cuts in our defenses that would weaken our ability to be ready to defend our interests.

We're taking other steps to meet the threats of this new era. At the NATO summit convened in January, we and our NATO allies adopted the concept of the Partnership For Peace to help draw former Communist states and other

states in Europe not presently aligned with NATO into closer security cooperation with Western Europe. We're working to increase regional security in areas like the Middle East, where we hope tomorrow Israel and the PLO will sign an important accord that builds on the promise of their breakthrough last September.

We're continuing to reduce the world's nuclear dangers, working to end North Korea's dangerous nuclear program. We started negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. When I took office, four former Soviet republics had nuclear weapons. We succeeded with three of them in nailing down commitments to eliminate their entire nuclear arsenals. And we are proceeding in that important work. And now, for the very first time, our nuclear missiles are no longer targeted at Russia, nor theirs at us.

The second part of our strategy is to place economic progress at the center of our policies abroad. For too many years there was a dangerous dislocation here in America between our international policies and our economic policies. We were strong militarily when we became economically weak because of our dangerously high deficits and low productivity, things which contributed to the weakening of nations all around the world and dried up much of the capital needed in less developed countries for development and growth. We advocated free trade, but often we practiced just the reverse when under the pressure of poor economic performance. And even when we pushed free trade, we often here in our own country lacked the policies we needed to make sure that it benefited ordinary American citizens.

My goal has been to reduce our deficit, increase our investment, increase our competitiveness, improve the education and training of our people, and keep pushing for agreements to open world markets for no special treatment for the United States but more open markets so that all of us may grow and compete together.

This past year, there was important progress. We enacted the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico and secured the biggest market opening agreement in history with the GATT world trade talks, agreements that will create American jobs for us here in the United States while spurring significant global economic growth. We hosted a summit of leaders from the Asian-Pacific region, the fastest growing region on Earth. This year we will seek enactment of the GATT round in the Congress and convene the first summit in a generation of our hemispheric neighbors.

We work to promote environmentally sound forms of economic development both here and abroad. We have to remember that many of the civil wars we have seen and are seeing today, tearing apart societies across Africa and elsewhere, are caused not only by historic conflicts but also by the abject and utterly terrifying deterioration of not only the economy but the environment in which those people live.

The third key to our policy is fostering democracy. The new progress of democracy all around the world resonates with our values and our interests. It makes us safer here in the United States. We know democracies are less likely to wage war, to violate human rights, to break treaties. That's why we fought two world wars, to protect Europe's democracies, and why we stood firm for a half a century to contain communism.

Now the greatest opportunity for our security is to help enlarge the world's communities of market democracies and to move toward a world in which all the great powers govern by a democratic plan. If we do, we'll have more valuable partners in trade and better partners in diplomacy and security. That's why I have given a lot of attention to promoting democratic and market reformers in Russia, in Ukraine, the Baltics, and other former Communist states. We saw that strategy pay off again just last week as Russia and Latvia reached an historic accord to withdraw Russia's military from Latvian territory by the end of August.

Our goal is to foster the success of new democracies like those in Latin America and now in South Africa and to apply pressure to restore democracy where it has been overthrown, as in Haiti.

Security, prosperity, democracy: These are the pillars of our strategy in the new world. These building blocks do not answer every question we confront. In particular, this era has seen an epidemic of humanitarian catastrophes, many caused by ethnic conflicts or the collapse of governments. Some, such as Bosnia, clearly affect our interests. Others, such as Rwanda, less directly affect our own security interests but still warrant our concern and our assistance.

America cannot solve every problem and must not become the world's policeman. But we do

have an obligation to join with others to do what we can to relieve suffering and to restore peace.

The means we use will and must vary from circumstance to circumstance. When our most important interests are at stake, we will not hesitate to act alone if necessary. Where we share an interest in action with the international community, we work perhaps through the United Nations. This week we will unveil a set of policies to reform U.N. peacekeeping to help make those operations both less expensive and more effective.

In other cases we will work in partnership with other nations. In Bosnia, for example, we have stepped up our diplomatic involvement, along with Russia and others. We supported NATO enforcement measures and committed to provide United States forces as a part of a NATO enforcement mission if and when the parties can reach a workable peace agreement.

Although that conflict continues, we should never forget that there are tonight people in Sarajevo, Tuzla, and Mostar who are alive because of the actions taken with NATO working with the United Nations. The safe areas, the no-fly zone, the longest humanitarian airlift in history, all these efforts and others are contributing to a resolution of a very difficult problem.

This is a pivotal moment in the affairs of our world, a moment when we can expand the frontiers of freedom, create a more prosperous global economy, give millions in war-torn lands a chance to enjoy a normal life, when we can make the people in each of our lands safer from the world's deadliest weapons.

On each of these, I believe the leadership of the United States is indispensable. My commitment is to exercise that leadership so that we can pass onto our children a world that is safer, freer, and more livable for their future.

Thank you very much.

Haiti

[*At this point, Judy Woodruff described the format for the forum and introduced a participant from Trinidad, who asked about U.S. policy toward the Caribbean and Latin America.*]

The President. Well, our policy has not changed. I believe in the Good Neighbor Policy, and we've tried to be a good neighbor. We have worked with our friends in Mexico on trade and democracy. We have worked with many other countries. The Vice President has been to South America a couple of times to work on developing the information superhighway and many other things. We're trying to bring democracies into closer trade relationships with us in the Caribbean, as well as in Central and South America. And I have made it very clear that the United States wishes to be a partner, not a dictator, about the internal events of other countries.

On the other hand, every country in the region is governed by a democratically elected government but two. One is Cuba; the other is Haiti, which voted two-thirds for President Aristide, and he was then thrown out. We had an agreement, the Governors Island Agreement, made by the military, the Aristide faction, in cooperation with the United States and the United Nations. It was abrogated by the military rulers of Haiti. We went back to the drawing board. We have worked for months since Governors Island was abrogated to try to find other solutions. Meanwhile, innocent civilians are being killed and mutilated.

We are doing our best to avoid dealing with the military option. We are now pursuing—we put on the table at the United Nations today—stiffer sanctions. We're working for tougher enforcement of the existing sanctions. But given how many people are being killed and the abject misery of the Haitian people and the fact that democracy was implanted by the people and then uprooted by the military rulers there, I think that we cannot afford to discount the prospect of a military option.

I want to work with our friends and neighbors in the Caribbean and in all of Latin America. And I hope that whatever we do from here on out will have their support. The United States never will interfere in the affairs of another country to try to seek to thwart the popular will there. This is a different case.

Ms. Woodruff. If I may follow up, Mr. President, when you say you wouldn't rule out a use of military force, you're saying U.S. troops on the ground. What would be their mission if they were to go there?

The President. Well, let me say what our policy is. Our policy—and we have not decided to use force; all I've said is we can't rule it out any longer. Our policy is to restore democracy to Haiti and then to work to develop Haiti with a functioning government and a growing economy. The people who are now in control

in Haiti have thwarted democracy; they have brought down the economy; they have visited abject misery on their people. And they are now once again killing and mutilating not just sympathizers of Aristide but other innocent civilians. And it is wrong, and we've got to do what we can to try to stop it. That is our policy, and we are going to pursue that policy as vigorously as we can.

I want to make it clear: This is the responsibility not of the United States but of the people who are running things in Haiti tonight. They abrogated the Governors Island Agreement. They have started killing, first the allies of President Aristide and now innocent civilians. They have brought this reign of terror and poverty on their people. They can change it tomorrow if they will. And I hope they will.

Ms. Woodruff. But you wouldn't say at this point what the mission would be if we were to go in?

The President. The mission of the United States, whatever means we choose to pursue that mission, is to restore democracy, to start a multinational effort to help Haiti function and to grow again and to crawl out of this enormous hole that the present rulers of Haiti have illegally driven the people into.

North Korea

[*A participant from Seoul, South Korea, asked about the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula.*]

The President. Well, I think it is a very serious situation. And let me say, first of all, it is a very serious situation because North Korea has agreed to be a nonnuclear state, to follow nonproliferation policies. Because it has nuclear resources, it has agreed in the past to submit to the international inspections of the IAEA. There has been a lot of trouble about that, as you know, as well as about how to resume a dialog between North Korea and South Korea. I would say to you, sir, that the options we have are largely again in the hands of the North Koreans themselves. North Korea can choose, and I hope they will.

And I would say this to the North Koreans—I believe we have North Koreans watching us tonight—I would say to you: The United States wishes to have friendly and open relationships with you. We wish to have a constructive relationship. We want you to have a constructive relationship with South Korea. You in North Korea have pledged yourselves to a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. That's what we want. If there is a policy of isolation pursued by us, it will only be because you decide not to follow through on the commitments you have already made to honor international inspections and to be a nonnuclear state.

The options are, I think, clear. But they are not easy. No one wishes this confrontation. But neither does one wish to have a state not only with nuclear power but with a capacity to proliferate nuclear weapons to other nations. It is a very serious potential situation. We intend to stand firm and to keep working with our allies, South Koreans, the Japanese, working with the Chinese and others, to reach a good solution to this.

Our hand is still out to the people of North Korea and to the leaders of North Korea. But we expect the commitment that North Korea made to be a nonnuclear state to be honored.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, if I may just quickly follow up here. With all due respect to what you said, if North Korea wants to go ahead and develop a nuclear weapon, what is to stop them from doing so? You're not saying that the United States is prepared to go to war if they continue with this program that they've begun.

The President. At a minimum, North Korea will be much more isolated, in a much more tenuous position. And the relationships between the North Koreans and South Korea will be strained, I think, irrevocably in many ways. And the problems that North Korea will then have with their neighbors in Japan as well as with their friends in China will be very significant. The least that would happen is that they would be much, much more severely isolated and they would run a risk of having more difficult things happen. And their rhetoric has recognized that.

I think this is another one of those issues—it's in the hands of the North Koreans. But we have reached out the hand of friendship and cooperation, and we know the South Koreans wish to do the same. It does not really make sense for the North Koreans to pursue this path of isolation. They can have more prosperity, more security, and more prestige by abandoning this nuclear program that they have already promised to abandon than by going forward with it, and I hope they will.

Bosnia

[*Following a commercial break, a journalist in Belgrade asked if it would be more productive to treat all factions in the Bosnia conflict equally, without sanctions against the Serbs.*]

The President. I guess the short answer is no, but not entirely no. Let me explain what I mean by that.

The United States does not believe that we can or should, alone or through NATO, enter into your war on the side of the Government of Bosnia and its new partnership with the Croats. When we supported creating the safe zone around Sarajevo, we made it absolutely clear that anyone caught violating the safe zone would be subject to the NATO air strikes, including weaponry of the government. We also have made it clear to the government that they should not look to us to change the military balance on the ground, and that there has to be a negotiated settlement. We have said that to the government, just as the Russians have said that to the Bosnian Serbs. And we intend to undertake a very intense effort to restore diplomatic negotiations.

Now, having said that, I do not favor lifting the sanctions while that is going on for the very simple reason that the United States supported and recognized Serbia when it became an independent country, Croatia, and Bosnia. The United Nations decided to keep the arms embargo on all of the former Yugoslavia. But the arms embargo was a mockery in Bosnia because Serbia was next to the area occupied by the Bosnian Serbs. And as you know, Yugoslavia was a great manufacturer, even an exporter, of arms before it broke up. So the necessary effect of the arms embargo was to give an enormous strategic advantage to the Serbs in heavy weaponry, to facilitate ethnic cleansing when we were trying to support a peaceful solution that would enable all the people of Bosnia, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Muslims, to live together.

So I could not support lifting the embargo. But I agree with you to the extent that there cannot be a military victory here. There must be a negotiated settlement. That is why I thought it was a mistake for the Serbs to press their advantage around Gorazde. We only seek to use NATO air power to protect safe areas, to keep the Brcko area stable, to stop this fighting on the ground. Let's go back to the negotiations. Let's make a peace so that we can all return to normal peaceful relations. I want that, and I want that with Serbia as well. But we have to do it in the right and moral way.

[*Christiane Amanpour, CNN correspondent in Sarajevo, asked if delay in articulating a policy on Bosnia had aided the Bosnian Serbs and if the policy flip-flops would encourage North Korea, for example, to take the United States less seriously.*]

The President. No, but speeches like that may make them take me less seriously than I'd like to be taken. There have been no constant flip-flops, madam. I ran for President saying that I would do my best to limit ethnic cleansing and to see the United States play a more active role in resolving the problem in Bosnia. And we have been much more active than my predecessor was in every way from the beginning. I also said very clearly that I did not believe we should inject American ground forces on the ground in Bosnia to try to affect the strategic outcome, to take part in the civil war.

When I became President, I argued to our European allies that we ought to lift the arms embargo, or at least be caught trying, in the United Nations because of the unfairness of the situation on the ground. They argued back to me that they were on the ground as part of the U.N. peacekeeping force and that if we lifted the arms embargo, we would lengthen the war, make it more bloody, and subject their people to being shot or taken as hostages. So, we could not prevail.

I then worked to get NATO, for the first time in its history, to agree to an out-of-area operation, which we did in August. We have enforced a no-fly zone. We have had the longest humanitarian air lift in history. We have succeeded, because of the NATO air power, I believe, in getting a lot of the lines of communications for humanitarian aid open again there, and of course, the safe zone around Sarajevo and elsewhere. I wish it could have been done overnight, but fundamentally, Bosnia is in the—it's in the American interest to limit the conflict to Bosnia, to try to restore humanitarian conditions, to see that a bad example is not set, and to limit the refugee outflow. Those are the things we are trying to do.

We have troops in Macedonia. We have used our air power. We have pushed NATO. And we have pushed the United Nations. But I don't think you can say that the world community

could have intervened and changed the course of this war or should have intervened on one side or the other. What we need to do is to stop the conflict from spreading, which I think has been done, try to stop the military escalation within Bosnia, which I think has been done, and then get the parties back to negotiate a decent peace.

I believe that was, as a practical matter, the only option open to me after I became President, and I have worked very hard on it for a year. I do not believe I should have injected American ground forces there into the conflict. We, after all, had at the time I became President several thousand forces in Somalia. We have obligations in Korea and in other places in Asia. We have obligations potentially in the Middle East because of the work we are doing there. And the United States has done the best it could.

I think we have done a very great deal. Do I wish we could have done more earlier? Do I wish the Europeans and our other allies had totally agreed with me? Of course I do. But I also respect their differences and their long experience in this area. I did the best I could. I moved as quickly as I could. I think we have shown a good deal of resolve. And I think what this Bosnian situation shows is that if you can get NATO agreed to act with resolve, NATO can have an impact.

I will still say in the end we have to resolve this through negotiations. Air power cannot change the course of the civil war either. They're going to have to negotiate a peace. What we're going to try to do is to make it less bloody and less productive to pursue aggression, so that the parties will want to go back to the peace table.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, just a quick followup. Would you not acknowledge that given what you said during the campaign about it being time to end Serb aggression, that it is much easier to make these statements in a campaign than actually to carry them out as President?

The President. Well, what I will acknowledge is that I underestimated the difficulty of putting a coalition together, all agreeing on one policy. Her question to me was right if she were to ask me, do I think it took too long for all of us to get together? Yes, I do. But we worked at it very hard from the beginning. I don't think it's fair to say we've gone back and forth. We tried one area; it didn't work; we try another.

There were people who said to me, "Don't get involved in Bosnia. Leave it alone. Let it go. It's a sinkhole. You can have no influence. Walk away from it. If you try to do something, you can't dominate it; you'll just be attacked for that." I thought that was bad advice. The United States sometimes has to try to make a difference where it cannot control events but can influence them. That is the situation with Bosnia. We are not in control; we have some influence, we're doing our best to exercise it, and I think we're better off.

I think during the campaign, when I made it clear that I didn't think we could or should send ground forces in unless there was an agreement, I underestimated the difficulty of getting broad agreement through NATO and then getting the U.N. to use the NATO force. I did underestimate that. It took longer than I wish it had. But if you think about what an unprecedented action NATO has taken, the first time we have ever acted together out of the NATO area, I think still it's something that's remarkable and very much worth doing.

Poland and NATO

[*A participant from Poland asked about the denial of NATO membership to Poland.*]

The President. First of all, I fully expect NATO to be expanded eastward. At the time we formed the Partnership For Peace and asked Poland to participate, which it agreed to do, along with Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, all the former Warsaw Pact countries, Ukraine, all the former republics of the Soviet Union, there was at that time no consensus within NATO about which countries to take in, in what order, and what the obligations of NATO membership would be for a new country coming in. So it wasn't, with all respect, in response to Russian pressure that no membership was offered to Poland or any other country last summer.

What I argued for in the Partnership For Peace was the beginning of joint planning, joint maneuvers, joint operations with military cooperation with any country that wanted to join the Partnership For Peace—including, I acknowledge, Russia if they wished to join—because I thought at the end of the cold war we had a chance which we ought to take, a

chance to see Europe united for the first time since nation states began to dot the European Continent, a chance. And it seemed to me that the Partnership For Peace offered us the best of both worlds. That is, if everyone would agree to observe and respect their neighbors territorially and to see their neighbors' territory as integral to their own security, then we might succeed.

If, in fact, imperialist tensions in Russia reasserted themselves, then we could always, by planning for NATO, take in other countries into NATO membership at an appropriate time without any risk to their security whatever. That is my hope and goal.

If you're asking me, the big question is, does the United States have an interest in the security of the people of Poland and Hungary and Central Europe and Eastern Europe? The answer to that is yes. But don't assume that NATO has walked away from Poland. NATO is walking toward Poland, not away.

Middle East

[*An Israeli journalist asked what evidence the President had of a strategic change on the part of President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria regarding peace with Israel and regarding terrorism.*]

The President. The evidence I find is that he has welcomed a very frank and candid and explicit exchange of views and ideas about how to make a lasting peace and achieve normal and peaceful relationships with Israel.

Secretary Christopher has been asked by President Asad, and approved by Prime Minister Rabin, to serve as an intermediary at this point in having what I believe are the most serious conversations ever held since the creation of this terrible divide between Israel and Syria, between a leader of Syria and a leader of Israel.

I have had several conversations with President Asad and of course with Prime Minister Rabin, with whom I talked just this afternoon about the ongoing progress of Middle East peace negotiations. And all I can tell you is that all of us believe that we have a greater chance to achieve a breakthrough agreement than ever before. And obviously, that breakthrough agreement ultimately would have to include an agreement with Lebanon recognizing the territorial integrity of Lebanon and excising terrorism from Lebanon. And I believe we are on that road, and we have a real chance to make progress this year.

Obviously, since their conversations are private, I can't say more. But all I can tell you is I honestly believe that, and I think the other major actors in this drama believe it as well.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, I've just been told that just in the first few minutes that a Palestinian delegate, PLO delegate, has announced in the Middle East that the Israelis and the PLO have wound up their talks, and they have reached an agreement on Palestinian autonomy, which was something you referred to just a few moments ago.

We want to go—continue in our Jerusalem location now with a question from a Palestinian journalist.

Go ahead.

[*A Palestinian journalist in Jerusalem asked about loans and loan guarantees for Palestinians.*]

The President. Well, first let me say, I agree it will take more than $2 billion to totally construct a successful economy on the West Bank and around Jericho and in other places—in Gaza and Jericho, excuse me. But I think the $2 billion is a very good start. That's what we might call real money. I mean, it's a pretty good beginning.

And let me say that in anticipation of—I've not checked this today, but I asked if we could have in Cairo, when the agreement is signed between the PLO and Israel, a delegation of American business people, American Jews and Arab-American business people who have pledged themselves to work together to bring private capital and private investment in to support the other commitments that the governments have made at the donors conference.

So, I believe you can look forward to a significant increase in private investment from the United States from both Arab-Americans and Jewish-American business people in these areas because of their common determination to work together to see that you are able to work and live together.

Japan

[*A television correspondent from Japan asked about U.S. requirements for continuation of trade negotiations with Japan.*]

The President. Well, let me answer the first question first, the "what." If you go back to the agreement I made on my trip to Japan as part of the G–7 conference last summer with the then-Prime Minister Miyazawa and the conversations I had with Prime Minister Hosokawa and with your new Prime Minister, Mr. Hata, when he was in his previous position, what we wish to do is to simply continue to make progress within the framework of the agreement that Japan and the United States both made last summer.

The big hangup is over the question of the use of numerical targets, and does this amount to managed trade, does this amount to quotas. I want to emphasize, if I might, two things: Number one, I have never asked for any access to the Japanese market for the United States that I have not sought for every other country. It would be wrong. I have not asked for that. Number two, I have pledged my efforts to ensure that the use of numerical quotas would not be used—or numerical targets would not be used to establish trade quotas or managed trade for the Japanese people. I know that we cannot require your people to buy products they do not wish to buy. We cannot overcome price or quality problems our products or services might have.

On the other hand, the Japanese Government, both when Prime Minister Miyazawa was in office and when Prime Minister Hosokawa was in office, always agreed that Japan needed a more open trading policy, that your consumers were paying 37 percent more for consumer goods than they would pay in a more open economy, that it was in your long-term interest not to have a permanent trade surplus, not just with us but with the world, of over $100 billion a year.

So we have to know, are we making progress or not? The only reason we wanted to use numbers was because that will show some aggregate worldwide trend. I do not want you to promise the United States any specific part of your markets. And I think if we can overcome that misunderstanding, we can begin again.

As to when it happens, I think that depends in part on how things go with your attempt to develop a new government and new policies. You have a new Prime Minister now. I hope he can work out arrangements so that we can resume this dialog. I must say I have a very high regard for all three of the Japanese Prime Ministers with whom I have worked. And I believe we can work this out.

I also think I should say—I don't mean to abuse your time, sir—but for the benefit of the whole rest of the world who look to the United States and to Japan for leadership, I think sometimes people are worried about our relationship because they think we're fighting over trade too much. We are basically not only partners but friends. We share common strategic interests, we share common political values, and we share common economic interests. We will not allow, we must not allow these differences which reflect a mature discussion and debate to spoil the relationship that I think is so important for the whole world.

China

[*Following a commercial break, a journalist from China asked about U.S. relations and trade with China.*]

The President. Let me answer the second question first, and then I'll answer the first question. Yes, I believe if we were to withdraw most-favored-nation status from China it would undermine what I hope to see in terms of our relationship, and it would be detrimental to the economic progress in China and to the standard of living which has come to so many millions, indeed, hundreds of millions of Chinese people. So I do not wish that to happen.

As you know, relationships between our two countries became very strong again, after a period of difficulty, starting in 1972 with President Nixon's trip and then in 1979 with President Carter's actions to recognize China and all the things which have come forward after that. Then there was a great strain on our relationship after the difficulties in 1989 in China at Tiananmen Square.

What I have sought to do is to find a balanced way for our two countries not simply to be partners but to restore our genuine friendship, which is very much in the interest of the whole world as well as our two peoples, by trying to establish conditions that would permit that partnership and that friendship to go forward. Those are the criterion I set forward in order to continue the most-favored-nation status next month.

I do not seek nor would it be proper for the United States or for any other nation to tell a great nation like China how to conduct all its internal affairs or to treat all its citizens

or what laws it should have. That would be wrong.

The criteria in the Executive order I issued are those things recognized in all universal declarations by all countries as essential to human rights. I will say we have made real progress in our relations with China on the immigration issue, on getting a prison labor agreement, in many other areas. As you know, Wang Jontao was released last week. There has been some progress there, too, in the area of political dissidents and human rights.

We still have a way to go. And I told Vice Premier Zou that I would work personally very hard and that our Government would work very hard in the next month to try to work out our differences so that we could go forward together. I think that is in your interest and ours and in the world's interest. But human rights is very important to the United States. And there are some issues that I believe the United States has perhaps an extra responsibility to stand up for, human rights, nonproliferation, other things that if we didn't do it, it would be even more difficult for other countries to do.

So I'm doing what I think we must do, but I am doing it in the spirit of genuine reconciliation and hope that in the next month our two great nations can work this out.

Thank you.

Ms. Woodruff. Mr. President, excuse me, is most-favored-nation trading status, just to be clear about this, is it seriously in jeopardy of being withdrawn from the Chinese?

The President. Well, under the present—under the present facts, China has made significant overall progress in several of the areas outlined in my Executive order of last year, but not in all of them. There are still areas in which we are different. And that is obviously clearly an option on the table. Yes, it is a possibility. But he asked me the question, would it be a bad thing for China and would it be consistent with the relationship I hope we have with them. And the answer is, yes, it would be a bad thing; and, no, it's not consistent with the relationship I hope we have. But we have to keep working to get over these last humps. And I hope and pray that we will in the next month.

Somalia

[*A journalist from Uganda asked about lessons learned in Somalia and their applicability elsewhere.*]

The President. That, sir, is a brilliant question. I mean, it is the question of the day in Africa and in some other places.

Let me say, first of all, thank you for acknowledging the work of the Americans and the others there. While we are gone, there are still several thousand United Nations forces in Somalia from all around the world working to continue to save lives.

What lessons did we learn? First of all, I think we learned that it is very difficult to have the forces of the United Nations and certainly the forces of the United States go in for any prolonged period of time and say that this is only a humanitarian crisis. In other words, the people of Somalia were starving and dying not because they couldn't grow food but because of the political and military conflicts within the country, not because no one would send them food but because it was hard to deliver before we went there.

So I think we learned lesson number one is, don't go into one of these things and say, as the United States said when we started in Somalia, "Maybe we'll be done in a month, because it's a humanitarian crisis," because there are almost always political problems and sometimes military conflicts which bring abut these crises.

Lesson number two is that when the United States handed over its mission to the United Nations, it was quite appropriate for there to be someone who would take action, military action if necessary, to protect the lives of the United States and the United Nations troops there. But the United States in its role as a superpower cannot be caught in the position of being a policing officer in a conflict like that when there is not political process going on, because what happened was the police operation—which was a legitimate one, that is, to protect the lives of the soldiers who were there trying to save the lives of the Somalis—became viewed as a way of choosing sides in the internal conflict of the country because there was no political dialog going on.

So I think those are the two great lessons. We must not be naive. If we're going to go in and try to save lives, we must know that in the beginning, everyone will be glad to see the U.S. or the U.N. or anybody because they're starving and dying. But after a certain amount of time, it will be obvious that it wasn't just a natural disaster. It was a political problem, a military problem.

And secondly, we must never give up the political dialog, then, so that everyone in the country know that we are there, all of us, to make peace and be peacemakers. Yes, we will fight to protect the lives of our people, but not to try to solve your problems for you. Those are the two lessons, I think.

Rwanda

Q. Can these lessons be used to save lives in a similar situation now in Rwanda?

The President. Well, perhaps. We're looking at that with the states that border Rwanda. We released another $15 billion today for aid. And we have to provide more aid; we have to try to deal with the refugee problem; we have to try to get a political process going again; and we have to try to marshal the resources, it seems to me, of nations all around the world who care very deeply about this. I think the conscience of the world has grieved for the slaughter in Rwanda and just a few months ago in Burundi in almost the same proportions.

But we also know from not only the Somali experience but from what we read of the conflict between the Hutus and the Tutsis that there is a political and military element to this. So I think we can take the lessons we learned and perhaps do a better job there over a longer period of time and perhaps head off the starvation and do those things which need to be done. I hope so.

Aid to Africa

[*A Nigerian television correspondent in Johannesburg, South Africa, asked why aid to Africa had declined.*]

The President. The search for clients rather than friends? No, it is true that there has been a reduction in our foreign aid assistance to Africa, going back before I became President but continuing. But the reason for that, sir, is that in the aftermath of the cold war, our Government's deficit was so high we have been cutting almost all kinds of spending.

And foreign assistance has not had a great level of support in our country. It's not that we're looking for clients or we'd rather give the money to someplace else. It is that one of the things that I still have to do as President is to do a better job of persuading the American people that we have an interest, long-term interest in the success of South Africa and in the success of Nigeria and all points in between, that we have a long-term interest that requires us to invest modest amounts of our great treasure in foreign assistance so that we can be in a more secure world, a more peaceful world, and that the American people actually benefit from it.

In our country, many of our people think we spend much more money than we do on foreign assistance, and they say we have problems at home we should deal with. But that's what caused the decline in assistance. There has been no discrimination against Africa in my judgment, although I think we don't emphasize Africa enough and we should do more.

[*CNN correspondent Bernard Shaw in Johannesburg asked if other nations would feel slighted if aid to South Africa was increased.*]

The President. I think other nations may feel slighted. But I think if you look at the potential of the government of national unity, Mr. Mandela, after all, has committed himself to a government of national unity for 5 years involving Mr. de Klerk and his supporters and presumably Mr. Buthelezi and the Inkatha supporters. We haven't gotten the final numbers yet, but I think that will be the case.

And if we can help to restore South Africa's economy in a multiracial environment—after all, we had a billion dollars in trade this year; just 10 years ago we had $3 billion in trade with South Africa in the U.S. alone. And South Africa can be a beacon of economic development and prosperity for all of southern Africa, can help to build interest in American and other business people in investing in all of southern Africa and can help to build a constituency for expanded assistance throughout Africa.

So I think that this is an opportunity which in the short run benefits South Africa, but has the capacity in the near term to be of immense benefit to Africa. And it's not as if we could double aid to someplace else if we didn't do

this. There is no possibility. So I think this is an enormous opportunity. We should seize it and use it to build a broader and deeper relationship with the rest of Africa.

Latin America

[*A journalist from Brazil asked about leftist Presidential candidates in Brazil and Mexico.*]

The President. Well, we are ready to do business with the democratically chosen leaders of any nations who are willing to deal with us on honorable terms consistent with international law. And we are certainly ready to do business there. Let me say that—you may know that my Secretary of Commerce has identified 10 nations which he estimates will be growing rapidly and will provide great economic opportunities for the United States in the years ahead. Both Brazil and Mexico are on that list.

And we know that if people govern with an eye toward the interest of their people, they can govern well coming from a wide range of democratic parties. If you look next door in Argentina, when President Menem was elected, coming out of the Peronist legacy, people said, "Oh, my goodness, what will this Menem do?" Well, he got the economy straightened out, he opened up the economy to trade, he maintained a strict adherence and support to democratic principles, and he's largely been quite successful by bringing the sort of left and center together, if you will.

So whatever decision the people of Brazil make is fine with me as long as we can have that kind of working relationship when the election is over.

Q. Do you believe that if that happens, these two countries will be on that list?

The President. It depends entirely, sir, on what policies are pursued. They still have to be committed to growing the economy, to participating in a market economy, and to giving their people a chance to compete and win in the global economy. If they do that, they can be. It depends on what you do with power once you get it, not so much what the name is, what your label is when you come to power but what do you do after you assume office.

Cuba

[*A Cuban television correspondent questioned U.S. policy toward Cuba, saying that its purpose could not be only to win Florida votes.*]

The President. Well, but I didn't win in Florida, so you can't hold me—[*laughter*]

Q. I know. I know.

The President. I mean, I like them very much, but I didn't win there. [*Laughter*]

I do support, however, the Cuban Democracy Act, which reinforces the blockade but also calls for greater communications contact and greater humanitarian aid to Cuba.

I think, in much the way I answered some of the previous questions, that the isolation of Cuba is largely the result of the policies of Cuba and the history of 30 years. I mean, just recently, just in the last few days, someone in Cuba was sentenced to several years in prison for simply talking to a foreign journalist.

And maybe we do have higher standards for Cuba because we have a large Cuban-American population and because Cuba is close to our borders, even though there's no longer any prospect of Russian missiles there, but that is our policy. And Cuba continues to stand in isolation to the democratic wind which has swept through every country in the Caribbean and South and Central America and even through Haiti. Even though the Haitian President was ousted, he was at least elected.

And I think that Mr. Castro has it within his own power to change the nature of the relationships between our two countries by moving toward a more open and democratic system. And that is up to him to do. And our country, meanwhile, has simply reaffirmed its policy in 1992 with the passage of the Cuban Democracy Act. And I don't expect that policy to change anytime soon.

Antidrug Policy

[*A journalist from Colombia asked about antidrug policy in the United States and Colombia.*]

The President. Well, let me answer the question slightly differently. It is true that we believe, more strongly than we have in the past, that the drug problem in America is a problem of demand as well as supply. That is, we have about 5 percent of the world's population—actually, a little less. We consume about half the world's illegal drugs. Now, part of that is because we have a good deal of money, but we have only 22 percent of the world's wealth, and we consume half the world's drugs. So, obviously, we want drugs more than some other places.

There are things unique to the United States, that we cannot blame on Colombia or Mexico or anyplace else, that we have to deal with. So we have invested a lot more money in this budget in drug education and drug prevention and drug treatment—in dealing with the problem—and in enforcement here on our own streets.

There are two other things that we should focus on. One is, can you stop the drugs in transit? That has been a big emphasis of the U.S. Government in the past, getting drugs coming into the air into our country or at the borders. The other is, can we help countries deal with drugs at the source, moving farmers into other products, helping deal with the drug cartels in their own countries.

It is true that we have reduced the former, that is, we have reduced emphasis on stopping drugs in transit. But we want to increase our efforts to work with you in Colombia and other countries to stop drugs at the source. We want to do more with you if you are willing to take the steps necessary to deal with it. And of course, I have seen your country's legitimately elected judges and prosecutors and political leaders who have taken on the drug problem, have done it at terrible risks. Many of them have been murdered; all of them have put their lives at risk.

And I understand that when the United States says to Colombia, we're not satisfied with the efforts you're making, it's a little hard to take sometimes because of the terrible risks that are associated with taking it on. All I can tell you is that we will do more to help stop the drug problem in the countries where the drugs are produced or processed if the governments are willing to work with us. That is our commitment, and we will do more.

It seems to us we can be more efficient by emphasizing the source countries and reducing demand in our country, even if we have to spend a little less in trying to stop the drugs in transit.

Foreign Policy

[*A participant from Finland said that although the President was elected for his domestic policy, he has received more criticism on foreign policy issues.*]

The President. I'm used to it—[*laughter*].

Q. Do you feel you have received unfair criticism on your foreign policy?

The President. Oh, I don't know. I wouldn't say that, in the sense that in our country, at least, there's a great tradition of freedom of the press. And part of the job of the press is to criticize whoever's in power. [*Laughter*] I mean, that's part of the job, to pick out the things that are going wrong.

I think what I would say is that we have had a lot of successes that perhaps have not been as noticed as they should have been, some of which I mentioned earlier tonight, and secondly, that the problems that we have had are a result of very difficult issues which do not have an easy solution. I just would mention two, very briefly, we've already talked about.

The first is Haiti. Two-thirds of the people voted for Aristide. Enormous numbers of people participated in democracy. He's kicked out. The military leaders promised to leave; they don't. But we want to be good neighbors. We don't want to be the big bully going around using our power in a destructive way. How do you solve that?

The other is Bosnia, where I do not believe we should have intervened in the war on one side or the other, but I do believe we have an interest in trying to work with Europe. And working with Europe meant in this case working both with the U.N. and with NATO in areas sort of unfamiliar to each, and certainly working together was unfamiliar. So it took longer and it was more ragged and more frustrating than I wish it had been. But that is part of the reality of the post-cold-war world, when we're all searching for new arrangements that work.

I don't mind being criticized, but I do think it's not fair to say that we have been unprincipled or vacillating. That's just not true. We have been quite clear, and we've tried to work through these problems, but not all problems have easy solutions.

Ms. Woodruff. Do you think you underestimated, Mr. President, the complexity of some of these issues?

The President. I saw an interview the other day with President Kennedy, about a year before he was assassinated, and they asked him what he had learned as President. And he said, "The problems were more difficult than I imagined them to be." [*Laughter*] And at least on the international front, I would say, the problems are more difficult than I imagined them to be.

Ms. Woodruff. Do you think you've had the right foreign policy team to help you tackle them?

The President. Yes, I think they're quite up to the job, it's just that they're plowing new ground. We could have gotten less criticism in a way if we had just said, "This problem and this problem, this problem, don't involve our vital interests; therefore we will not commit our prestige or our efforts." But President Roosevelt once said he'd rather be part of a government that made a few mistakes in the cause of activism than be part of one that was frozen in the ice of its own indifference. I do not believe we can afford to be indifferent. But as we venture out in these new areas, we have to risk error. And so I have been willing to risk error. And when you do that, you get more criticism.

Ms. Woodruff. And when you're accused of vacillating, it doesn't bother you, right?

The President. Oh, sometimes it really bothers me. [*Laughter*] But I think, first of all, all leaders sometimes have had to back and fill and alter their course throughout history. But there is no vacillation in the principles of the policies here. It's just that we don't know what will work within the limits of our ability to deal with some of these problems.

Not every issue is one that you can put the entire wealth, the entire military might, the entire prestige of the United States on the line for. But many issues are things that are worthy of our best efforts within the limits of our ability to proceed. And that is where all these gray areas are, the areas of frustration, particularly for the people who are on the receiving end of the problems. I didn't—I was waiting for my lecture from Sarajevo tonight, and I rather enjoyed it, because that poor woman has seen the horrors of this war and she has had to report on them.

Ms. Woodruff. Christiane Amanpour.

The President. Yes, she's been fabulous. She's done a great service for the whole world on that. I do not blame her for being mad at me, but I'm doing the best I can with this problem from my perspective.

I didn't know, you see, I would have to look at her—now I'll blush—[*laughter*]—anyway, go ahead.

Ms. Woodruff. That's a good note to end on. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you very much, all of you. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 7 p.m. in the Cecil B. Day Chapel at the Carter Center. In his remarks, the President referred to Tom Johnson, president, and Ted Turner, owner and founder, Cable News Network.

Letter to the Speaker of the House on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

May 3, 1994

Dear Mr. Speaker:

On April 15, the United States and more than one hundred other nations signed the Uruguay Round agreement in Marrakesh, Morocco. It is the broadest, most comprehensive trade agreement in history.

For half a century, the United States has led the global effort to reduce trade barriers and expand trade. The Uruguay Round, which is scheduled to enter into force on January 1, 1995, represents the most important step in that effort.

This agreement will create hundreds of thousands of American jobs and new economic opportunities at home. Moreover, it will allow American workers and businesses to compete in a freer, fairer, and more effective global trading system that lays the foundation for prosperity into the next century.

I intend to transmit legislation to implement the Uruguay Round and am committed to seeking bipartisan support for its passage this year.

The attached booklet describes the Uruguay Round's benefit to American workers and firms. I look forward to working with you in the months ahead to implement this important agreement.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

Statement by the Press Secretary on United States Counterintelligence Effectiveness

May 3, 1994

President Clinton signed today a Presidential Decision Directive on U.S. counterintelligence effectiveness to foster increased cooperation, coordination, and accountability among all U.S. counterintelligence agencies. The President has directed the creation of a new national counterintelligence policy structure under the auspices of the National Security Council. In addition, he has directed the creation of a new National Counterintelligence Center, initially to be led by a senior executive of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Finally, the President's Decision Directive requires that exchange of senior managers between the CIA and the FBI to ensure timely and close coordination between the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

The President's decision to take these significant steps of restructuring U.S. counterintelligence policy and interagency coordination, followed a Presidential review of U.S. counterintelligence in the wake of the Aldrich Ames espionage investigation. The President, in issuing this Directive, has taken immediate steps to improve our ability to counter both traditional and new threats to our Nation's security in the post-cold-war era.

Nomination for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission

May 3, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Mary L. Schapiro as Chair and Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). CFTC is the Federal agency charged with regulation of the Nation's futures markets. The President also announced his intention to nominate Sheila C. Bair to continue in her role as a CFTC Commissioner.

"In her years as a Commissioner with the SEC, Mary Schapiro has contributed an intelligent and experienced voice to the matters that have come before this important board. I look forward to her taking on this new challenge as CFTC Chairman," the President said.

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

Remarks Honoring the Small Business Person of the Year

May 4, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, and welcome to the White House. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just seen an example of Clinton's first law of politics: Whenever possible, be introduced by someone you've appointed to high office. [*Laughter*] I say that in good humor. You know, when I met Erskine Bowles in 1992 when I was out running for President—and our wives had gone to college together and had known each other many, many years ago, and his wonderful wife was and still is one of the most successful textile executives in the United States—and I talked to him about what he had done over the last 20 years, starting small businesses, helping them to expand, helping them to get involved in trade, I thought to myself, you know, this is the sort of person that ought to be head of the SBA, somebody that actually made a living helping other people with their small businesses, someone that actually knew something about it and had some idea of what the practical realities of daily life were like, somebody that would be recognized by people without regard to their political party. This

ought not to be a political agency. It ought to be an agency committed to the economic interest and the advancements of the Small Business Administration.

And at the time, of course, I had no way of knowing whether I'd even be nominated, much less elected, or whether he would ever be willing to leave his good life in North Carolina and come up here and do this. But I want to tell you that I think he's been one of the best appointments I've made as President. And I thing he's made a difference in the small business community. And I think we have set a standard that I hope future administrations will follow of not politicizing the SBA but instead appointing someone who actually knows what it's like to start up, finance, expand, and deal with the problems and the challenges of small business in America today. And I want to thank him for that.

Today is a happy day not just for Erskine but for me because we get to honor the national Small Business Person of the Year and the second and first runners-up. We all know that those of you who will be recognized today as winners and those who have won in each of their States really represent people just like you, thousands, indeed, millions of people all across America. Nonetheless, it's a very happy thing to do.

Let me begin by saying what I guess political leaders always say, but something that's increasingly true in this country, and that is that the small business economy is critically important to the future of America. You have only to look at just what's gone on in the last 15 months, where we have seen a dramatic expansion of new jobs in America. In the first 14 months of this administration there were 2.5 million new jobs created, which were together more than in the previous 4 years. And 2.3 million of those jobs were in the private sector, which is more than twice as many private sector jobs as in the previous 4 years. But big companies in America, in large numbers, continued to downsize, which means that in the small business sector, in the new and growing and entrepreneurial sector of our economy, even more jobs were created.

And if you look at the way the world is going, where jobs are being created more and more and more in cutting edge technologies, and opportunities are more and more and more in the refinement of certain products and services, if you try to imagine what the world will be like 10 years from now or 15 years from now, it is impossible to draw any conclusion other than that if we're going to continue to be the engine of job growth in this country and for the world, it will have to come through small business people.

It's an exciting prospect, but it means that we have to reorient a lot of our thinking toward what would be necessary to try to support small business as the primary engine of new job creation. A lot of the big things that we do in Government, which make a difference for all business, obviously help small business.

Last year, we had the biggest deficit reduction package in history, $500 billion. It helped to drive interest rates down; it helped to trigger home-building and automobile buying and a lot of other things that got this economy going again.

This year, the Congress is dealing with a budget that I gave them which does some very interesting things I want to talk to you about. It eliminates outright 100 Government programs; it cuts over 200 others. If adopted as it is, it not only continues to reduce defense—and I want to say a little more about that in a minute and just ask you for a little help—but it not only continues to reduce defense, but for the first time since 1969 it would have our Government reducing aggregate domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years.

And we do it while we actually increase funding for Head Start, for nutritional programs for poor children, for new technologies for the 21st century, for defense conversion efforts, and for worker training, because we cut out so much other stuff. And if it's adopted, it will give us a budget, which for the first time since Harry Truman was President, in the aftermath of the Second World War, when it had to happen just naturally—when the Government has reduced its deficit 3 years in a row. And the United States will have a deficit that as a percentage of our annual income is smaller than that of any major industrial country in the world, which is a huge sea change from the last several years. And it will begin to give us some control over our financial destiny and the future of the little children that are in this audience today.

I say that because I want to emphasize that it's important that this budget pass. It's also important that we not posture with it at the end. Last night—I don't know—no reason that

any of you necessarily would have seen it, but I did an hour-and-a-half press conference on CNN with people from all over the world. There were people from 200 countries and territories watching that press conference, looking to us for leadership. And what I tried to do was to explain what I thought we had to do in leading the world and what we obviously could not do, because we can't do everything; we can't afford to do everything. There are a lot of problems out there in the world that do not affect our vital interests. And even though our values are aghast at some things that happen, we can't do all this. On the other hand, there is a limit to how much we cut our national defense and still protect the security of America and the vital interests of America.

And I tell you that I think we have reached that limit. We have cut defense all we can. I imagine most people in this room and most people back home in your civic clubs and your churches and synagogues and other places think we ought to do more to bring this Government spending down and like the fact that we're reducing the deficit. But I also would ask for your support for a reasonable defense budget. We, after all, still have—there are no nuclear missiles pointed at us from the Soviet Union, but there are other countries trying to develop nuclear programs. And we have to maintain our commitments in Asia and in Europe.

So I would ask you to support what we're doing to bring the deficit down; but say, look, there is a limit; we do have a national defense; we do have obligations here. And we do have to retrain workers, and we do have to help move these technologies from defense to commercial technologies. So we need to spend some money on that.

Secondly, let me say, there's some things that are specific to the SBA I want to emphasize. Since Erskine Bowles has been the Director of the SBA, we've increased our lending program by $3 billion, and they've introduced a one-page application that takes 2 days to process. That alone was worth me appointing him, wasn't it? [*Laughter*]

I also want to say a word about this health care debate which is going on in Washington which is doubtless not only important to you but occasionally must be somewhat confusing because it's an extremely complex subject. First, let me say that people say, "Well, Clinton's bill's 1,300 pages long. Nothing that complicated should ever be passed by Congress. By definition, they'd mess up a one-car parade." I've heard it many times.

You should know that if that bill passed in its entirety, it would replace even more pages of Federal law now in existence, that is, that a lot of this so-called complexity deals with issues not of direct concern to you but of indirect concern to you like, well, how are we going to deal with the major medical schools, and how are they going to get their funding? And what about the public health clinics of the country? What about the people that live way out there in rural areas who have no access to health care unless there's not a clinic?

But fundamentally, when I asked Erskine Bowles to come into this debate early, and I said, "Look, the biggest bone of contention to providing health coverage for all Americans will be what are the obligations directly or indirectly of small business, because that's where the problems in affording coverage are. So make sure we design something that provides enough protection for small business so that we continue to grow jobs, not shrink jobs." It's also true that the biggest problems in health care come to small business, paying on average 35 percent more for health care premiums than larger businesses do, and being subject to a lot of problems of—my wife and I have a friend that she grew up with, and she and her husband and their children have become great friends of ours over the last 20 years. He only has four employees in his small business. And he provides coverage for all of them. And one of these young men, has been with him a long time, has a child with Down's syndrome. And this fellow—it's time really for him to move on and to broaden his horizons and to do something else in his life, and he simply can't do it because no other business can afford to hire him because he's had a sick child under the present system.

The reason the system is so complicated in America is that we're the only country that has a financing system organized around 1,500 separate insurance companies, writing thousands of different policies with different coverages, all in fairly—many of them in fairly small pools. And at the same time we have two Government programs, Medicare and Medicaid, one for the poor, one for the elderly and disabled, that have different coverages, so that the whole mechanism of financing requires massive numbers of people to figure out when you're not covered

or what is not covered. And furthermore, to be fair to the people in the insurance business—we're not talking about bad people here, we're talking a system that's broken, to be fair to the people in the insurance business—requires them to charge people more or have higher deductibles if there's somebody in their family that's been sick in the past, with a so-called preexisting condition or there's a big age differential in workers, because if they insure people in small pools, if there's a couple of hundred people in the pool, one person with AIDS, one kid with a bad diabetes condition, one woman with breast cancer, one man who has a premature heart condition can throw the whole thing out of whack and make it impossible for them to make a profit.

So what we're trying to do up here in the simplest terms is this: Figure out a way to let the forces of competition work, to hold health care costs down, figure out a way to let those things work for small business and self-employed people as well as big business; because what's happening now is, people in big business and Government in the context of this debate have done a good job of slowing down medical inflation, but it still leaves big problems for the small business sector and the self-employed people.

How do we propose to do it? By giving you the chance to be in cooperative buying pools so you can buy on the same terms as big business and government; by providing discounts to small businesses with low margins and low average payrolls on the insurance premiums and by eliminating some of the practices, the discriminatory practices.

Why is that causing a problem? Partly because it will require a substantial reorganization of the health insurance industry and require them to bid on business in much bigger pools, which means a lot of the smaller policies and customs will go away. And that is a problem. And there's no way to resolve that problem if we're going to try to deal with this.

But I just wanted to say to you, without trying to resolve all the specifics, that what we need here is a very reasoned debate in this year in the Congress about how to deal with this problem in a way that enhances the long-term economic security of small businesses instead of undermining it. But if we walk away from it and we don't deal with it, what we'll continue to see is a bigger differential in premiums as more big business and Government have access to managed care and more and more people permanently without insurance, which means they'll show up at the hospital, the emergency room, when the care is too late, too expensive, and they'll shove their cost onto everybody else, and we will all pay it. So the price of doing nothing is also quite high for you. That's the point I want to make. And Erskine has done his best to be a very good advocate.

We also propose in our plan to go to 100 percent deductible for self-employed people, which would mean a lot of people with very small businesses will actually be able to pay something for their employees and insure their families at lower costs than they're now paying for themselves by the time they buy into a big pool and get the 100 percent deductible. So, we're working on it. And I urge you to work with him because we understand there's no way to solve all these problems, and we're continuing to learn about it every day. But we need a very reasoned debate to face this issue.

Now, let me say, it is my happy responsibility to recognize this year's winners. And I want to talk a little bit about each of then and to congratulate all of you who are here. The second runner-up is Earl Kashiwagi. Stand up. There he is. You'd never guess where's he's from, would you? Earl and his wife, Chris, cut short their honeymoon in 1973 to work on his uncle's produce farm in Kauai. When one uncle became ill, he became manager and began to build a wholesale side of the business. He helped teach farmers how to diversify local crops. He fashioned innovative shipping techniques and created a broad new distribution network. He's beaten the effects of many hurricanes. In 1990 he bought his business, which employs more than 30 people and is the largest produce wholesaler in Kauai with sales exceeding $4.5 million. He is our second runner-up. Let's give him another hand. [*Applause*]

[*At this point, Mr. Kashiwagi presented the President with a lei.*]

The President. I like this, but, you know, I probably should take it off because we can't have all three winners from Hawaii. [*Laughter*]

Our first runners-up are Francis Voigt and John Dranow. Are they here? Where are they? Stand up. Come on up. They left their chosen fields to begin the New England Culinary Institute in Vermont. Their wives, both poets, were

their first support system. However, they later received less poetic but equally public-spirited support from the SBA. They prepared people for success in the food business through hands-on training and with the lowest teacher-student ratio in the entire Nation. They offer lifelong support and financial aid to their students. They now have a 100 percent placement record. Starting from nothing, they now have 188 employees, 400 students, and revenues of nearly $100 million. They are our first runners-up. Give them a hand. [*Applause*]

After I leave you today, I'm going over to sign the school-to-work bill, something that has immense significance to the small business community. It begins to establish a Federal partnership for a network of training young people who graduate from high school, don't want to go on to 4-year colleges, but do need further training. All of our competitors have much more well-organized systems, particularly the Germans, than we do in providing further training. One of our first school-to-work trainees, I guess the first one we've been involved in, and someone they trained who now works at Blair House, so you want to—come on up, Francis—explain this.

Francis Voigt. She's right out here, Karen Webber. Karen, come on up.

You know, entrepreneurs can't help themselves; we're always looking for opportunities to promote our organization. We just visited the Blair House yesterday to see how our student was doing. The executive chef arranged for her to come by this morning and present a hat to the President.

The President. You all probably know this, but Blair House is the official guest residence for the President. That's where—when foreign leaders come to stay, for example, they all stay in Blair House.

So, are you doing a good job over there? [*Laughter*]

Karen Webber. Absolutely.

The President. Thank you. You all go over there and stand, and we'll do this.

[*Ms. Webber presented the President with a hat.*]

The President. I'll use this, this weekend. [*Laughter*]

Our winner is Lorraine Miller from Salt Lake City, the president of Cactus and Tropicals. Come on up here. You stand here while I talk about you.

Lorraine is president of Cactus and Tropicals in Salt Lake City, Utah. She began with just a love of growing plants, half of her $2,000 life savings, and a dream. She found a boarded-up building, lived above it, and worked 7 days a week. She's overcome reluctant bankers, salesmen who refused to believe a woman made the decisions, and the loss of her store to eminent domain. One winter, she thawed the frozen ground with briquettes to dig the footings for her greenhouse.

Today, she has 4 greenhouses, 15 employees, over $1 million in sales, and a business growing at a rate of 20 percent a year. For her job and her persistence and her symbolism of the entrepreneurial spirit of America, Lorraine Miller has been chosen the Small Business Person of the Year.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:44 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Remarks at a Department of Housing and Urban Development Crime Briefing

May 4, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Cisneros, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to see you here, and I know what you've been here talking about.

I just want to make sure that you know when you heard from the Vice President and then Secretary Cisneros, that you were looking at two of People magazine's 50 most beautiful people of the year. [*Laughter*] Some of us resent that. All I can tell you is that I hope to live to see both of them become President of the United States—[*laughter*]—because they would not only be outstanding Presidents, they would quickly lose any eligibility for that title.

I want to thank you for many things; first, for working with Secretary Cisneros and the people of HUD to deal with the problem of safety in public housing. And especially, I want to thank my good friend Vince Lane and the other folks in Chicago who tried to help us work through this court decision so that the people who live in these units would still have the right to be protected from a level of crime and violence that many Americans would find it impossible even to imagine.

I also want to ask you—everyone who is here today and everybody who's associated with public housing and every law enforcement officer who is here and all those whom you represent—to call every Member of Congress in the next 24 hours and ask them to vote on this assault weapons ban for law enforcement. This is an amazing conflict. It is a conflict that pits, on opposite sides, people that ought not to be on opposite sides.

People who are concerned with law enforcement and public safety and people who know about it and live it are overwhelmingly in favor of this assault weapons ban. They are being told by people who represent the folks who are against this that they really don't understand, that they're not in any more danger from these assault weapons than they would be from a hunting rifle. I find that amazing that any American, after what we have been through on our streets and in our schools in the last few years, could stand up and look into the eyes of the law enforcement community of America and tell them, "You don't know that your life's in more danger." I don't see how they could say it, looking into the statistics of what the emergency rooms of this country have faced in the last 10 or 15 years. If you want to talk about it just crassly, just go back and look at the statistics on gunshot victims outside the home in emergency rooms in major cities in the last 10 years, and look what the average number of bullets you find in the bodies of people who show up are.

And so I understand this is a tough political vote for the House of Representatives, and I know we started way behind. And I know that as late as yesterday, I was still talking through with Members actually what is in the bill. A lot of people didn't know, for example, that the bill grandfathers the possession of these weapons on the part of sportsmen who like to shoot a couple of them at the ranges in contests. Well, they can keep those weapons operating for decades if they take good care of them, literally decades. But people who use them on the street in crimes and gangs, they won't take as good care of them. A lot of them will be washed up; we'll get them out of the system much more quickly. But the people who have them will not lose them now by law.

I still find that we've got—a lot of the problems we've got with this bill are literally making sure that everybody knows everything that's in it. But the big problem is the political fight. And I just would implore you to call everybody you can. They say we haven't got any chance to win, but they already admit we've made up 50 votes over where we were last time this thing was voted on. And I think we do have a chance if every law enforcement officer who knows every Member of Congress would call those people and say, "This is not a partisan issue. This is a question of law enforcement and safety for Americans and sensible policy. And don't you believe those people who tell you that we don't know what we're talking about. We are on the receiving end of these bullets, and we can count, thank you very much. We do understand the difference between being shot at with a revolver and something with 12 rounds, 15 rounds, 30 rounds, or 60 rounds. We can count."

And I believe if you can make it just that simple, then it is our job to answer all the factual questions that we are being asked by people from rural districts, who in good conscience have to be able to answer these questions to the sportsmen in their districts. We can answer those questions to their satisfaction if you will lay the hammer down and say, this is about standing with law enforcement and children and safety and the future. We are beginning to put some sanity back into our laws, and the American people are beginning to demand that we have greater safety in our homes, on our streets, in our schools.

This crime bill's got a lot of good things in it. It's going to ban possession of all handguns by minors, except under controlled circumstances with approved supervision. It's going to give us the money we need to provide security, metal detectors and other things, in schools. It's going to put more police officers on the street. It's got a lot of good things. But we ought not to walk away from this. We ought to put it in. It's right for law enforcement.

And if you guys will do this—if the men and women of law enforcement in America will call the Congress in the next 24 hours and say, "Do this one for us, and don't believe all those people telling you that we don't know our own best interest and we don't really know what's good for people on our streets. We do. We have been on the wrong end of those weapons, and we know we'll be better off without having to look down those barrels anymore. Help us. Help us. Stand up for law enforcement. Stand up for safety. Stand up for the kids of this country"—we've still got a chance to win this thing, and we need your help. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vince Lane, chairman, Chicago Housing Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Signing the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994

May 4, 1994

Hey, Chris, just go on and sit in my seat. If you keep talking like that you'll occupy it someday anyway. [*Laughter*]

My goodness, he was good. You know, all of us, I think, carry around inside progressive impulses and conservative impulses that send us different messages from time to time. And one of the conservative impulses that has been honed in me over time is always be careful what you do because of the law of unintended consequences. Well, when I think of the enormous bipartisan support this legislation has had, it didn't seem to me that there could possibly be any adverse unintended consequences. But do you realize what Chris Brady has done today by telling us what he does? Do you have any idea how many criminals all over the world have always wondered who monitored those $10,000 transfers for the IRS? What the heck, it was worth it to get the bill and to meet him. [*Laughter*]

You know, when a President signs a bill into law, normally he just needs the bill, a pen, and a desk. And ordinarily, the bill and the pen get the top billing; he signs the bill, hands out the pens. Today we're going to try to give the desk a little higher billing. It's no ordinary desk, and its presence here today, as much as any speech or ceremony, symbolizes what this bill is all about.

Last month Janet Swenson gave her students at the Manufacturing Technology Project in Flint, Michigan, an assignment: Suppose the President wanted you to design a desk and build it to use at a White House ceremony. It couldn't look like a typical desk. It had to be inexpensive. It had to be easy to move and reassemble. Within an hour, eight of her students had formed a project team, drawn up rough blueprints, and even called a supplier to check on the availability of materials.

Then they went to work. They drew on their knowledge of geometry and applied math to tinker with the blueprints. They negotiated with the vendors and bought the proper supplies. They built the desk at their center in Flint, Michigan. Then they broke it down, packed it up, and brought it with them to Washington. Yesterday, with a few Allen wrenches, they put it back together again here on the White House lawn, and here it is. This is a custom-made piece of furniture, developed, designed, built, delivered, and assembled by eight young people, none of whom is older than 20 years of age. I'd like to ask them to stand, along with their teacher. Where are they? Stand up. Here they are, these eight. Give them a hand. [*Applause*]

This bill is not the end of a journey. It's not a problem that has been solved. Instead, it's a whole new approach to work and learning. Hillary and I were talking up here, as we looked out across this vast sea of faces of those of you whom we have known and worked with for so many years on this issue. I was thinking about how many nights I have talked to Bob Reich about this subject over the last 10 years, long before he ever dreamed he'd be Secretary of Labor and certainly before even his fertile imagination could have figured out how I might be able to appoint him someday. [*Laughter*]

The whole time I served as Governor of my State, I kept in my office a little silver box that Dick Riley gave me way back in 1979, the first time I went to South Carolina to meet with him and talk with him. I see in this audience the sea of faces of people with whom there is some story, some connection about this great endeavor on which we are embarked. The last major initiative I supported as the Governor of my State before I began campaigning for President was one designed to create a school-to-work network and a higher quality of training for young people who didn't go on to 4-year institutions of higher education and ultimately to degrees.

This is the work, my fellow Americans, that we will have to continue for a lifetime. If you want to keep the American dream alive, we must not only create more jobs, we have to make it possible for people who work hard and do the right thing to become members of our middle class society.

You heard Hillary mention the Grant commission report way back in '87 about the forgotten half, the young people who don't go on to further education and training, or the Carnegie report, "America's Choice: High Skills and Low Wages." These are things that she and I and all of our people for years talked about because we knew the people personally who were affected by it. If you were fortunate enough to represent people from a small State, like me or Senator Mitchell, who never comes to the White House without at least one person from Maine—I've now met half the population, Governor—[*laughter*]—thanks to his coming here—you actually know people who work harder every year for lower wages. You know people who lose their jobs and then they can never get a job that good again. You see what's happened in stark terms to people whom Senator Riegle represents in the automobile industry. There are millions of people like that everywhere.

And so I want to begin just by thanking the Members of Congress who put aside partisanship and regionalism and everything else to pass this bill. And they have already been acknowledged, the leaders have, by Secretary Reich, but let me just acknowledge the people who played a major role in the various committees, whose names I now have: In addition to Chairman Ford, the minority leader of that committee, Congressman Bill Goodling; Congressman Dale Kildee; Congressman Steve Gunderson; on the Senate side, in addition to Chairman Kennedy and Senator Mitchell, Senator Durenberger, Senator Jeffords, Senator Metzenbaum, Senator Pell, Senator Simon, Senator Wofford, Senator Hatfield. And I know Senator Ford and Senator Riegle are here, but there are a slew of Members of Congress here whose names I don't have. But I want you to see the depth of support this bill has, so I'd like to ask every Member of Congress here present to stand so the rest of you can see how much they cared about this.

We have probably more than 10 percent of the entire Congress here today. I thank Secretary Riley, and I'm glad that Secretary Reich could tear himself away from Jay Leno long enough to show up today. He was funny last night; did you see him? Probably wants a raise today. [*Laughter*] He needs further training before we do that. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank the people from business and labor and education and the community activists, all of you who are here. And most important, I want to honor the young men and women who are now seizing the opportunity provided by existing programs to make sure they don't become part of America's forgotten half. Each of the young people who are here today will receive a certificate, but I think we ought to give them another hand and say we're pulling for their future. [*Applause*]

Creating this national network of school-to-work programs is our common attempt to address perhaps the greatest challenge of our times for Americans: how to make the dramatic economic changes occurring all over the world work for our own people, how to put their interests first and reward their efforts and give life to their aspirations. We can revive our economy. We can bring the deficit down, increase investment, create jobs; we can expand trade. We can do all these things, but if we don't give our own people the change to reap the rewards of economic progress, we will have failed.

The last two decades have been especially hard on the working people of America—all of you know that—especially on the 75 percent of our people who don't actually finish getting a 4-year college degree. We are now in a global economy where, to use my buzz phrase, what you earn depends on what you can learn, not even what you know. We now see that we passed the decade in the eighties where the gap between the wages of college graduates and

high school graduates literally doubled because of global economic forces.

For too long, we were the only country that did not have a system to provide this sort of education and training and opportunity for young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges. Oh, a lot of people were doing a great job of it and, interestingly enough, as so often happens to people, were way ahead of the system. And you can see that in the explosion of enrollments in high-quality 2-year programs all around the country and more and more high schools trying to come to grips with their responsibilities to train young people who weren't going to college. But we didn't have a way of providing these opportunities to all of our people.

The legislation that I will sign is both innovative in structure and ambitious in scope. It doesn't simply throw a lot of new money or create a lot of new bureaucracy. Instead, it enables us in the National Government to be a catalyst, to bring together workers and businesses, parents and students, the experts and the doers, the designers and the implementers to create programs that work for every American in every community in this country. It will provide development grants for each State to plan comprehensive training and education and apprenticeship systems. And it will do what I think we ought to do: It will set national standards for what these programs must accomplish, grassroots reforms, national standards.

The Federal Government is not very good at regulating or operating things like this, but we can know through readily available information what standards all programs ought to meet, and then we can empower people at the grassroots level to decide how they can most easily meet those standards. That's the sort of reinventing Government the Vice President is always talking about and working on. It's a small seed that will give us quickly, I predict to you, a national network of school-to-work programs.

In the years to come, our young people will be able to know with confidence that their learning will not end when they leave high school, but they won't leave high school without enough learning to go on to further training and to be productive citizens.

This new law, as important as it is, is a part of a larger piece. Just a few weeks ago, I signed the Goals 2000 legislation, and a lot of you worked hard on that, setting national performance standards for the first time for our schools and again supporting grassroots reforms to achieve those standards. Now we're working cooperatively again in a bipartisan spirit with Congress to refine and to enact the last significant piece of this lifetime learning agenda, the reemployment act, that will change the unemployment system to a reemployment system in recognition of the fact that most people don't get called back to their old jobs when they are on unemployment.

The average worker will now change jobs seven times in a lifetime, and in a workplace where ROM's and RAM's and robotics are the rage, there will never, ever be a time again when our workers won't need to learn something new. The reemployment act will, therefore, complement this school-to-work act and the Goals 2000 bill. And as the American people, with all their energy and ingenuity and ability, implement them, it will be a lasting tribute to those of you from all corners of America and all walks of life and both political parties who have known for many years that this was the thing we had to do.

It will also be another chance to keep alive the dream that has driven so many of us to this place and this lawn today, the chance to make a good living, the chance to reach for the brass ring, the chance to achieve the American dream. That is, after all, what we were given and what we clearly owe to the young people here today and to their children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Chris Brady, a school-to-work student from Boston, MA. H.R. 2884, approved May 4, was assigned Public Law No. 103–239.

Statement on Signing the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994

May 4, 1994

Today it is with pride that I sign into law H.R. 2884, the "School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994." The enactment of this legislation fulfills a promise I made to the American people. It is particularly appropriate that the enactment of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 so closely follows the enactment of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." These Acts are important milestones on our Nation's journey toward excellence and equity in our schools and workplaces. In particular, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 will provide a better education for our young people as they progress from school to a first job in a high-skill, high-wage career and to further education or training.

We have failed for too long to give our young people the opportunity and tools to make the critical and challenging transition from school to a first job with a future. Too many students either drop out of school or complete school without the skills they need to succeed in a changing world. They lack a sense of the promise and potential that lies ahead of them. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 will help change that.

In today's global economy, a nation's greatest resource—indeed, the ultimate source of its wealth—is its people. To compete and win, our work force must be well-educated, well-trained, and highly skilled. Let me repeat what I said earlier this year: "We are living in a world where what you earn is a function of what you can learn . . . and where there can no longer be a division between what is practical and what is academic."

We all know that low-skilled jobs are becoming scarcer. Those jobs are being replaced by technology or drifting to countries whose workers are eager to labor for a small fraction of American wages. In short, the days of unskilled teenagers leaving high school and finding good-paying factory jobs for life are gone.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act can help young people adapt to this changing world, making it an important part of my work force strategy. This Act will ensure that during the last 2 years of high school, and typically for at least 1 year beyond, young people will benefit in several ways. They will be able to obtain quality on-the-job experience combined with classroom instruction, leading to certification in marketable skills. Such well-marked paths to productive roles in the working world will benefit both our young people and the Nation's many businesses anxious for skilled new employees.

This Act is not another top-down mandate for one more Federal program. Under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, Federal funds will be available, for a limited period, as venture capital to stimulate State and local creativity in establishing statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems. To promote systemic reform, State and local participants are given a substantial degree of flexibility to experiment and to build upon current promising approaches. All the States' systems will, however, have to share certain common features and basic program components that experience demonstrates are crucial to a quality school-to-work system. Also, by forming local partnerships of individuals who have a stake in their children's future, communities will play an active role in giving American youth access to skills and employment opportunities.

Under this Act, States and communities can build bridges from school to work through programs that provide students with a wide array of learning experiences in the classroom and at work. All School-to-Work Opportunities programs will contain three core components. First, the school-based learning component will include a coherent multi-year program of study tied to high academic and occupational skill standards, such as those to be developed as a result of the recently enacted Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Second, the work-based learning component will provide students with a planned program of job training and work experiences, including workplace mentoring, in a broad range of occupational areas. Third, the connecting activities component will ensure coordination of the work-based and school-based learning components, as well as encourage the active participation of employers. By completing a School-to-Work Opportunities program, a student will earn a high school diploma or its equivalent, a diploma or certificate from a post-

secondary institution (if appropriate), and an industry-recognized skill certificate for competency in an occupational area.

This Act fosters the creation of "partnerships" in local communities that will develop and tailor the local School-to-Work Opportunities programs to the needs and resources of those communities. The partnerships will consist of representatives of many important local interests, such as employers, educators, labor organizations, students, parents, and local government agencies. These partnerships will, starting immediately, foster the design and implementation of a School-to-Work Opportunities system in every State. The partnerships can develop the local program based on promising practices already underway. Together, States and communities will take the lead in determining goals and priorities, developing new strategies, and in measuring progress.

H.R. 2884 was developed by the Administration working closely with the Congress in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation. This spirit of cooperation will continue on many different levels in the day-to-day operation of the School-to-Work programs. First, the Act will be jointly administered by the Secretaries of Labor and Education. Second, States and communities can work together in developing the various programs that will become part of this system. Third, the formation of the partnership at the local level will allow communities to examine their needs and to address them in a cooperative manner.

Today, with my approval of H.R. 2884, we start on the path to a better future for our Nation's young people.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 4, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 2884, approved May 4, was assigned Public Law No. 103–239.

Statement on the Implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles

May 4, 1994

The signing today in Cairo of the agreement to implement the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles marks another milestone in progress toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. On behalf of all Americans, I have called Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat to congratulate them for this accomplishment. I expressed my high regard for Prime Minister Rabin's courageous leadership and stressed to Chairman Arafat the importance of moving without hesitation to make this agreement a reality. I also telephoned yesterday and again today President Mubarak to underscore our gratitude and appreciation for the key role he played in making this historic step forward possible.

Now the focus must be on implementing the Declaration of Principles in as rapid and successful a manner as possible. The process of transforming the situation on the ground for the better must begin. The promise of a new future of hope for Israelis and Palestinians alike must now be realized. I assured Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat that the United States would do everything possible to help make this happen.

Building on the progress achieved today and our ongoing discussions with parties in the region, I am hopeful that this can be the year of breakthrough to a lasting and comprehensive peace for all the peoples of the Middle East.

Message to the Congress Transmitting District of Columbia Budget Requests
May 4, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia Government's 1995 budget request and 1994 revised budget request.

The District of Columbia Government has submitted a 1995 budget request for $3,409 million in 1995 that includes a Federal payment of $674 million, the amount authorized and requested by the Mayor and the City Council. The 1995 Federal payment level proposed in my fiscal year 1995 budget of $670 million is also included in the District's 1995 budget as an alternative level. My transmittal of the District's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

I look forward to working with the Congress throughout the 1995 appropriation process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 4, 1994.

Remarks at the Andrew W. Mellon Dinner
May 4, 1994

Thank you very much, Mrs. Stevenson, Mr. Smith, members of the Mellon family, distinguished Justices of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, Secretary Riley, Mr. and Mrs. Powell. To the many patrons of the arts and supporters of education who are here, it is an honor for Hillary and for me to be here at this special event at this wonderful, special building, truly our national monument to art.

It's a pleasure to be among so many of you who have done so much to support our country's cultural heritage. Without our Nation's magnificent tradition of philanthropy, Americans from all walks of life would never have the chance to enjoy art and culture, to find true education.

I first came here as a young student at Georgetown. Then, when I was in my twenties, after I had left school, I came to this gallery almost every time I came back to Washington. When Hillary and I met in law school and came from time to time to Washington, we would come to the National Gallery. Later when I was a Governor and came here only for stuffy old meetings, on occasion I would sneak away from wherever we were supposed to be convening and come here and look at these pictures and think I would never do anything remotely as important as paint some of the things that hang on these walls.

For all of you who have given, I thank you. The spirit of giving really creates America's sense of common bond, our sense of community. I want to especially thank the members of the Mellon family and other patrons of this gallery. Andrew Mellon somehow knew that throughout the ages, art could make a difference in the lives of people and nations. Thankfully, that was a gift he passed along to his children, who represent the best tradition of service to others.

I do want to thank, since it's been mentioned, the National Gallery for the gifts of art to the White House—on loan. [*Laughter*] And I do want to say that I'm glad you've got enough left over to fill these wonderful buildings with so many extraordinary works of art.

Tonight we honor not only the contributions of Andrew Mellon and his family, but we take time to underscore the partnership between the United States and the citizens who have done so much to preserve and enhance artistic institutions in the United States.

In this time of budget-cutting and belt-tightening, the Federal, State, and local governments together only provide a small fraction of the support for our common cultural life. That's why the contributions of people like those of you

who are here tonight are crucial to the continuing vitality of our institutions.

I must say that one of the most difficult things that I have to face as President is the sure knowledge that if I fail to relieve the burden on future generations of the enormous debt which has been built up, I will be saddling our children, our grandchildren, with something that will always handicap our economy. And yet, it is difficult for me and for the Members of Congress not to be able to give more funds to things that we really believe in. We will continue to do what we can to support the arts, but we need for you to continue to do what you can as well. We would all be not only less well-educated but, in a fundamental sense, less human than we ought to be were it not for the opportunity to spend time in places like the National Gallery.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation to those of you associated with the Gallery who support the educational programs and the outreach of the Gallery. You know, I grew up in a small town in my home State, and I never will forget the first time I went to the State's art gallery. I thought I had died and gone to heaven. Now there are children all across this country that, because of the outreach programs of galleries, see pictures, understand art, develop a level of cultural awareness and sensitivity that would be absolutely unthinkable without these programs. So for the educational efforts you have all made, I say thank you.

And if you'll give me one more indulgence, I want to say a special word of thanks for the astonishing generosity of two people who are here tonight, Walter and Leonore Annenberg, who have done so much to help us to promote education in this country.

I was pleased when we stood in the line tonight, how many of you came through and said something like, "Well, I'm from a little town in Missouri." "I've been to your State," or "I understand something about your background." I think sometimes people think too quickly that these great magnificent works of art can only be appreciated by those of us who are fortunate enough to live in the great cities of our country, to assume the high positions in business and government and elsewhere. But if you look at the life stories of the artists that we honor by hanging their wonderful pictures in these galleries, you will see a much more typical picture of ordinary life at every age and time. You have helped us to bind up one another in a common culture and to understand our connections to the past so that we can better hand down our values to the future. For that, the United States is in your debt.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 p.m. at the National Gallery of Art. In his remarks, he referred to Ruth Carter Stevenson, chair, and Robert H. Smith, president, board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art; and director of the National Gallery of Art Earl A. Powell III, and his wife, Nancy.

Remarks on Legislation To Ban Assault Weapons and an Exchange With Reporters

May 5, 1994

The President. In a few weeks the Congress will pass, and I will be able to sign, landmark legislation to fight crime in this country. Working together we have been able to show that crime is not a partisan issue. It's an American issue, and it requires comprehensive solutions, more punishment, more prevention, more police officers.

This afternoon, the House of Representatives will be considering a key part of that strategy, a law that bans 19 deadly assault weapons that pose a clear and present danger to our citizens and to our police officers. Just 2 years ago, a similar law was defeated by a very wide margin in the House. Now we're a few votes away from a dramatic strike against these deadly weapons and the criminals who use them.

Congressman Steve Neal, in an act of conviction and courage, has joined the ranks of House Members who support our local police and fight

for safe neighborhoods, joining forces with law enforcement and standing up to a lot of the misapprehension and fear and misinformation that has been spread by the opponents of this very sensible crime control measure. I want to thank Steve Neal, and the citizens across this country who are concerned about this terrible problem are in his debt.

The vote to keep dangerous assault weapons out of the hands of criminals occurs this afternoon. Members are having to choose and make difficult choices between supporting the local police in their efforts to disarm criminals who can use these weapons to kill lots of people and those who are spreading fears about the reach of this law.

Today, the American people hope and believe that common sense and the common good should prevail. With the help of people like Steve Neal, it will. I'm very grateful to him, and I wanted to give him the chance to say a few words this morning before we have the vote this afternoon.

Congressman.

Representative Steve Neal. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you so much.

Representative Neal. Thank you. Well, I would say that the President is right about this. It is the first responsibility of our Government to protect our citizens. There is a war going on on the streets of America, mostly in the big cities, and the police are outgunned. Now they say they need this legislation to help them protect us and our families against violent criminals. So we ought to give them this tool that they say they need to protect us against violence.

Singapore Caning of Michael Fay

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the caning of the American in Singapore?

The President. I think it was a mistake, as I said before, not only because of the nature of the punishment related to the crime but because of the questions that were raised about whether the young man was, in fact, guilty and had voluntarily confessed.

Q. What are you going to do about it, Mr. President?

The President. Well, we're discussing that, actually, as we speak here, what would be an appropriate statement by our Government in the aftermath of this.

Assault Weapons

Q. [*Inaudible*]—if the assault ban fails in Congress today, is there any administrative action you could take, say, through the Treasury Department, to ban these weapons yourself in the Executive order or prohibition?

The President. I don't believe we can do that. There may be some things that we can do that will minimize the problem. But I don't think any options that are available to us will be as effective as the ban on these assault weapons.

I do want to say, as I have talked to Members, there are basically two classes of concerns among those who wish to vote for this bill—and I am convinced a majority, if they could vote anonymously, would vote for this bill. And there are two classes of concerns among those people. One is some of the administrative requirements, which we'll circulate a letter today that Congressman Schumer and Mr. Synar and others have worked on to satisfy the people who are worried about the recordkeeping requirements that all those concerns, those practical concerns, can be fixed in the conference report.

The other is the so-called camel's-nose-inside-the-tent theory. A lot of our Members are being told by folks back home that they have been convinced by the opponents of this bill that today it's these assault weapons, which they don't own, and tomorrow it'll be some legitimate hunting weapon, which they do own. Well, that's why the bill contains the list of over 600 specific weapons that are protected. So I hope that we can, in effect, just debunk that, can overcome that argument by the time of the vote this afternoon. Those are the two things I've been hearing.

I was on the phone until about midnight last night. And I've made several calls again this morning working on this issue. And I believe we have a chance. It's very difficult, as you know; we were way, way down when we started and counted out right up until the 11th hour. But we may still have a chance to pass this because people like Steve Neal have been willing to come forward.

Supreme Court Nominee

Q. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal says that Judge Richard Arnold is now your favorite to become the next Supreme Court Justice. Should he be penalized because he's from Arkansas? Is he your favorite?

The President. Well, first of all, I have no comment on whether I have a favorite or not. And secondly, he shouldn't be penalized because he's from Arkansas. I mean, he was first in his class at Harvard and Yale; he's the chief judge of the 8th Circuit; and he's been head of the Appellate Judges Association. So I don't think anyone would question—it would be difficult to find, just on terms of those raw qualifications, an appellate judge with equal or superior qualifications. I don't think any American would expect someone to be disqualified because they happen to come from my State.

Q. When will we learn about your selection?

The President. Well, there's one or two other things going on here, but we're working on it. We're spending a good deal of time on it. It won't be long.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks Announcing Assistance to South Africa
May 5, 1994

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to all of you. Last week we watched with wonder as the citizens of South Africa went to the polls, as voters lined up for miles and miles, coming on crutches and in wheelchairs, waiting patiently, crossing the countryside to exercise their franchise, to create a new nation conceived in liberty and empowered by their redemptive suffering.

I have just spoken with President-elect Mandela and with President de Klerk. I congratulated Mr. Mandela on his victory and told President de Klerk that he clearly deserves tremendous credit for his leadership. Their courage, their statesmanship, along with the leadership of Chief Buthelezi and others, has made this transition smoother than many thought possible.

South Africa is free today because of the choices its leaders and people made. Their actions have been an inspiration. We can also be proud of America's role in this great drama. Because those of you here today and many others have helped to keep freedom's flame lit during the dark night of apartheid, Congress enacted sanctions to help squeeze legitimacy from the apartheid regime. Students marched in solidarity. Stockholders held their companies to higher ethical standards. America's churches, both black and white, took up the mantle of moral leadership. And throughout the fight, American civil rights leaders here helped to lead the way. Throughout, South Africa's cause has been also an American cause. Last week's miracle came to pass in part because of America's help. And now we must not turn our backs.

Let me begin by saying that we all know South Africa faces a task of building a tolerant democracy and a successful market economy and that enabling the citizens of South Africa to reach their potential, economically, is critical to preserving the tolerant democracy. To show that reconciliation and democracy can bring tangible benefits, others will have to help. I'm convinced South Africa can become a model for the entire continent. And America must be a new and full partner with that new government, so that it can deliver on its promise as quickly as possible.

We've already begun. Over the past year, the United States sent experts to South Africa to negotiate a new constitution—or to help them negotiate the new constitution. We provided considerable assistance to help their elections work. We lifted sanctions. We sent two trade and investment missions to lay the groundwork for greater economic cooperation. And we had a very fine American delegation of election observers there during the recent elections. And I'd like to especially thank the leader of that delegation, Reverend Jesse Jackson, for his outstanding contributions to the success of the South African elections. Thank you, sir.

Today I am announcing a substantial increase in our efforts to promote trade, aid, and investment in South Africa. Over the next 3 years we will provide and leverage about $600 million in funds to South Africa. For this fiscal year we have increased assistance from $83 million

to $143 million. Along with guarantees and other means, our resources, which will be mobilized for next year, will exceed $200 million. Through the programs of 10 U.S. Government agencies, we will work with South Africans to help meet the needs which they identify, to build homes and hospitals, to provide better education, to promote good governance and economic development.

I'm writing to the leaders of the other G–7 countries and asking them to join us in expanding assistance to South Africa. And we urge the international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, to do the same.

Next week, I'm also sending an official delegation to South Africa for President Mandela's inauguration. Vice President Gore will lead the trip, along with Mrs. Gore. They'll be joined by the First Lady, Secretary Brown, Secretary Espy, and many others, including those here in the audience today.

We are taking these actions because we have important interests at stake in the success of South Africa's journey. We have an economic interest in a thriving South Africa that will seek our exports and generate greater prosperity throughout the region. We have a security interest in a stable, democratic South Africa, working with its neighbors to restore and secure peace. We have a clear moral interest. We have had our own difficult struggles over racial division, and still we grapple with the challenges of drawing strength from our own diversity. That is why the powerful images of South Africa's elections resonated so deeply in the souls of all Americans.

Whether in South Africa or America, we know there is no finish line to democracy's work. Developing habits of tolerance and respect, creating opportunity for all our citizens, these efforts are never completely done. But let us savor the fact that South Africa now has the chance to begin that noble and vital work.

Thirty-three years ago, Albert Luthuli became the first of four South Africans to win the Nobel Peace Prize. As he accepted the award, he described his people as, and I quote, "living testimony to the unconquerable spirit of mankind. Down the years they have sought the goal of fuller life and liberty, striving with incredible determination and fortitude."

Today, that fortitude and the strivings of generations, have begun to bear fruit. Together, we must help all South Africans build on their newfound freedom.

Thank you very much.

And now I'd like to ask the Vice President to come forward to make some acknowledgements and some remarks and to talk a little about the historic trip that the American delegation he will lead is about to make. Mr. Vice President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to South African President-elect Nelson Mandela, President F.W. de Klerk, and Mangosuthu Buthelezi, leader of the South African Inkatha Freedom Party.

Remarks on Action by the House of Representatives on Legislation To Ban Assault Weapons and an Exchange With Reporters

May 5, 1994

The President. This afternoon, the House of Representatives rose to the occasion and stood up for the national interest. Two hundred and sixteen Members stood up for our police, our children, and for safety on our streets. They stood up against the madness that we have come to see when criminals and terrorists have legal access to assault weapons and then find themselves better armed than police, putting more and more people in increasing danger of their lives.

The 19 assault weapons banned by this proposal are deadly, dangerous weapons. They were designed for one purpose only, to kill people. And as long as violent criminals have easy access to them, they will continue to be used to kill people. We as a nation are determined to turn that around.

In the last year there has been a sea change in the crime debate. To be sure, there is still a national consensus in support of the rights of hunters and sportsmen to keep and bear their arms. And as long as I am President, those rights will continue to be protected. But we have also overcome the partisanship and the rhetoric that has divided us too long and kept us from our responsibilities to provide for law and order, to protect the peace and safety of ordinary Americans.

We have come together in the belief that more police, more prisons, tougher sentences, and better prevention together can make our neighborhoods safer, our streets, our schools, and our homes more secure.

This legislation passed today now becomes part of a larger strategy to fight crime, to make the American people safer. That's what the elected mayors and Governors want without regard to party. That's what every major police organization wants, representing people who put their lives on the line to protect the rest of us. And most importantly, that is what the American people want, the right to be safe and secure without having their freedoms taken away by criminals or by an unresponsive or unreasoning National Government.

I want to especially thank Congressman Schumer for the tenacity, the determination that he demonstrated in leading this fight for so long in the House. And I want to thank every Member of the House of Representatives in both parties who voted for this bill today, and in so doing, demonstrated extraordinary courage in the face of extraordinary political pressure to walk away.

I want to thank our remarkable Cabinet led by the Attorney General and by Secretary Bentsen who worked so hard for the passage of this legislation. I want to thank the band of stalwart workers here in the White House, in our Congressional Liaison Office and elsewhere, and especially I want to recognize Karen Hancox and Rahm Emanuel who never gave up and always believed we could win this fight.

Let me conclude by reminding all of you that Americans are not divided by party or section or philosophy on their deep yearning and determination to be safer. And so I close by extending the hand of friendship to our friends on both sides of the aisle and both sides of this issue. In particular, to Chairman Jack Brooks whose leadership is going to bring us the toughest and most significant anticrime bill ever passed by the United States Congress. Let us go back to work until our work is finished.

Thank you very much.

Assault Weapons

Q. Mr. President, how much difference did your lobbying make, sir, do you think? How much difference did your personal lobbying make, did you think? And when did you know that you had it, if it was before the vote itself?

The President. Well, it's hard for me to know how much difference my personal lobbying made. I made dozens of phone calls. I finished my phone calls last night at midnight, and I started again this morning. And I continued up to the very end.

To be candid, I never did know we were going to win. I don't think we ever knew for sure how this was going to come out. I had an instinct right at the beginning of the vote when I spoke with Congressman Carr.

The hunters and sportsmen of this country and the National Rifle Association itself never had a better friend in the Congress than him. And he decided to vote for this measure because he thought it was the right thing to do. And after I hung up the phone—that was right at the beginning of the vote, I think—I said, "You know, we just might pull this off." But I didn't know before then.

Whitewater

Q. Mr. President, there was a very broad subpoena served in the White House today which might raise a number of questions for you. How will you decide whether to assert executive or lawyer-client privilege on things that might be very private, such as notes to you from Vince Foster or from you to Vince Foster?

The President. I don't know. I don't know anything about it. I've been working on this all day. I have no knowledge of it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:40 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks at a Cinco de Mayo Celebration
May 5, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Ambassador and Mrs. Montano, thank you for welcoming me here at this magnificent building, and thank all of you for coming and giving me a chance to celebrate Cinco de Mayo with you. I want to recognize here the Secretary of Transportation, Federico Pena, and thank him for all of his work; three of my able White House aides, Joe Valasquez, Suzanna Valdez, and Grace Garcia. And I want to say a word about the Members of Congress who are not here, apparently. They're still voting—[*laughter*]—but that is, in some ways, our fault. We staged a great fight today in the House of Representatives to pass the assault weapons ban. So they are a couple of hours behind schedule, but it's because they did the work of America tonight, and I'm very grateful to them.

It's an honor for me to be here to celebrate on this holiday Mexico's unity and national sovereignty. The Hispanic community, Mexicans and 13 million Mexican-Americans who live here in our Nation have every reason to mark this day with great pride.

With the implementation of NAFTA, the friendship between our two nations has grown even closer. Our cooperation is also critical to strengthening democracy in this hemisphere. Sometimes in the pursuit of that great goal of democracy, we encounter tragedy. We have known it in our own country, and we here shared your profound sadness over the assassination of Luis Donaldo Colosio last March.

But Mexico's response to this loss, in my judgment, showed its resilience, its courage, its determination, its true patriotism. These are qualities which can inspire the world and can strengthen democracy even in adversity. The United States is committed to standing with you.

Immediately after hearing of the tragic assassination, the Secretary of the Treasury and I talked very late at night, and we committed to establishing a multibillion-dollar contingency fund to help to stabilize the financial markets until people were able to deal with the consequences of these tragedies.

I have profound confidence in the strength of Mexico's political institutions and its leadership, and in the bright prospects for the Mexican economy. I think Mexico can overcome any setbacks and any tragedy. And on August the 21st, I believe that Mexico will hold full, free, and fair elections.

I also want to say that all of you know our cooperation is terribly important for what we can do together economically and for what that can mean for all of Latin America. The North American Free Trade Agreement is a fine example of how we must go forward together. In a time when nations face crucial choices all around the world, we can be proud that, together, we made the right choice in going forward with NAFTA. I want to say again tonight how much I appreciate President Salinas in his unswerving support of the agreement. The implementation, I can report to you, is proceeding smoothly. And we are committed to continuing that cooperation.

Next week, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, our HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, our EPA Administrator Carol Browner all will visit Mexico City to meet with their counterparts to discuss the issues that we can work together on. And in December, I will convene in Miami a Summit of the Americas where democratically elected leaders of 33 nations will come together to discuss our common goals. You think of it: Every nation in this hemisphere, save two, tonight is governed by a democratically elected leader, and one of those two had a democratic election in which the leader was ousted. That is an astonishing record. No hemisphere can claim to do so well in the pursuit of democracy.

Benito Juarez once said, "The respect for other's rights means peace." We in the United States believe if we can promote democracy around the world, there will be more peace. There will be more opportunity to make agreements. There will be more reliability. There will be less war, less turmoil, and less hatred. Not the end of problems, not the end of conflict, but the promise of working through them, that is the promise that we see fulfilled today in the wonderful relationships between the United States and Mexico, a genuine partnership among equals, striving for the future in the best way

we know how. That is worth celebrating on this Cinco de Mayo.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:45 p.m. at the Mexican Cultural Institute. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Jorge Montano of Mexico and his wife, Luz Maria Valdez de Montano.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Federal Advisory Committees

May 5, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (Public Law 92–463; 5 U.S.C., App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting my first Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees for fiscal year 1993 for your consideration and action.

Consistent with my efforts to create a Government that works better and costs less, I issued Executive Order No. 12838 on February 10, 1993, requiring the executive branch to conduct a comprehensive review of all advisory committees. Based upon this assessment, each department and agency was directed to reduce by at least one-third the number of committees not required by the Congress. I am pleased to advise that this initiative has resulted in a net reduction of 284 unproductive advisory committees, exceeding our elimination target of 267, by 6 percent, or 17 committees. In addition, we have identified approximately 30 unneeded statutory groups.

While progress has been achieved in assuring that the work of advisory committees remains focused on national, rather than special interests, I am asking for your support in effecting other needed improvements. The Administration will forward to the Congress a legislative proposal to terminate 30 advisory committees required by statute, but for which compelling needs no longer exist. I urge the Congress to act quickly and favorably on this proposal, and I welcome any recommendations of the Congress regarding additional groups that may be eliminated through our joint efforts to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government. Toward this end, I hope the Congress will show increased restraint in the creation of new statutory committees.

I have directed the executive branch to exercise continued restraint in the creation and management of advisory committees. This will allow us to obtain further savings recommended by the Vice President and the National Performance Review. Consistent with Executive Order No. 12838, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget will continue to approve new agency-sponsored committees when necessary and appropriate. In addition the General Services Administration, as apart of its overall responsibilities under the Act, will periodically prepare legislation to propose the elimination of committees no longer required by the Government.

We stand ready to work with the Congress to assure the appropriate use of advisory committees and to achieve the purposes for which this law was enacted.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 5, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for Democracy
May 5, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 504(h) of Public Law 98–164, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4413(i)), I transmit herewith the 10th Annual Report of the National Endowment for Democracy, which covers fiscal year 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 5, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations
May 5, 1994

On May 3, 1994, President Clinton signed a Presidential Decision Directive establishing "U.S. Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations." This directive is the product of a year-long interagency policy review and extensive consultations with dozens of Members of Congress from both parties.

The policy represents the first, comprehensive framework for U.S. decisionmaking on issues of peacekeeping and peace enforcement suited to the realities of the post-cold-war period.

Peace operations are not and cannot be the centerpiece of U.S. foreign policy. However, as the policy states, properly conceived and well-executed peace operations can be a useful element in serving America's interests. The directive prescribes a number of specific steps to improve U.S. and U.N. management of U.N. peace operations in order to ensure that use of such operations is selective and more effective.

The administration will release today an unclassified document outlining key elements of the Clinton administration's policy on reforming multilateral peace operations.

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
May 5, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate the following four individuals as Federal judges: H. Lee Sarokin to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Blanche M. Manning to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; Lewis A. Kaplan to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York; and William F. Downes to the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming.

"These individuals will bring excellence to the Federal bench," the President said. "Each has an outstanding record of achievement in the legal community."

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

Remarks on Women's Health Care
May 6, 1994

Thank you, Mrs. Bailey, for the wonderful introduction and for the wonderful life you have lived.

I want to thank all the mothers who are here for doing such a good job with their sons and daughters, helping them to achieve a full measure of ambition. I want to thank the Vice President and Mrs. Gore for being wonderful examples of good parents. And I want to thank my wonderful wife for being the best mother I have ever known, as well as for taking on this often thankless but terribly important job.

You know, since Tipper was kind enough to mention my mother—I was sitting here thinking, I know some of these mothers here. Rosa DeLauro's mother campaigned with me in New Haven, and Rosa said, "You need to get my mother to go with you. She's worth a lot more votes than I am." [*Laughter*] So I watched all the people along the way being too intimidated to say no, they wouldn't vote for me. [*Laughter*] Sure enough, we carried it.

On Mother's Day we tend to think of the wonderful and warm and kind and loving and sacrificial things our mothers do. You heard Hillary say that, like most families, mothers make the health care decisions and prod everybody else to do it. But you know, very often mothers are also the most practical members of the family and the most hard-headed and the most insistent that we face up to our responsibilities. Very often the values, the internal character structure of children is profoundly influenced by the sort of daily insistence of mothers that you just face up to your daily tasks and do your job and life will take care of itself. And that may seem terribly elemental, but one of the reasons that I ran for President is I thought all that had been abandoned here, and there was a lot more talk than action.

Now, last month, we just learned today that our economy produced 267,000 new jobs, in no small measure because the people in this National Government have begun to take responsibility for bringing the deficit down and trying to do things that will grow the economy.

Yesterday, in a heroic move, the United States House of Representatives voted to ban 19 assault weapons. It was a very difficult thing for some of the Members, who were literally threatened with losing their seats and their political careers. But in the end, they got beyond the rhetoric to a very commonsense, old-fashioned American judgment that it was the right thing to do, the disciplined thing to do, the sort of thing your mother would be proud of you if you did. [*Laughter*]

I say that because I want to focus on what your mother would tell you to do in health care, not just for emotional reasons but because every day, those of us who are charged with the responsibility of working here are supposed to get up and do what my mother told me to do, which is to do your job. And my mother used to tell me all the time, "Bill, you give a good speech, but you still have to *do* something—[*laughter*]—in the end you still have to do something."

There's so much talk and genuine concern in this country about the American family. We're here paying tribute to it. Sunday we'll pay enormous tribute to it. And I think all of us would admit, whether we're Democrats or Republicans or independents and whatever our political philosophies are, that if the families of this country weren't in so much trouble, we'd have about half as many problems as we've got. I think we all know that. But what I want to ask you is what my mother would ask me, "Well, so what are you going to *do* about it?" And how can we be so concerned with the stability of the family as an institution, and still walk away from those stories that Hillary talked to you about? I mean, we've heard so many of these stories, we can't keep up with them all now. We literally cannot keep up with them all.

Millions of women in this country have no health insurance. Many more have insurance policies full of the kind of loopholes that you heard Hillary describe. There are policies that deny mammograms or that don't pay for well-baby visits or prescription drugs, that routinely exclude pregnancy as a preexisting condition. How can a pro-family country say pregnancy is a preexisting condition? Some insurance companies have gone so far as to call domestic violence a preexisting condition. Well, so is breathing.

A couple of weeks ago, in the New York Times, there was a remarkable column by a novelist named Anne Hood who wrote how the system fails families today. She said she was a self-employed writer and her husband had a hard time finding health insurance. And when they finally found insurance that they were actually able to purchase, the quarterly payment was $1,800. That's $7,200 a year for a family policy.

And still, after they paid all that money, their worries weren't over. She and her husband moved from New York to Rhode Island, and she had a baby. After the baby was born, she learned the insurance company had dropped their coverage when they moved 6 months into her pregnancy. And to renew her insurance would have cost $2,000 more a quarter, an extra $8,000 a year for maternity coverage. That was more than it would cost to have the baby.

Now, it's seems to me that common sense tells you that if we can make it possible for self-employed people, like this fine woman and her husband, and small business people to afford to take care of themselves and their families and to stop passing on their costs to the rest of us, and we can organize it so they can buy insurance on the same terms that those of us who work for government or big business can, that we ought to do that. And it seems to me that their mothers would tell them they ought to pay a little for it and assume their responsibility, too.

We have got to try to reform this system to try to help people stay healthy and take care of them when they're sick. In any given year, about a third of all American women fail to get basic preventive services, like clinical breast exams, Pap smears, complete physicals. More than half of all American women over the age of 50 fail to receive a mammogram, often because of problems with their insurance.

In medical research, women have been on the sidelines too long, too little research into the causes and cure of breast cancer and osteoporosis. Heart disease is a number one killer of women, but until recently, all of the search for a cure was centered only on men. The simple fact is that we've paid too little attention to the unique problems of women.

I met with a lot of mothers this week whose children either have or have already died of AIDS, and there are an enormous number of women who now have the HIV virus and who have passed it along to their children, or some have it and some don't. And we don't know whether or not there are different potential resolutions of this for women than for men.

We're trying to change all that in this administration. For one thing, I've put only women in charge of the health care struggle. Donna Shalala is Secretary of Health and Human Services. America became the first nation in the world to establish a senior Government position to oversee women's health issues. I put a woman and a mother in charge of health care reform, and you can see she's done a pretty good job, and we're all still pretty healthy.

We created an office of research on women's health at the National Institutes of Health, and increased funding for breast cancer research, for a national action plan on breast cancer, for research into other problems that affect women. We removed barriers that stood in the way of finding cures to Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. We passed the family and medical leave law, a pro-family bill if I ever saw it. You ought to read the letters that we get on that.

But if we really want to do right by the American family, and if we really want to honor our mothers, if we want the emotional satisfaction of seeing a lot of that pain taken away and the personal satisfaction of thinking we have done what our mothers would have told us to do, which is to face up to our responsibilities and do the right thing, then we've got to find a way to provide health care to all Americans, to guarantee comprehensive benefits, including preventive care, including those screenings and tests and check-ups to keep people well, not just spend a fortune on them when they really get in trouble.

We've got to preserve the right to choose doctors that women normally make the choice of. And our older women need to be able to rely on Medicare.

We can do these things. We can fix what's wrong with our system and not mess up what's right. But in order to do it, it's going to take the same discipline that was required to deal with the problems of the economy, the same courage that was required to take that vote yesterday on assault weapons, and some memory that that is, after all, what we were raised by our mothers to do. And on Mother's Day, I hope that we will all resolve that by Mother's Day next year, the women who cared for us will have a health care system that cares for them.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:52 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Barbara Bailey, mother of Representative Barbara B. Kennelly, and Luisa DeLauro, mother of Representative Rosa L. DeLauro.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad of Malaysia

May 6, 1994

Jones Lawsuit

Q. Mr. President, do you have any comment on the lawsuit filed against you today?

The President. Well, I thought Mr. Bennett did a fine job. I don't have anything to add to what he said.

Q. Are you going to argue that all the charges are false?

The President. I don't have anything to add to what Mr. Bennett said. I'm going back to work.

Q. Do you categorically deny the charges?

The President. Bob Bennett spoke for me, and I'm going back to work. I'm not going to dignify this by commenting on it.

Haiti

Q. Can you tell us whether you're thinking of changing your Haiti policy regarding the return of the refugees given the escalation of violence?

The President. We've had our Haiti policy under review, as you know, for the last 3 or 4 weeks. And we had a meeting about it today. We're going to meet again tomorrow. And I think we may have some announcements to make after that.

Q. About changing the policy on the refugees, sir?

Q. Have you tasked the Defense Department to do some military options just in case these sanctions cut today don't work?

The President. I don't want to discuss that. As I have said, I do not favor that option. I just don't think we can rule it out. I think it would be irresponsible to rule it out.

Q. You do not favor that option?

The President. Well, I've never favored—you know what I favor. What I've been trying to do is to get Governors Island followed. I'm trying—I think the people down there ought to keep their word. But we certainly can't afford to rule it out.

Q. Do you think you might have announcements regarding the refugee policy, was that what you were referring to?

The President. I don't have—I'll make an announcement when I have something to say about Haiti policy. But I don't have anything else to say.

Q. Are you referring to the refugee policy?

The President. I have nothing else to say about it.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Malaysia

Q. Mr. President, you missed Dr. Mahathir in Seattle. Now that you have met him personally, how do you feel about it?

The President. Well, we haven't had a chance to visit yet, but I have been looking forward to this for a long time. I admire his leadership very much, and I admire the incredible accomplishments of his nation under his leadership over the last several years. And I look forward to establishing a good relationship with him and continuing our partnership.

I'm also very grateful for the security partnership we have had and for the contributions that have been made by Malaysia to the operation in Bosnia, to the operation in Somalia, and to being a responsible leader in world affairs.

So we've got a lot to talk about and I'm looking forward to it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:55 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to attorney Robert Bennett. Former Arkansas State employee Paula Jones' lawsuit sought civil damages for alleged sexual harassment in 1991. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the NCAA Champion Lake Superior State University Hockey Team

May 6, 1994

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Just minutes before his team took the ice against the Russians—and some of these young people were too young to remember that thrilling Olympic victory in 1980—but Herb Brooks told his team that they were born to play the game. He said, "You were meant to be here at this time. This is your moment."

Well, Senator Levin and Congressman Stupak, I thank you for your help in making this event possible. And today I say to the players, the coaches, and the other supporters of the Lake Superior State hockey team, welcome to the White House. This is your moment.

I want to give my best regards to Bob Arbuckle, the president of LSSU; Jeff Jackson, the head coach of the Lakers. And I want to talk a little about this team. But before I do, I have to say something about another Michigan moment. During this last winter, the coldest we'd had here in 100 years, a deep freeze struck the Upper Peninsula, causing extensive damage to the infrastructure of the region.

The State of Michigan requested a major disaster declaration through our emergency management agency to provide assistance to 10 counties. I have just been advised by the Director of FEMA, James Lee Witt, that his agency is reviewing the State's request, and he expects to recommend to me on Monday that a major disaster declaration is warranted with a preliminary estimate of $7.1 million, which is expected to increase as the thawing continues. I want to thank Representative Stupak and Senator Levin and Senator Riegle for their interest in the matter and say that I hope the thawing continues in the Upper Peninsula, Mr. Stupak.

Now, back to the school. It's relatively small, 3,400 students, and smaller than many of your competitors. And yet, by concentrating on the fundamentals, concentrating on quality, year after year you produce excellence: three national titles in 7 years, two in the last 3 years; three straight NCAA championship games.

Be proud not just because you're champions but, more important, because of what made you champions: hard work, determination, discipline, loyalty, and teamwork. I hope each of you will take that example into your communities and on into your lives. There are too many young people in America who don't have the kind of hope you have, no one to push them forward or no one to cheer for them.

Tonight and tomorrow, people all over this country will now see a picture of you here, and some child will be inspired to work harder. Because of you, he or she will believe that they can do more with their lives, make more of themselves, and make a difference.

If I could leave one message today, it would be this: Never underestimate the impact of this achievement on other people, especially young people. President Kennedy once said, "One man can make a difference, and every man should try." I hope all of you will do that.

Again, welcome to the White House.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:13 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Herb Brooks, 1980 U.S. Olympic hockey team coach.

Statement on the Death of Mike Walsh

May 6, 1994

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to hear of the death of our good friend Mike Walsh. His friendship and advice will be sorely missed. Our prayers and sympathies are with his family during this difficult time.

The President's Radio Address
May 7, 1994

Good morning. This week we saw a dramatic example of what we can accomplish together when you make your voices heard and Washington sets aside partisan differences to do the people's business.

Even though nearly everyone said it couldn't be done, the House of Representatives voted to make our streets safer by banning the sale of 19 different assault weapons. We pushed hard for this result, and the outcome defied the old enemy of gridlock. Democrats and Republicans alike sent a powerful message that the American people are determined to take their streets, their schools, and their communities back from criminals.

This vote teaches us an important lesson: No matter how uphill a battle may seem, when we set our minds to it, we can deal with the problems facing our country. Last year it took the same kind of commitment to pass a powerful plan to reduce the deficit. And now we're seeing the rewards of that.

Just yesterday, we learned that our economy has created over a quarter of a million jobs in April, and almost a million in the first 4 months of this year alone, about 3 million jobs since we all began this effort and nearly all of them in the private sector.

Our successes in fighting crime and improving the economy are worth thinking about on this Mother's Day weekend. We are honoring the people who are at the heart of our society's most important institution, the family.

Tomorrow, mothers all across America will enjoy the flowers, cards, and breakfasts in bed. But we should remember another gift that will improve and prolong their lives: the gift of good health care. Women are the people most likely to guard their families' health care and to make sure we're all healthier. And yet too often our health care system leaves women behind. Even when treatments are available, women don't get the necessary health care they need because they have inadequate insurance or none at all. More women than men work part-time or in jobs without insurance. And historically, research studies on everything from heart disease to strokes to AIDS have tended to focus on men, leaving women more vulnerable to many diseases.

I am committed to redressing these inequities. We've made a good start. We've got a fine woman, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala. We created the first senior-level position in Government dedicated to women's health concerns. We've increased funds to prevent and treat diseases that afflict women. Right now, the largest clinical trial in the United States' history is underway, looking at how to prevent heart disease, the biggest killer of our women. We launched a national action plan on breast cancer to fight the killer of 46,000 women every year. These women are not just numbers, they are loved ones lost forever. And most important, we're pushing to reform the health care system.

The great majority of the letters Hillary and I have received about health care reform have been from women, voicing concerns for their families, their children, and their parents. One was from a New York woman forced to take a job with no medical coverage. Last year, a lump was found in her breast, and her doctors said it should be removed. But her family can't afford the operation. "I don't want to die," she wrote us, "and because of lack of money, I may. I hope that you'll be able to do something soon so that no one will have to go through what I am going through."

This mother is just 44 years old. I can't share her name because she hasn't told her family yet. She doesn't want them to worry. This woman's condition may be treatable, but she won't know because treatment is simply out of her financial reach.

Travesties like this happen too often. Women avoid preventive care because they're afraid of having records of preexisting conditions that will deny them insurance coverage. In a recent survey, 11 percent of women said they didn't get their blood pressure checked; 35 percent didn't receive a Pap smear; and 44 percent didn't receive a mammogram.

Our health care plan emphasizes preventive care. It eliminates preexisting conditions and bans lifetime limits on health coverage. It makes research of women's health problems a priority.

It helps families when a loved one needs long-term care. And it gives coverage to everyone, regardless of whether she is healthy or ill, married or single, working inside or outside the home.

For every American blessed with a mother, or the wonderful memory of one, I ask you to think about the 16 million women in our Nation who don't get the health care services they need. And think about their children. Think how a single illness can destroy a family.

I think of a courageous woman I met this week named Kate Miles, who is caring for a son with multiple disabilities. Her family has no assistance for long-term care. So to keep her son, Robert, out of a nursing home, and because of the awful way our system operates, Kate Miles had to give up her job, and her husband, Tom, must work two jobs. As she so eloquently put it: "In an institution, who will be there in the middle of the night when he's frightened, to tell him it's all right and that his mother loves him?" No mother should have to know such pain.

So today I ask every mother's child to send another card this Mother's Day. Address it to your Senator or Representative in Congress. Tell them this health care reform plan is important, because it may help the most important person in your life. And tell them along with mother love, most of our mothers taught us that the most important thing in life was to be a good person and do the right thing.

Well, this Mother's Day, the right thing is to make sure that by next Mother's Day we never have to worry about the health of our mothers being cared for.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:06 p.m. on May 6 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 7.

Remarks Announcing the Appointment of William H. Gray III as Special Adviser on Haiti and an Exchange With Reporters

May 8, 1994

The President. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I want to speak for a few moments about the crisis in Haiti, the challenge it poses to our national interests, and the new steps I am taking to respond.

Three and a half years ago, in free and fair elections, the people of Haiti chose Jean-Bertrand Aristide as their President. Just 9 months later, their hopes were dashed when Haiti's military leaders overthrew democracy by force. Since then, the military has murdered innocent civilians, crushed political freedom, and plundered Haiti's economy.

From the start of this administration, my goal has been to restore democracy and President Aristide. Last year, we helped the parties to negotiate the Governors Island accord, a fair and balanced agreement which laid out a road map for a peaceful resolution to the crisis. But late last year, the Haitian military abrogated the agreement, and since then they have rejected every effort to achieve a political settlement.

At the same time, the repression and bloodshed in Haiti have reached alarming new proportions. Supporters of President Aristide, and many other Haitians, are being killed and mutilated. This is why 6 weeks ago I ordered a review of our policy toward Haiti. As a result of this review, we are taking several steps to increase pressure on Haiti's military while addressing the suffering caused by their brutal misrule. We are stepping up our diplomatic efforts, we are intensifying sanctions, and we are adapting our migration policy.

Let me describe these steps. First, to bring new vigor to our diplomacy, I am pleased to announce that Bill Gray, president of the United Negro College Fund, former House majority whip, and chair of the House Budget Committee, has accepted my invitation to serve as special adviser to me and to the Secretary of State on Haiti. Bill is here with his wife, on his way to the inauguration of President Mandela in South Africa, and I will ask him to speak in just a few moments. But let me just say that he is a man of vision and determination, of real strength and real creativity. And I appreciate his willingness to accept this difficult and

challenging assignment. He will be the point man in our diplomacy and a central figure in our future policy deliberations.

As part of our diplomatic efforts, we will work with the United Nations to examine the changes in the proposed U.N. military and police mission in Haiti. We want to ensure that once Haiti's military leaders have left, this mission can do its job effectively and safely.

Second, the U.S. is leading the international community in a drive to impose tougher sanctions on Haiti. On Friday, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution we had proposed to tighten sanctions on everything but humanitarian supplies, to prevent Haiti's military leaders and their civilian allies from leaving the country, to promote a freeze of their assets worldwide, and to ban nonscheduled flights in and out of Haiti. U.S. naval vessels will continue to enforce these sanctions vigorously.

We are also working with the Dominican Republic to improve sanctions enforcement along that nation's border with Haiti. To shield the most vulnerable Haitians from the worst effects of the sanctions, we will increase both humanitarian aid and the number of U.N. and OAS human rights monitors in Haiti.

While these stronger sanctions will cause more hardships for innocent Haitians, we must be clear: The military leaders bear full responsibility for this action. They can stop the suffering of their people by giving up power, as they themselves agreed to do, and allowing the restoration of democracy and the return of President Aristide.

Third, I am announcing certain changes in our migration policy toward Haiti. Currently, Haitians seeking refugee status, including those interdicted at sea, are interviewed only in Haiti and not beyond its shores. Our processing centers, which have been dramatically expanded in this administration, are doing a good job under bad circumstances.

In 1993, we processed and approved about 10 times the number of refugee applicants as in 1992. In recent months, however, I have become increasingly concerned that Haiti's declining human rights situation may endanger the safety of those who have valid fears of political persecution, who flee by boat, and who are then returned to Haiti where they are met at the docks by Haitian authorities before they can be referred to in-country processing.

Therefore, I have decided to modify our procedures. We will continue to interdict all Haitian migrants at sea, but we will determine aboard ship or in other countries, which ones are bona fide political refugees. Those who are not will still be returned to Haiti, but those who are will be provided refuge. We will also approach other countries to seek their participation in this humanitarian endeavor.

The new procedures will begin once we have the necessary arrangements in place. This will take some weeks. Until then, the Haitians must understand that we will continue to return all boat migrants to Haiti. Even under the new procedures, there will be no advantage for Haitians with fears of persecution to risk their lives at sea if and when they can assert their claims more safely at a processing center in Haiti.

The ultimate solution to this crisis, however, is for the military leaders to keep their own commitment to leave, so that Haiti's people can build a peaceful and prosperous future in their own country.

I am committed to making these new international sanctions work. At the same time, I cannot and should not rule out other options. The United States has clear interests at stake in ending this crisis. We have an interest in bolstering the cause of democracy in the Americas. We have an interest in ensuring the security of our citizens living and working in Haiti. We have an interest in stopping the gross human rights violations and abuses of the military and their accomplices. And we clearly have a humanitarian interest in preventing a massive and dangerous exodus of Haitians by sea.

The steps I have announced today are designed to relieve suffering, redouble pressure, and restore democracy. Working with the Haitian people and the world community, we will try to advance our interests and give Haiti an opportunity to build a future of freedom and hope. They voted for it, and they deserve the chance to have it.

Mr. Gray.

[*At this point, Mr. Gray made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, what makes you believe that these sanctions, these new policies on returning Haitian refugees to Haiti will work this time? Haven't they been tried before and found to be unreliable or to encourage people to——

The President. Before, when they were tried, the circumstances were somewhat different.

First of all, let me answer the question about why we would undertake to change the policy, even though there is clearly some logistical challenge involved in doing so.

I ordered the review of this policy 6 weeks ago when we began first to get intelligence reports and then clear news reports that there was increasing violence against citizens of Haiti who did not agree with the policies of the military regime—and indeed, some of them seem to not be political at all—of people not only being killed but being mutilated. It seems to me reasonable to assume that some of the people who are fleeing by boat are in that group of people who also are fearful of their lives. And the way the boat return has worked so far is that we take the people back, let them off at the dock at Port-au-Prince. They are then—by and large, they have been free to go to the in-country processing. But they are subject to the authority of the Haitian police at that moment. And I simply think that the risks of that cannot be justified, given the increased level of political violence in the country. Therefore, I think we have to change the policy.

Now, why do I think it will work? First, we've studied what happened before when the policy of inspection of people at sea occurred, and we have determined that two things ought to be done. First, we ought to look for a third-country processing center. And second, if we do it at sea, we ought not to do it on the Coast Guard cutters, which can be quickly overrun in their capacity, but to do it on bigger ships.

We believe if—given a little time to organize this logistically, we can handle it. Also, it will be clear that we are not changing our policy, which is the law of the United States with regard to economic refugees. People who seek to come to the United States for economic reasons only, are not eligible for this kind of status.

So we will do these reviews. We think we can do them fairly quickly, in a matter of a few days, and then return those who should be returned and take those who should be taken into the United States.

Ron [Ron Fournier, Associated Press].

Q. Are you in danger, sir, of sending signals that could open the floodgates for Haitian refugees? And how much, if any, did the fast play into your decisionmaking process?

The President. First, let me answer your first question. I hope that we will not have a flood of refugees, but we are increasing our naval resources to deal with them. We are not changing our policy about who can come and who cannot. That is a matter of American law. We are not able to do that, nor should we do that.

But I don't believe the policy we have now is sustainable, given the level of political violence against innocent civilians in Haiti. We have to try to implement this policy. I believe we can, and I think, as we do it firmly, the Haitian people will see we are not opening the floodgates for indiscriminate refugee migration into the United States but that we are going to try to find those people who have left because they have a genuine fear.

The review of this policy began before Mr. Robinson's fast, but if you will go back, and when I was first asked about it I said that I did not mind his criticism of our policy, it obviously had not worked. I said that from day one. And I respect his conviction and his courage and his conscience. And I was gratified by the comments that he said today. And I'm glad that on this Mother's Day he's going to be having dinner with his wife tonight.

Q. Mr. President, on sanctions, your former envoy to Haiti warns that the stricter sanctions will—could also ruin the situation on the ground in Haiti. It would make it impossible for President Aristide or for anyone Mr. Gray works with to set up there to bring democracy back. What kind of confidence do you have that economic sanctions are going to bring the military leaders out?

The President. Well, I think the economic sanctions will have to be coupled with a vigorous and aggressive and broad-based diplomatic effort. And we are exploring all alternatives.

As you know, we have been reluctant to impose the more severe sanctions, although President Aristide and many of the Friends of Haiti group, the French, the Canadians, others who have worked with us on this for a long time, since, have advocated this course. In my view, we must exhaust all available alternatives as we try to resolve this diplomatically. And I think it is an appropriate thing to do now.

If we are successful in trying to bring back democracy and to restore not only President Aristide but the concept, the spirit that was in the Governors Island accord, that is, a broad-based, functioning representative government that can relate to the business community as well as to the ordinary citizens of Haiti, then

we will have to get ourselves in gear to try to make sure that that economy comes back as quickly as possible. We're trying to do that with South Africa and others. I think we'll be able to do it.

Q. Mr. President, I don't understand why the administration is saying that it does not expect a large influx of Haitian refugees now. Are you saying effectively that you expect the results of the new policy will be the same as the results of the old policy?

The President. No, I'm saying—I think there will be more—some more people in the sense that we will be reviewing more people simultaneously. That is, we will be reviewing people not only in the in-country processing centers, but we'll be interviewing people either on boats or in a third country. But what I'm saying is that we have not broadened the criteria of eligibility for coming to the United States.

I want to make this very clear. The problem with the present policy is—the present policy worked in 1993 up through the abrogation of the Governors Island accord and for some time thereafter in the sense that we did not have evidence of widespread indiscriminate killing of civilians. And we increased by tenfold, by tenfold, the number of people processed and the number of people approved for refuge in this country for 1993 over 1992.

But when all this killing started, when it became obvious that the military leaders had no earthly intention of honoring Governors Island or anything approaching it or keeping their commitments, but instead were going to tolerate, organize, and abet increased killing in Haiti, it is logical to assume that some of those who get on the boats include not only economic refugees, who are the vast majority of them, but also some who genuinely fear for their lives. The only way we can get those people to the in-country processing is to let them off at the dock in Port-au-Prince where the police have jurisdiction. I do not believe that is a sustainable policy, either practically or morally, given the level of indiscriminate violence.

So there may be some more people who get in because we'll be reviewing even more people. But it would be a great mistake for Haitians who want to come here for economic reasons to just take to the boats, because we are not changing the standard by which we admit people.

Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

Q. It seems there are two outstanding problems. One is that Lieutenant General Cedras said this morning he doesn't really have any intention of stepping aside in order to replace—in order to make room for President Aristide, and that even your supporters on this policy are concerned that there is still no equivalency between what happens with the United States and Cuban immigrants and the United States and Haitian immigrants. How do you address those two things?

The President. Well, I think we are going to have—we do have an equivalency in terms of people who get here. But we have an obligation to try to let the people who genuinely fear for their lives into this country. We are now going to do that without regard to whether they're processed in-country or on boats. Therefore, the legal standard is what it ought to be.

The Cuban situation is unique in the sense that there is an act of Congress which has certain specifics about the Cuban situation which changes our relationship with Cuba to some extent. But this will alleviate the legitimate concern with regard to the Haitians, and I hope will minimize the likelihood that hundreds of people will die at sea innocently.

Q. And about Lieutenant General Cedras?

The President. Well, of course, he's going to say that. That's what he's been saying ever since—that's what he told us when he abrogated the Governors Island accord. "I gave my word. I never expect President Aristide to keep his word. President Aristide called my bluff, kept his word, and so I'm going to shaft the agreement." That's what he said on September 30th. So he hasn't changed his mind since then. But we may be able to do better now. And I think the gentleman to my right is a person of extraordinary ability; maybe he can do some things we haven't done yet. We're going to give it our best shot.

[*At this point, a Cuban-American expressed appreciation for the new policy on Haiti.*]

The President. Thanks.

One more.

Q. How long are you willing to give sanctions to take the desired effect?

The President. I think I have to let Mr. Gray do a little work before I can answer that question.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:15 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Raoul Cedras, commander of the Haitian Army, and Randall Robinson, TransAfrica Forum executive director who fasted to protest U.S. policy in Haiti. The Executive order and proclamation of May 7 on Haiti are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress on Additional Economic Sanctions Against Haiti
May 7, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1703 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 on October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 on October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c) I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 on June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 (June 16, 1993).

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 on October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. These include, *inter alia*, a requirement that Member States deny permission for take off, landing or overflight to any aircraft flying to or from Haiti, other than aircraft on regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights. In addition, the Resolution strongly urges, but does not mandate, the freezing of funds and financial resources of officers of the military in Haiti, including police, major participants in the coup d'etat of 1991, and in illegal governments since the coup d'etat, those employed by, or acting on behalf of, the military, and immediate family members of the foregoing. Effective at 11:59 p.m. e.d.t., May 8, 1994, I have taken additional steps pursuant to the above statutory authorities to enhance the implementation of this international embargo and to conform to United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

This new Executive order:

—bans arriving and departing flights and overflights stopping or originating in Haiti, except regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights;

—blocks the funds and financial resources, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, of the individuals specified in Resolution 917, identified above;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to implement certain provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 of May 6, 1994, that are to take effect without delay. Further measures, including a comprehensive trade embargo with certain humanitarian exceptions, are required no later than May 21, 1994. I am considering additional measures to give full effect to these and other provisions of that Resolution. The measures we are imposing and the United Nations Security Council Resolution adopted on May 6, 1994, reflect the determination of the United States, acting in concert with the inter-

national community, to end the assault on democracy and human dignity in Haiti.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

May 7, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 9. The Executive order and related proclamation of May 7 are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks to Pathmark Employees in New York City
May 9, 1994

Thank you so much, Jack. And I want to thank you and all of you here for hosting me today. I was beginning to tell a story. You know, the first job I ever had was working in a grocery store. I was 13 years old; I don't think I violated the child labor laws at the time. [*Laughter*] But anyway, I did. And so every time I come into a food store, I'm always so happy, and I look around to see how the merchandise is stacked and how it's organized and everything. And I remember how different it was when I started my career as a worker almost 35 years ago now.

I want to thank you for your support of this endeavor. I want to thank Senator Connor and my longtime friend, your borough president, Ruth Messenger, for being here today in support of this. I want to thank Doug Dority and the United Food and Commercial Workers for their support of health care reform and their intense efforts to educate the Congress about this.

I want to say again what this plastic bag says, and I want to emphasize why I'm here today, besides the fact that I was kind of hungry, driving in from the airport. [*Laughter*] That bag says: "Pathmark and the UFCW support health benefits at work and quality health care, including prescription medicines for all Americans." That just about says it all.

We're having this raging political struggle in Washington where everybody in the wide world says, "Oh, I believe every American ought to have access to health care, but we can't figure out how to do it." And the Members of Congress are being told day-in and day-out that all retail establishments and all small businesses oppose requiring employers and employees that don't have any health insurance at all now to get coverage at work, with the employers paying a substantial and fair share of that. And the image they have now is that all retail establishments and all small businesses feel that way. We have now produced hundreds of small business people, men and women from all over America who say, "I want to insure my employees, but I can't afford to because my competitors don't have to do it. Please require us all to do it, and then give small business the same chance to buy that big business has."

Today, you see a major American retailer, 175 stores, a company that's proved that you can be socially responsible and still make money. You can provide health care to your employees, and you can put stores in the inner cities. And you can make money by treating people right, your customers and the people who work with you. That is the message today.

The truth is that if all retailers in the country had to provide insurance on equal terms to their employees, you would be advantaged, because no one would be able to get a competitive advantage over you by not covering their employees while you all are covered, and you bear that cost in common and the truth is that in the future, your health benefits could be purchased for a lower cost. That is, your costs wouldn't go up as much because today part of your cost is paying the bill for everybody who doesn't have coverage, because when they get sick, they get care. They show up at the emergency room when it's too late and too expensive, and then the cost is passed on to everybody in our society who is paying a fair share.

So this is a very, very important thing today. By being here, you are saying to me that you support health benefits at work. It works for

you, and it can work for America. I just want to point out that, today, 9 out of 10 Americans who have private insurance get their insurance at work. Eight out of 10 Americans who do not have health insurance are in working families. Therefore, the most conservative, the most practical, the most realistic way to cover all Americans is to say, if people are working, they should be covered at work, and their employers should bear a fair share of that cost, like most employers do. If people are not working, then the Government should figure out how to handle it.

Today, unless you're older, on Medicare, the only people with guaranteed health care in this country are people on welfare. Why should people on welfare have a guarantee that people that are working don't have? There are people all over this country who are on welfare who would quit and go to work, let's say for one of your competitors who doesn't provide health care, and lose health care benefits for their children.

Think of that: "Well, what's your story?" "Oh, I left welfare. I went to work at Food Store X. I don't have health care, but at least I'm working. Now I'm paying taxes so people who didn't go to work and stayed on welfare could get health care." You don't have to be a genius to figure out that doesn't make any sense. It is not fair. It is not right. It is not fair for your competitors to have any price advantage over you because they don't contribute to their employees' health care.

It's also not fair for people whose children are born with an illness or who develop an illness not to ever be able to get health insurance because they were never in a work unit that provided it. There are millions of people like that. So I just wanted to thank you for giving me a chance, through the press, to show America that there are plenty of businesses who support requiring employers to pay their fair share. Plenty of them. And you represent that. And the truth is this country would be a whole lot better off if all the food stores in America did what you do instead of walking away. But unless everybody does it, it's going to be harder and harder and harder for you to do it. That's what Jack said, and it's absolutely right.

Let me say, I just saw Senator Moynihan walk in. Come over here, Senator Moynihan. Senator Moynihan, your Senator, is the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, which has the largest share of responsibility for the health care bill in the United States Senate. And he will tell you that the big battle that we're fighting out there is how to find a way to cover everybody.

You have proved that a retail establishment can cover their employees and make money, that by treating people right you get higher productivity, greater employee loyalty, more production, and in the end, higher profits. But it isn't right unless everybody has to do it.

So I want to ask you as I close, every time you fill up that bag, tell people you mean it. And ask them to call their Member of Congress or write them or drop them a note and say, this is important for America. If we don't now seize this opportunity to give health care security to all of our people, more and more people will start to lose insurance. Another 100,000 Americans a month lose their health insurance permanently. It is not right. We can do this right. It will save us money over the long run. We will be a healthier, stronger, happier, more coherent, more cohesive society if we do this. We have ignored this for 60 years. In 1994 we can do something about it if people like you will let your voices be heard.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:54 a.m. in the Pathmark supermarket at 227 Cherry St. in Manhattan. In his remarks, he referred to Jack Futterman, chairman and chief executive officer of Pathmark, and Doug Dority, international president, United Food and Commercial Workers.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the Association for a Better New York in New York City

May 9, 1994

Thank you very much. Lou, you are certainly richer than I am, but that ain't saying much. [*Laughter*] If only the people who weren't were compelled to stay here and the rest of you could leave, we could hold this meeting in a closet. [*Laughter*]

I am delighted to be here. And I thank Senator Moynihan for coming with me, and I'm glad to see the Members of Congress who are here. I see Representative Maloney and Congressman Schumer, but I have been told that Congressmen Nadler, Towns, King, and Serrano are here. They may not be, but that's what I've been told. If they're not, don't be embarrassed. They've heard this speech before. [*Laughter*] Charles Rangel is on our official delegation, along with the Vice President and Mrs. Gore and the First Lady, to the Inauguration of Nelson Mandela. So that's why he's not here. And I think that my national economic adviser, Bob Rubin, and my Deputy Chief of Staff, Harold Ickes, are also here. I thank them for coming with me. I never like to come to New York alone. [*Laughter*]

Let me say—Lou Rudin has already mentioned this, but unless you had been there, you cannot imagine what an astonishing thing it was that the House of Representatives passed that ban on assault weapons. And if it hadn't been for Charles Schumer lighting that little candle in the darkness when everybody else said it was dead, it was over, there was no chance, we would never have made it. It was an astonishing thing.

It just shows you that democracy can work, that systems can change, that things can change. But you have to work at it, and you have to be willing to fight those battles that don't always end in a landslide. We won by two votes on this one. That's twice the margin we had on the economic plan last year. [*Laughter*] But when these things come up, it's important to take the position, stake it out, and try to change. And there are a lot of wonderful stories; I wish we had time to tell them all today.

I'd also like to say I'm glad to be back before this organization. About 8 years ago, I spoke to ABNY when I was the Governor of Arkansas and I was organizing a group of southern Governors to support the continuing deductibility for State and local income taxes. Remember that? And you had something to do with me coming here.

I remember—I liked that better then, because I was—at home we call that preaching to the saved; everybody agreed with what I was saying. They thought, what is this crazy guy from a little State doing up here taking a position that may be against his own economic interest? I thought it was the right thing to do then in the interest of federalism; I still believe it was the right thing to do. But I remember well that fine day that I had the first opportunity to see this remarkable organization.

Today I want to say a few words about the health care debate in which the Congress is involved and in which many of your Members will play a pivotal role, none more than Senator Moynihan because he's the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. But I'd like to put it in the context of all the other things that are going on.

We're at one of those rare moments in history in which, while we clearly have serious responsibilities around the world, ones that we have to meet in new and different and innovative ways, we also have an opportunity to look at ourselves very clearly and to try to strengthen ourselves from the grassroots as we move toward the next century; one that I think will be an exciting world of more open trade borders and constantly changing economies; one that will, to be sure, still be full of danger and disappointment but one that can give the American people an astonishing amount of opportunity if we do what it takes to play a leading role and to give all of our people a chance to live up to their full potential.

We can only do that, in my judgment, if we find ways of facing our problems and building our bridges to the rest of the world by being faithful to our traditional values and adapting them to the world toward which we are going, by giving our citizens the freedom they need to make the most of the opportunities they'll find, and demanding that all of us take respon-

sibility for our common future by strengthening our families, our education system, and our system of work, and by rewarding the work of citizens by telling people that if they do what it takes to compete and win, they will have a chance to do just that.

We can't allow our people to be helpless in the faces of the changes that are coming, a world in which the average 18-year-old will literally change work seven or eight times. Giving them the confidence and the capacity to embrace those changes is a big part of my job as President as we move toward the end of this century. We've fought hard for an economic strategy that will create a more stable and more prosperous America, beginning with an understanding that the private sector is the engine of wealth creation and job creation.

Last year, the Congress passed, against enormous opposition and the threat of recurrent gridlock, the largest deficit reduction plan in history. We used honest numbers, and Congress and the President didn't argue over whether I had given them unrealistic budget assumptions. We proposed real cuts, and soon, we will cut our deficit in half.

This year or next year, our deficit in America, as a percentage of our annual income will be smaller than any of the other major industrial countries in the world. That is a huge turnaround from the 1980's.

If the Congress adopts the budget before it now, and it's passing at a record rate, 100 Federal programs will be eliminated, 200 others will be cut, and we will have 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry S. Truman was President of the United States. That is one of the reasons, along with the enormous changes which have been made in the private sector in this country, that consumer confidence is up, investment is up, productivity is up, and inflation is down.

Last week, we learned that last month our economy produced over a quarter of a million new jobs and has produced about a million in the first 4 months of this year. Over the last 15 months, the economy has produced about 3 million new jobs, nearly all of them in the private sector, again, a rather marked departure from the experience of the last few years when a very significant percentage of the jobs were created by Government.

Now, we know that there are still a lot of problems. There are still a lot of people who want work, who don't have it. There are still a lot of sections of the country that are lagging behind. But we are moving in the right direction.

Last year, the Congress also, working with me, gave us what most experts said was the most productive first year of the Presidency, either since Lyndon Johnson's first year or Eisenhower's first year, depending on how they count in Washington; I can never quite keep up with it. But anyway, we had a good year. We passed the Family and Medical Leave Act after 7 years of gridlock. We passed the Brady bill after 7 years of gridlock. And it is already beginning to save lives. It is beginning to have an impact.

We dramatically expanded a provision of the Tax Code called the earned-income tax credit, which is designed to lower taxes for working people with children who hover right at or just above the poverty line. It is, in many ways, the biggest incentive we have for people to stay off welfare and stay at work, by saying that the tax system will not tax you into poverty, instead, it will reward your willingness to work.

We have a lot to do in the area of education and training. But already this year the Congress has passed two of the three legs of our comprehensive education program: first, the Goals 2000 bill, which gives us national education standards written into the law of the United States for the first time in the history of the Republic, supported by grassroots reforms and all kinds of incentives to achieve them in our public schools; and the school-to-work legislation, which will begin to establish a network in America of education and training for people who do not wish to go on to 4-year colleges but must have some further training after they leave high school in order to be competitive in the global economy and get good jobs with growing incomes.

Still to be done is changing the unemployment system into a reemployment system. Most of you who are employers pay an unemployment tax for a system that's been out of date for some time now, a system that assumes that when people lose their jobs they're just laid off temporarily and they'll be called back. So the unemployment taxes provide a pool of money to support people at a lower level than their wage but a sustainable level until they are called back. But the truth is most people are not called back to their old jobs today. And so we need to transform this system from an

unemployment system to one that begins immediately to retrain and replace people for new jobs in the economy.

Finally, something that Senator Moynihan has worked on a long time, we have to complete the work of welfare reform. In the end we are going to have to end the system as we know it. We are going to have to say, we'll provide education and training, we'll have a fair Tax Code, we'll have health care coverage for your kids. Once we do all these things, the system itself should come to an end at some point, and people should be provided work opportunities which take precedence over welfare.

One other thing I have to say, since we've all clapped for Congressman Schumer, is the crime bill has not passed yet. It's passed the House and it's passed the Senate, but they haven't agreed on a bill. And it is a very big deal for New York. The crime bill will have another 100,000 police officers. You have already seen in this city the evidence that crime can go down if you have neighborhood policing with real connections to the community. This 100,000 police officers will help to do this. It provides more funds for States for punishment and for alternative forms of punishment and more funds for prevention. And now it will provide the assault weapons ban. But it has not passed yet. And it is very important that we keep up the pressure to get the two sides, the Senate and the House, together to make an agreement, get the bill out quickly, and pass it as quickly as possible so that we can begin to show the benefits to the American people on the streets where they live. All these things are now in progress.

As proud as I am of all this, I have to tell you that it will not be enough to help us to deal with our present problems or seize our future opportunities, in my judgment, unless we deal with the health care situation in America, a crisis that has engulfed millions of people and stories that my wife and I have heard in letters and personal encounters, one that threatens the future stability of the Federal budget, one that threatens these fine teaching institutions you have here in New York and indeed the whole very fabric of our American community.

I wish I could just share with you any number of the unbelievable numbers of letters that I have received from middle class America and sometimes upper middle class Americans who lost their health insurance or who have a child with diabetes or the mother had an early breast cancer or the father had an early stroke, and they've got a preexisting condition and they can never change jobs again, or the number of small businesses who tried so hard to cover their employees, but their premiums went up 35 percent and 40 percent a year.

I can tell you this: This budget I sent to the Congress—to give you an idea of the budget implications of the health care crisis—the budget I sent to the Congress cuts defense quite a lot. I think it cuts it as much as it should, and I hope it won't be cut another dollar right now with the challenges we face in the Pacific and elsewhere. But defense has been brought down dramatically since 1987.

This budget cuts overall discretionary domestic spending for the first time since 1969. We still spend money, more money on Head Start, on education programs, on women's health programs, on medical research, on education and training, and on new technology. Why? Because we eliminate 100 programs and cut 200 others. So we increase spending on the things we should, but overall domestic, discretionary spending is cut in the budget I sent to the Congress, for the first time since 1969. And still, if we adopt this budget in 1996 or '97, the deficit will start to go up again. Why? One reason only: Because health care costs in the Government's programs, Medicaid for poor people, Medicare for the elderly, are going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. So that, by the end of this decade, you will have pared down the defense system as much as it can possibly be pared down, you will have cut domestic spending, in many of our eyes, more than it should be cut, given the level of public investment we need in infrastructure and other things, and we will still have a rising deficit only because the only thing that will be going up in this budget is Medicare and Medicaid.

And at the same time, we find more and more of our finest teaching hospitals having more and more budget problems because people are being forced by their employers into managed care networks, and they're pulling out of more expensive care. And more and more folks are showing up at the door without health care coverage, uncompensated. This system eventually is going to cost everybody.

Now, the institutions of health care in this city, as Senator Moynihan never tires of telling me are the finest in the world. And New York-

ers have set standards for expanding coverage and for returning insurance to what it was meant to be: a fair deal at a fair price. I know that Governor Cuomo, especially, has worked very hard at the State level to control costs by keeping people healthy, not just by treating them when they're sick. A lot of things have been done. But it is clear, I believe, to everyone who studies this problem that until we find a way to provide health care security for all of our people and to ask everyone to bear a fair share of personal responsibility for the cost of health care, we are not going to be able to deal adequately with the institutional problems that we face.

What I have recommended is a system which is the most conservative change I think we can make, building on what we have: asking all employers who do not presently cover their employees or who have very limited coverage to pay a fair share of their employees' health care overage and asking the employees to pay some as well. I think that is a fair thing to do.

I just left one of your distinguished retail operations here, a big food chain headed by Mr. Jack Futterman, who is here. He joined with Doug Dority, the president of the United Food and Commercial Workers, today to advocate our requirement, our proposed requirement, that all employers who don't cover their employees at least made some contribution to their employees' health care and that employees also make some contribution.

If we don't do something to provide universal coverage, if we don't do something to have a system in which everyone has health security, you're going to see more and more and more of the present problems. Today in America, 100,000 employees a month lose their health care coverage for good. Today in America, millions of people, 81 million Americans to be exact, 81 million in a country of 255 million, live in a family where someone has had a preexisting condition. And what that often means is that the person either can't get health insurance or the person is locked into the job they're in because they can never change jobs. Because if you change jobs and go to another job, the new employer won't be able to cover you. This is going to become a bigger problem as big employers downsize and more and more new jobs are created by smaller employers. The structural changes in the American economy are going to accelerate this problem of providing affordable health insurance.

So what are we going to do to change it? Many of the people who are opposed to this say, "Well, you're going to break small business if you require them to pay anything." The truth is most small businesses pay something for health insurance, but their premiums, on average, are 35 percent higher than larger business or Government. They're getting hurt by it.

The truth is, if you have a chain of food stores, like the one I visited today, and they cover their employees, they're at a competitive disadvantage to people who don't. But many do it anyway. And it isn't just the 39 million Americans who don't have health insurance; it's all the other people who are at risk of losing theirs.

If you think about it, very few people in American today have absolute security that they can never lose their health insurance, very few people. You have to either work for Government because you think Government will be there until the end of time and you think you'll always have that job, which may not be predictable because governments are downsizing, too, now, or you have to work for a company that is not only big and strong but one you're convinced will never downsize or at least won't downsize on you.

So this is an issue that affects all Americans. If you believe that everyone should have access to health care coverage, as they do in every other advanced economy except ours, there are only a couple of options. You could do what the Canadians do and say, "We'll have a private health care system, but it will be publicly financed." That's what we do with Medicare in America. We have a payroll tax and we pay for the health care of elderly people, and then they pay something for their health care depending on what they can afford to pay. It seems to me that that was the most dramatic change we could make, because that would actually just basically take all private health insurers out of the system, and it would remove the kind of incentives you have in a country like Germany, for example, where employers and employees have a vested interest in trying to continue to keep up the pressure to hold down health care cost increases.

So I rejected that approach. If you're not going to do it that way through taxes, then people have to pay for it who don't have it now.

And there are two ways you could do that. You can continue the system we have now, where employers and employees share the burden and allow those employers who want to cover it all to do so. Or you could pass a law saying anybody that doesn't have coverage now will have to buy himself or herself, the employees, the so-called individual mandate.

There are several problems with that. Number one, it becomes much more expensive in the subsidies you have to provide the low-wage workers, because employers who aren't providing anything don't have to do anything. Number two, it's like automobile liability insurance, it's harder to enforce, and often you don't find out people don't have coverage until they're sick and they need it. And number three, it would leave an enormous incentive, if widely applied throughout the society, for employers who are providing coverage to their employees now, to dump the coverage.

So it seems to me again the responsible thing to do is to extend the system that we have now. Nine out of 10 Americans and 8 out of 10 people in New York with private health insurance have it through their workplace. Eight out of 10 Americans who don't have any insurance have someone in their family who works. Therefore, it seems to me the logical, the most prudent, and the easiest and most easily understood way to cover everybody is to extend these benefits in the workplace and to provide two things to small businesses and self-employed people. One is a system of discounts so they can afford to buy decent coverage. And two is a system in which they can become part of a buying pool so that small businesses and individuals can buy on the same favorable terms that big business and Government can. That is quite simply what we try to do.

Now, we believe if we go to this sort of system and then provide for people to be in big buying groups where they can compete for health care, billions of dollars will be saved just by the end of the decade, that we will not continue to see costs go up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, and that the savings will be broadly and fairly shared. Today, you know, medical inflation has gone down in the last year as it almost always does when we seriously considered reforming health care. But the benefits have flowed disproportionately to those who have access to big, managed care networks and not to those who do not.

So I will say again, it seems to me that this is an issue, for human reasons, for economic reasons, for reasons of our ability to manage the Federal Government's budget, has to be addressed and ought to be addressed this year. This is a thing that is going against the whole thing we want to do in America, which is to promote labor mobility by freezing tens of millions of people in the jobs they're in because of the health care problems of their families.

The system we have now clearly discriminates against small business, when small business is the energy behind most job growth in America. And the system clearly discriminates against you if you're responsible and you provide health care, because of the billions of dollars in cost-shifting. The system is also causing serious problems now or in the future for the great academic health centers of our country, including those here in New York.

For 60 years, Presidents and Congress have grappled with this problem. Richard Nixon proposed an employer requirement to cover health insurance in the early seventies, sponsored by Senator Packwood from Oregon, who is still in the Congress. We have debated this over and over and over again. What is the difference today? The difference today is, any number of medical associations have come out for what we're trying to do. Hundreds of small businesses have stood up against the relentless lobbying of the NFIB against the employer requirement, rooted in part in the fact that the NFIB has a lot of independent insurance agents who are obviously vested in the system we have now.

We have a lot of big business, even retailers, who are now saying the time has come for all Americans to have health care security. It's the only way to control health care costs. It's the only way to have genuine competition. It is the only way to guarantee labor mobility. It is the only way to reward work over welfare.

Just consider this—I'll say this in closing. Senator Moynihan's worked on this welfare issue all these years. Consider this: If you are a person on welfare and you are a person with a limited education and you take a job, chances are you'll get a job at a very modest wage, often in a company that doesn't have health insurance. Then you can begin working, drawing an income, and paying taxes to go to pay for the health care of people who didn't make the decision you did, instead, who stayed on welfare.

That is the system we have in America today: Go to work, lose your health care benefits; stay on welfare, keep them; go to work, pay taxes for the people who didn't make the decision you did. That is just one of the incongruities. The only way to fix it, ever, is to provide health care security for all of our people. Every other advanced country in the world does it, and we ought to do it now.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President left the room briefly to meet with Vina Drennan, widow of Fire Capt. John Drennan, Jr., who died in the line of duty. After Lou Rudin, president, Association for a Better New York, invited participants to ask questions, the New York State comptroller asked the President how the health care plan would relieve State and local governments of the burden of Medicaid.*]

The President. Well, they will do one thing for sure and another thing, maybe. And let me try to be explicit about that. There are—in New York, as nearly as I can tell—I've studied these figures over the last several years for your State; this year I think the Medicaid budget went up something like 15 percent. If our plan passes and Medicaid is folded into the health care system generally—that is, people on Medicaid will go into large purchasing groups, along with folks from small businesses and medium-sized businesses and others, and the working poor, many of whom get Medicaid supplements in this State and others—that's quite a large part of your burden—will be paid for in a completely different way, that is, employers, employees in a Federal discount, then the rate of increase in Medicaid costs will be dramatically less than it is now. So over the next 4 or 5 years you will save quite a lot of money.

In addition to that, the hospitals here who have large Medicaid burdens will be better off because the Medicaid population will be in with the whole population, and the reimbursement rate will be the same for everybody. So that will take a significant burden off the hospitals with high Medicaid costs here.

Now, the other big issue in New York has been, is it fair for New York to have a 50–50 match when Mississippi gets an 80–20 match? Maybe New York should pay more than Mississippi because there are more wealthy people here. But there is also a huge poor population here. In other words, is it fair to have this match rate based overwhelmingly on the, essentially, the average income of a State, the per capita income? We have a commission that is meeting on that, which is supposed to make a report to us in, I think, 1995, next year, about how to change it. There's no question that the formula should be changed and that States like New York with high per capita incomes but huge numbers of poor people are not treated quite fairly under a formula that only deals with per capita income. And that's going to happen next year.

But we reasoned, and I think properly so, that in order to pass a change in a formula like that, we needed to have an adequate study, we needed to have an alternative, and we needed not to mix it up in the whole question of providing health care coverage for all Americans, which we're having a hard enough time passing as it is.

So we put in this system to review it, come back in '95 and deal with it. So I think that that will also happen. I think you will get some relief there. But just passing the bill will save you a ton of money on Medicaid over the next 5 years.

[*A city councilman asked about provisions to help cities deal with the health care needs of illegal aliens.*]

The President. Well, as you know, presently, basically undocumented aliens often just become—their health care bills often become the burden for the States of the localities. What we propose to do is not to give undocumented aliens health care security cards, because if we did that we would basically be further rewarding people who get around our immigration laws, but to continue to handle them through the public health units that now do it, while providing a direct funding strain for the public health units to deal with the alien health care costs.

There will be a big debate in the Congress, and one of the things Senator Moynihan and the others who have jurisdiction over this in the committees will have to hash through is exactly how much money should be in the fund for undocumented aliens to go to public health units in New York, in Florida, in California, New Jersey, the States with big burdens.

But under our plan, at least, there is a special fund which recognizes that we are not doing enough to help the States deal with the burden of health care for undocumented aliens.

Q. Mr. President, my name is Joe Califano. Delighted to have you here, Mr. President.

The President. Also, I should say for Joe, we also have comprehensive drug treatment as part of the package of benefits.

Q. That's what I was about to ask you. New York City has one of the toughest substance abuse problems in the country, and what does your bill do for substance abuse?

The President. I think, Joe, I should make two points. One is that our bill, as it's presently written—and this is, again, a big problem for the Congress to deal with, but we thought that one of the reasons our bill is somewhat longer than some of the other bills is that we deal with a lot of other things other folks don't. What's going to happen to the academic health care centers, what's going to happen to the undocumented aliens—all of those things that have been—we believe that there should be a package of benefits which includes primary and preventive benefits and which includes comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse treatment in the benefits. And we believe it will save this society a fortune over the long run. And one of the real hard decisions that Congress will have to make and that we will have to deal with is whether we should continue to be a nation that closes the barn door after the cow's out.

You should know—and I didn't get into all this in my speech with you—but our bill is heavily weighted towards primary and preventive health care: mammographies for women whenever the doctor thinks it's appropriate and free from age 50 on—and just things like that, and comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse treatment benefits and any number of other primary preventive care treatment. So that's covered in the basic benefit package.

In addition to that, in this year's budget there is a 12 percent increase in funds for drug education and treatment, even though we're cutting overall spending. And in the crime bill there is a huge increase for drug and alcohol abuse treatment for people who are incarcerated or who can avoid incarceration if one of the conditions of avoidance is being in a treatment program.

Q. For those that don't know, Joe Califano was former Secretary of HEW a few years ago. Joe, thank you.

The President. He's also the head of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, which is why I knew the answer to the question before he asked it. [*Laughter*]

[*A participant asked about health care quality and academic health care centers.*]

The President. This is a rather complex issue, but I'd like to talk about it in a little bit of detail, because it's so terribly important to New York, if I might. The academic health centers today are mostly, by accident of history, located in large cities. They treat, as part of their ongoing teaching functions, huge numbers of poor people. They also, historically, have treated huge numbers of professionals and others who have wanted to come to them because of the high quality of their care.

They are now getting it coming and going, for the following reasons: The more poverty concentrates in areas where academic health care centers are, the more people they have to treat who basically have no compensation for their care. So that hurts them financially. And then, as you just heard, the more people—more employers put their employees in managed care networks, the more likely those networks are then, the people making those choices, to choose the lowest cost health care option available, which may steer income, again, and opportunity away from the academic health care centers, ultimately undermining quality, ultimately undermining the ability of the United States to train, educate, and provide the finest doctors in the world, as well as ongoing medical research.

This is a huge deal, much bigger than it would appear at the moment. It goes way beyond the number of patients who stream in and out of Sloan-Kettering every year because it has implications for the entire United States and the whole quality and fabric of our health care system.

We seek to do two things in our bill which I think would help. One is, while I strongly support the whole concept of managed competition and managed care, I believe that we should leave more choices, and I think economically we can leave more choices with the employees or the patients, if you will. So under our plan, each health alliance would have to offer every employee at least three choices, although we think that employees—people will be offered more choices. Under the Federal employee health insurance plan, for example, which is a pretty good model, we have probably more than

20 choices. But you would have a range of choices so that it wouldn't be the employer's decision alone. The employer's contribution would be constant, no matter what. The employer wouldn't have to pay more.

But the employee would have the option, at least to enroll in a fee-for-service medicine or enroll in a Sloan-Kettering plan, for example, even if it were a little more expensive, because you could get a wider range of doctors or higher quality or whatever. So we'd have more choices there.

The second thing that we do is to try to provide for a direct fund to the academic health centers in recognition of the fact that you won't get the—there won't be a Medicare disproportion of share payment anymore because everybody will be covered. There's going to have to be a direct fund. And it's sort of like the question this gentlemen asked about undocumented aliens.

There will be a big argument about how much money should be in the fund, but plainly the United States has been supporting academic health care centers directly through medical education subsidies but indirectly through this undocumented—this Medicaid disproportion of share payment. And the time has come for us as a people, I think, to directly support the academic health care centers.

And what I would just say to you, sir, I met with all your counterparts in the Boston area not very long ago, and I told them the same thing. We need to go into the Congress, work this out, figure out what the financial requirements are, and do it.

The American people pay 40 percent more of their income for health care than any other people on Earth. A lot of it is due to the inefficiencies of the system. A part, a small part, is due to the excellence with which we educate doctors. And I think every American is willing to pay it, and we ought to pay it directly. And so I think if we do it right, this health care bill will make your existence more secure in the years ahead.

And the one thing I think you would agree with, if we don't do anything your condition will grow more perilous. So we have to do something, and the right thing to do is to have a direct support mechanism for the academic health care centers.

[*A participant asked about people's fear of having to give up a familiar doctor for one chosen by an insurance company.*]

Q. Mr. President, I just want to tell you that his father and his grandfather come from Texarkana. [*Laughter*]

The President. Is that right? No wonder you asked such a good question. [*Laughter*] That's a good question. Give him a hand. He asked a good question—[*applause*].

If the health care plan is not passed, more and more people will give up their doctor. And let me explain why. Most people who have health insurance, as I said, are insured through their place of work. The employers normally choose what health care plan covers the employees. More and more employers are choosing so-called managed care plans, where you make—basically you agree to pay a group of doctors and other medical professionals a flat rate, and they provide all the care they agree to provide during the course of a year.

If you switch from a plan where all the employees just pick their doctor and their hospital to a managed care plan and if that managed care plan only permits the doctors, the hospitals, and the other medical providers to provide care who are enrolled in the plan, then obviously a lot of employees will have to be forced to change. That is happening today.

Today, a little more than half of the American people who are insured at work are insured by plans that give them no choice. We're already at a little more than half. Now, the plan—so that's where we are now. And that trend is growing rapidly as employers try to control health care costs.

Under our plan, at least every person would have access to three different types of plans: let's say a managed care plan, like the one we described, where you might have to give up your doctor but it would be lower cost; a professional organization where a few hundred doctors get together and offer health care; or continuing a fee for service medicine, continuing the old plan you've got, where you'd have to pay a little more, but at least your employer would still make the same contribution and you could pick your own doctor.

So we're trying to do our best to get the benefits of managed care and the cost controls inherent in it, the market controls, and still give people some choices of their doctors. And as

I said, the law requires three different types of plans, but if you look at not only the Federal health plan—California just had a small business buyers co-op that's a lot like what we're trying to set up, where they had 2,300 small businesses with 40,000 employees go in and buy insurance together. And everybody says this is a Government plan; we're just trying to do this for everybody. The State of California hired 13 people to run this plan. And they were able to lower the cost of all the businesses and employees involved and to offer them 15 different choices by simply pooling them together. That's what I want to do.

I want to try to get the benefits of competition but to leave the choice of physician up to the people themselves. And I think that this is the best way to do it. If we do it, it will encourage all these plans to let all doctors provide services who will do it at the right price. That's what I want to do.

The fair thing to do is to say, okay, we'll provide these services, we'll manage this plan, we'll provide these services if you'll pay this amount. Then any doctor who's willing to do it for that price, in my judgment, ought to be able to do it.

[*A participant asked about medical care for children in urban areas.*]

The President. Thank you. You raise an issue which I think is important to emphasize here, because it will be an issue in New York, and in a different way it's an issue where I come from.

There are two different questions here. One is, have you covered people for the services they need at the time they need it? The second is, even if people have coverage, do they have access? For example, you've got a lot of people living in this city whose first language is not English who are citizens. If we pass this health care plan, how are they to know what their benefits are and how they access them? And how are we going to do that? That's a significant educational problem.

In rural America, one of the things our bill does that I'm very proud of is provide significant incentives for National Health Service Corps doctors. We're going to increase by fivefold the number of those doctors going into rural areas and underserved inner-city areas to get health care out there to people where it exists.

But I am convinced that a lot of our children who come from such difficult family circumstances are going to have to continue to get health care information and some basic health care services in the schools. That's why I've always been a strong supporter of the school-based health clinics. I know that they've become emotionally charged around the whole issue of teen pregnancy, but quite apart from that—you know, when I was a kid, we got our ear tests, we got our shots, we got a lot of things in the schools that don't happen very often any more. So a lot of these services, if you want access to be there, in my judgment, are going to have to be provided either in or quite near schools if we're going to reach these children as we should.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President was presented with a gift.*]

The President. I want to say one thing: As an ardent basketball fan, Lou made one minor error when he compared the victory of Schumer with the assault weapons with the victory of the Knicks over the Bulls. And it's very important for health care, so I'm going to leave you with this: The Knicks overcame a 15-point deficit and beat the Bulls with fabulous defense. Schumer passed the assault weapons ban by playing offense. We cannot pass health care unless we play offense, and that means people like you have to tell the Members of Congress it's okay for them to play offense and solve this problem.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:07 p.m. in the Trianon Ballroom at the New York Hilton.

Exchange With Reporters During a Meeting With Health Care Letter Writers in New York City

May 9, 1994

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, Lawton Chiles is worried that your new refugee policy is going to put an undue burden on his State. Is there anything you can say to allay his concerns?

The President. Yes, I've already talked to him. We had a long talk about it. He just wants to make sure we don't start it until we have the capacity to implement it, which is what I said yesterday.

Q. Are you going to seek prior congressional authorization before you would consider sending troops to Haiti?

The President. I don't have anything further to say. I'm not going to discuss that option until it becomes appropriate.

Press Secretary Myers. Thank you.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, what did you gain by just meeting these people just now? Some insight into the average American's mind on health care?

The President. Well, these are—we received three letters from people who are here who either can't get health insurance or lost it, or people who think they have to stop caring for their children to go to work. There are all kinds of—the people who wrote me these letters—maybe I should let them speak for themselves—are often lost in the debate in Washington. Millions and millions of people whose hopes and whose whole lives are riding on the outcome of this health care debate are almost exclusively unorganized. They very often represent far more people than the people who have organized who are lobbying Congress, who are saying one thing or another about this health care bill. But they're in every community; they're in every work force; they're in every kind of situation.

Why don't we just—I don't know if you've met them already, but—did you introduce yourself to everybody here? Tell them who you are and what you do.

Sally Gorsline. I'm Sally Gorsline. I'm from Kingston, New York.

The President. And——

Ms. Gorsline. I had an illness, and I went bankrupt because I didn't have health insurance.

The President. And your friends came with you, right?

Ms. Gorsline. This is my daughter, Stephanie, and my future son-in-law, Bill.

The President. Who also has no health insurance.

Cathy Rosen. My name is Cathy Rosen. I'm from New Rochelle, New York. And I had coverage, but my boss went out of business, and I wound up taking up another job. And I have no insurance coverage right now. And I have a condition that warrants it, that needs health insurance coverage, but I don't have it, and it's potentially life-threatening. And this is my girlfriend, Ellen, who came with me.

The President. And you've now been seeing who?

Ms. Rosen. No, I'm not. I can't get treatment. I can't even find out what the possibilities are because I have no health coverage. And I just can't afford it.

Anita Lampert. My name is Anita Lampert. This is my husband, Steven, and my son, Cameron, who's getting very restless. My husband is self-employed. And so I wrote a letter discussing the problems of a self-employed individual, like probably a lot of you, photographers, freelance artists, plumbers, architects, anybody who's self-employed, and the problem with rates being so high. If you don't work for a big corporation, it's very hard to get insurance at affordable rates. And when you have a child that comes into your life, health insurance is very, very important.

The President. They might not be organized, but there are tens of millions of them. And we've already received—Hillary and I have received a million letters. We're just trying to give voice to them.

So in addition to all the economic arguments and all the substantive arguments I made in there in the speech, the real compelling case for health care reform is with these folks here.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:10 p.m. in the Mercury Ballroom at the New York Hilton. In his remarks, the President referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the Community in Warwick, Rhode Island
May 9, 1994

The President. Thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you, Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, Governor Sundlun. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for such a wonderful welcome. It's good to be back in Rhode Island and to see so many of you here.

Governor Sundlun thanked me for our quick approval of Rhode Island's plan to extend health care to pregnant women and to young children. I thank him and the people of Rhode Island for putting this plan together. Our administration has granted more initiatives for more States than any in history, but few as good as the one from Rhode Island to try to help the health care of your little children. And I congratulate you on that.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Pell for his leadership of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and his work with me on some of the most difficult issues of our time. In the last year, we have succeeded in opening up the United States in trade areas, investment areas, in ways that were literally not even thought of just a little while ago.

We also have continued our work to make the world safer. When I became President there were four countries in the former Soviet Union with nuclear weapons. Now three have agreed to give them up and are giving them up. And the nuclear arsenal in Russia is no longer pointed at the United States, nor are our missiles pointed at them. I thank Senator Pell for his support of that.

Finally, I want to thank your Congressman for his leadership in the Goals 2000 legislation that I signed a few weeks ago, which establishes national standards for our public schools and supports grassroots reforms to achieve those standards for the first time in American history, and for his courage in leading the United States House of Representatives to vote to ban the 19 serious assault weapons that are used for killing people on our streets.

I want to thank your Lieutenant Governor, your State treasurer, your attorney general, the State Democratic chairman, and the mayor of Providence, Lincoln Chafee, all of them for being here today. What?

Gov. Bruce Sundlun. The mayor of Warwick.

The President. The mayor of Warwick, I'm sorry.

Governor Sundlun. He's John Chafee's son.

The President. Yes, the Governor says he's John Chafee's son, I know that. And I want to thank John Chafee for having a health care bill that covers all Americans. I'm going to work with them, and we're going to have a bipartisan health care reform this year if I can possibly get it done.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ran for President because I wanted to change the country, working with you, because I wanted it moved beyond the politics of gridlock in Washington, all the partisan rhetoric, all the arguing over left and right, all the politics of delay and distraction and destruction, to try to move this country forward again and pull our country together again. I thought we could do it with three simple words: a commitment to opportunity for all Americans, an insistence on responsibility from all Americans, and a belief that we were one community, that we are all in this together. I thought we could do it by rebuilding the value of work and the strength of our families, by pulling together at the national level and at the grassroots. And we have made a good beginning.

Last year, in a very tough fight, the United States Congress had the courage to pass our economic program which brought down the deficit, kept interest rates down, got investments up. I'm happy to report that in the first 4 months of this year, we've seen a million new jobs come into this economy, 3 million in all in the first 15 months of this administration; 8 thousand new jobs in Rhode Island, the first job growth in 4 years in this State. We are

well on our way to meeting our goal of 8 million jobs in this 4-year period.

We also, if the Congress passes the budget I have presented this year, will not only increase funding for education, training, technology, and medical research, we will reduce overall domestic spending and defense spending for the first time since 1969. And we will have 3 years of reduction in the deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President. No more rhetoric; action for the American people.

Our administration is breaking new ground in education. We've reformed the college loan program to lower interest rates and to improve the repayment schedule for our young people. We passed the bill to have national standards for schools. We passed a bill to set up a network in every State in the country for the young people who graduate from high school who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need further education and training. And we are going to reform the unemployment system in this country to make it a reemployment system. And we're going to change the welfare system to end welfare as we know it. We can do these things if we keep working ahead.

I'm proud of the work our administration has done to strengthen the American families that are out there struggling to make ends meet and raise their children, with the Family and Medical Leave Act, with an earned-income tax credit increase in this year's tax year which will dramatically enable more and more working people on modest wages to stay out of poverty, to stay off welfare by cutting their taxes. One in six working families in America will be eligible for a reduction in income taxes this year, so they can support their children and be successful workers at the same time. That is the kind of thing we ought to be doing in this country.

Finally, let me say we are trying to rebuild the bonds of the American community in many ways but with two great initiatives. The first one you can see by the signs over here: the national service program. Ladies and gentlemen, this fall when school starts, 20,000 young Americans will be eligible to earn money for furthering their education after high school by working at the grassroots level in their communities in programs to solve the problems of America at the grassroots. National service will sweep America. The year after next, we will have 100,000 young Americans earning money on their education, solving the problems of America at the grassroots level.

The other thing we're trying to do, which will be done in a few weeks, to strengthen our American communities is to pass the most sweeping, most effective, most comprehensive crime bill in the history of the United States: 100,000 more police officers for our streets; innovative forms of punishment; real funds for prevention to help our young people avoid crime, to have something to say yes to as well as something to say no to; and finally, after that tough battle, finally a ban on those assault weapons which are meant to kill people, not go hunting with.

My fellow Americans, we are changing the landscape in America by moving beyond rhetoric to reality in dealing with the real problems and the real opportunities of the real people in this country. But we will never do what we need to do to rebuild community, to support family, to have a responsible budget, and to build a responsible future until we guarantee health care security to all the American people.

We are spending 40 percent more on health care than any other country in the world. We are the only advanced country in the world that does not cover all of its citizens. We have 100,000 Americans a month losing their health insurance for good. We have 58 million Americans in any given year who don't have health insurance part of the year. We have 81 million Americans who live in families where there is a child with diabetes, a mother with premature cancer, a father with an early heart condition, and they can never get health insurance or they pay more than they can afford or they can never change their jobs because of the cursed preexisting conditions which are paralyzing family life for tens of millions of Americans. Three quarters of American people have health insurance policies that have lifetime limits so that if anything should happen to them or their children, when they need it most they might lose their coverage.

Small businesses pay 35 to 40 percent more for their health insurance premiums than those of us insured by Government or big business. My fellow Americans, no one can justify an administrative system which costs tens of billions of dollars in sheer paperwork, more than any other system in the world. Why? Because we are the only country in the world that has, in spite of the best doctors, the best nurses, the best health care, the best research, and the best

technology, 1,500 separate companies writing thousands and thousands and thousands of policies on little bitty groups and employing hundreds of thousands of people in doctors' offices and hospitals and insurance companies to see who is not covered and what is not covered. We are spending billions of dollars to figure out how not to provide health care to our people, when we ought to be covering all Americans. If other countries can do it, the United States can do it as well.

Our goal is simple. By the end of the year, I expect to sign a law that guarantees Americans, every American, private health insurance that can never be taken away.

My wife and I have received about a million letters from people all over the country. They're people just like those of you in this audience. They may be some of you in this audience. Most of them aren't organized in any way, so they can't make their voices heard in Washington. But they're out there in every community and every workplace. I received a letter from Anthony Catuto and his wife, a young disabled couple whose Medicare coverage doesn't pay for the prescription drugs they need. They come from Rhode Island, and they just met me on the tarmac. They deserve the ability to take care of their children. I just met, out there on the tarmac, a relatively new resident of Rhode Island, Anne Hood, and her wonderful child. She was a self-employed writer from New York. And when she and her husband moved to Providence and had a baby, her insurance company dropped her coverage without even letting her know.

Let me tell you, let me tell you—I'm going to wait for the plane to go by. [*Laughter*] I just met three people in New York who had written me these letters. One of them, no health insurance for their child; another with a dangerous medical diagnosis, not pursuing the diagnosis even though it could be a life-threatening illness because they had no health insurance.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day. I met a wonderful woman who ran a delicatessen with 20 part-time employees and 20 full-time employees. And she said, "I am the embodiment of everything that is not right with this system, and I have a good insurance person who's done a good job of giving me the most inexpensive insurance they can get. I had cancer 5 years ago. I insure my full-time employees. We pay way too much in our deductibles, and our copays are too high. I cannot afford to insure my part-time employees. I feel guilty that I don't insure my part-time employees, and I'm mad that none of my competitors insure their full-time employees. I'm paying for them as well as for my own." We can do better.

Hundreds and hundreds of business people have told me that sort of thing. Today in New York, I was in the 10th largest retail grocery chain in the United States of America, and every one of their employees has comprehensive health benefits. And they said, "If we can do it, why can't all the other people in our business?" That's the kind of attitude we need in this country, people taking responsibility for themselves, their employees, and their future.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not going to be easy. Six Presidents have tried over 60 years to solve the health care crisis in America, and we have not done it. But this year we can do it with the same kind of courage that finally turned the deficit around, with the same kind of courage in the Congress that finally took on the interest groups for the assault weapons ban, with the same kind of courage that broke a 7-year deadlock for family and medical leave, a 7-year deadlock for the Brady bill, a 5-year deadlock on this crime bill. Let's do it in one year for health care and finally put this issue behind us.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:55 p.m. at the T.F. Green Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gov. Robert Weygand; Jeffrey Pine, State attorney general; Nancy Mayer, State secretary of the treasury; and Guy Dufault, Rhode Island Democratic State chairman.

Remarks in a Town Meeting in Cranston, Rhode Island
May 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. First, thank you, Doug and Ginger, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming. And I want to thank the people in New Haven and Springfield.

We only have an hour tonight; we're not going to have any breaks. So I'm going to give a very brief opening statement about the problems presented by our health care system in America today and briefly what we propose to do about it.

There is a crisis in health care. During any given time in the year there will be a total of 58 million Americans without any health insurance. There are 81 million Americans—out of a population of 255 million—in families with preexisting conditions, that is, someone in the family has been ill, which means they either don't have insurance, they pay much more for their insurance, or they can never change their jobs because they would lose insurance if they changed jobs. It's a huge problem.

One hundred and thirty-three million Americans, or three out of four Americans with private health insurance, have insurance policies with lifetime limits, which means they can outrun their limits if they have someone in their family really sick. In addition to that, the costs of the Government health program, Medicare and Medicaid, are going up at roughly 3 times the rate of inflation and threaten to undermine all of our efforts to bring the deficit down. It's a very serious problem.

And one more thing, even though we have this many people, 58 million, who are without insurance, our country spends a higher percentage of its income on health care, 40 percent more, than any other country in the world. Yet we are the only major country that hasn't been able to figure out how to give insurance to everybody.

If we want to cover everyone, if we believe everybody should have health insurance, you either have to have a Government-funded program, that is, Medicare is a Government-funded program or a program like the Canadians have, or you have to guarantee private insurance to everybody. There aren't any other options.

I favor a program of guaranteed private insurance to the employed uninsured because that's what we have for most everybody else. Nine out of ten people in this country with private insurance are insured through the workplace. Eight out of ten Americans without insurance are in a family with at least one worker. So I favor guaranteed private insurance with good benefits—including primary and preventive care and mental health benefits and alcohol and drug abuse benefits, because all these things will save us money over the long run—no lifetime limits, and insurance that can't be taken away.

Under our plan, we would preserve the choice of physicians, something that is rapidly disappearing today with the growth of managed-care networks. More and more people are losing the right to choose their doctors, actually being forced to give up their family doctors and go to someone else. So under our plan, every American every year would have the opportunity to choose from at least three different plans in which they choose the doctor, choose a high-quality plan. Employers wouldn't pick the plan, the employees would. And insurance companies couldn't deny anybody coverage.

To deal with the problems I mentioned up at the beginning of this talk, it would be illegal to drop coverage or cut benefits, increase rates for people who had someone in their family who'd been sick, use lifetime limits to cut off benefits, or charge older workers more than younger ones. I hope we'll get to talk about that more in a minute. Some younger workers are upset about that, but I'm convinced it's the right choice for our country. And I hope we get a chance to talk about it.

Our plan would preserve Medicare as it is but would add to Medicare prescription drug benefits and phase in long-term care benefits. I think that's quite important because a lot of people on Medicare don't get the drugs they need, with the result that hospitalizations are more frequent and the program actually costs more and keeps people less healthy than would be the case otherwise.

I favor guaranteeing these health benefits at work, with employers and employees bearing a portion of the contribution, in more or less the

ratio they do with major companies today but with discounts to small businesses who couldn't afford it otherwise. And the Government would help with the unemployed.

The last chart I turned over is just a summary of what I said. [*Laughter*]

So that's how the program would work: universal guaranteed private insurance; maintain the choice of doctors; leave Medicare the way it is; require employers and employees who don't cover now to take up their own coverage, but provide discounts for small businesses; the Government would have a pool to pay for the discounts and to cover the unemployed, uninsured; add prescription drugs; and phase in a long-term care benefit for the elderly people on Medicare and for the disabled, which I think is quite important.

Now, I hope we can flesh it out, but I don't want to talk anymore. Let's go to questions.

Health Care Reform

[*At this point, moderator Doug White introduced the first participant, who asked if the new health care plan could focus only on people currently uninsured and if health care professionals could donate one percent of their time to provide care to that group.*]

The President. Let me try to answer your first question and then your second question. First of all, somewhere around 15 percent are not insured. But the problem is more serious than that in two ways. A whole lot of people, principally folks who work for smaller business, have very limited insurance, that is, very high deductibles or copays or limited benefits. And an enormous number of people are at risk of losing their insurance, so that we are actually adding to the pool of permanently uninsured people about 100,000 people a month.

Therefore, we are going to leave a lot of people alone. There will be a lot of people, for example, who will keep the same benefits that they have. If they have the same or better benefits or their employers pay the same or bigger contribution, they'll be left alone. And that's a huge number of people. So there will be an awful lot of people that won't be affected by that in that sense.

But we have to set up a system that stops this hemorrhaging and gives small businesses and self-employed people the right to buy insurance on the same terms that big business and Government can. So I think that's an answer to that.

With regard to your other question, the truth is that most doctors and hospitals contribute far more than one percent of their time and earnings now because when people don't have insurance, they do eventually get health care. But they get it when they're too sick and they show up at the emergency room; they get wildly expensive care. And then they either absorb it, that is, the doctors, the nurses, the hospitals either eat it, or they pass it along to all the rest of you, so you wind up paying more than you otherwise would for your own health care because others don't do it.

But I think that basically, we are going to leave as many people alone as we can while trying to minimize the chance that anyone can ever lose their insurance again.

[*A participant with an artificial limb asked if she would receive the same quality care under the plan, even if she happened to lose her job.*]

The President. First of all, this health care plan will not take away from you any benefit you now have.

Q. Okay.

The President. So if you keep working for the State and you have this option, you can keep it. Secondly—they say I don't have the microphone high enough. Usually they tell me not to hold it so high. [*Laughter*] The second thing is, the choice you have of your provider is something we are trying to protect. I know that's a hot issue in one of your political races here. What I want to say to you is that more and more and more Americans are losing their right to choose their doctors right now, as employers decide on managed care plans to hold down costs. A lot of people who work for these employers are having to move into the managed care plan, and their doctors are not enrolled in the plan, or their suppliers, and so they lose their choice.

Under our plan, even if you change jobs—so you went to work, let's say, for a small business—every year, you would have the right every year to choose from a minimum of three plans, one of which would guarantee you the right to choose any provider you wanted. You might have to pay a little bit more for it than you would otherwise pay, but you would always have that right, and your employer would always

have to make a major contribution to your health care.

Q. Maybe I'll move to the White House next. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you. It would suit me just fine. I'd like to have somebody like you working for me.

Anticrime Efforts

[*A student asked about guns and drugs in schools.*]

The President. Thank you very much for your question. First, let me say, this young man has asked maybe the most important question in America today, but he's also asked a health care question. So I'll give you one line on the health care implications of this and come back and answer his question.

Why is it a health care question? Because one reason we pay more for health care than any other country is we have more kids getting shot and cut up and showing up at the emergency room, imposing enormous costs on this system. We have the highest rate of childhood violence and killing of any of the major countries in the world. It's a big issue.

Here's what we're doing. We are in the process of passing a crime bill which will do the following things, and it should be passed, now, in a few weeks: First, it will ban 19 assault weapons, the purpose of which is only to kill people, not to hunt. Second, it will make it illegal for minors to own or possess handguns, except under the supervision of an approved adult for an approved purpose. Third, it will provide funds to schools that have high levels of violence to set up things like metal detectors and do other things to make children more secure in the schools. The fourth thing it will do, and this is where you come in—you asked your question. The fourth thing it will do is to provide funds to schools and States throughout the country to teach young people ways to resolve their differences and deal with their anger and their frustration, short of resorting to violence. Because a lot of our kids are growing up in troubled families, are not taught how to do this. And a lot of young people don't think about the future, they just lash out and hurt people.

So all these things are in this crime bill. I think they're very, very important. We're also going to provide for more police officers on our street who can work with young people, work in the schools and go into schools and do things like the D.A.R.E. program, the drug education programs to try to keep drugs out of the schools. But I think all of these things will really make a difference.

Now, what can you do about it? We can pass all these programs, and unless every school in this country has committed young people and committed parents trying to keep the drugs out and the violence out and the guns out, it's going to be hard for us to succeed. So we're going to give you the tools to do it, and then you have to organize, school by school, to get it done. I'll do my part, and I want you to do yours.

Doug White. Do you think you can remember all that? [*Laughter*]

The President. Sure you can.

Q. I think so.

The President. Get the assault weapons off, take the handguns away from the kids, metal detectors and other security devices at schools, teach kids nonviolent ways to resolve their differences, and organize every school.

Education

[*Moderator Ginger Casey introduced a participant in New Haven, CT, who asked about racial balance in schools.*]

The President. Well, I think that racially balanced schools or racially diverse schools are good for the students. And in terms of how that is done, that's really a question to be resolved on a State-by-State basis. But one of the things we have tried to do at the national level is to change the school funding formula for Federal aid so that we give relatively more money to the schools that have a larger number of low-income children. And very often that means a more racially diverse population. That is about all we can do at the national level, besides enforcing the civil rights laws, which I intend to do very vigorously.

But I think in every State, since we live in a country that is so multiracial and multicultural, it is better if children go to school with people of all different racial and ethnic backgrounds. And I think we should support that so we can learn to live together and work together.

Anticrime Efforts

[*A participant from Salem, CT, suggested criminal control rather than gun control.*]

The President. Well, we already have the highest percentage of people in prison of any country in the world. And our crime bill gives more money to the States to build even more prisons. It also stiffens penalties. It has a "three strikes and you're out" provision to deal with people who are very dangerous but are fortunate enough to commit crimes where their victims aren't hurt so bad. If they do three violent crimes in a row, they'd still be getting a life sentence, ineligible for parole under Federal law. I favor tougher punishment, and I favor keeping serious criminals in prison longer. But you have to do other things as well.

There is no question that one of the reasons we have a higher death rate is, in the last several years, if you just look at it, is the average victim of a gunshot incident today outside the home has more bullets in him or her than was the case 10 or 15 years ago. And that's why I think we did the right thing to go after the assault weapon. But I also believe we should have tougher punishment and focus that punishment on the serious repeat offenders.

Health Care Reform

[*A participant asked if inner-city hospitals would be adequately compensated under the new plan.*]

The President. The short answer, Sister, is yes. And that's one of the reasons that the Catholic hospital network has been so supportive of what we have been trying to do and has worked very closely with my wife and with me as we've tried to put this program together.

But let me explain precisely what the issue is. There are an awful lot of people who are uninsured or underinsured in the inner cities. Under our program, every person who comes through your doors will be a source of reimbursement, that is, you will get reimbursed for the care you give. And it will make a huge difference in time to help keep some of our inner-city hospitals open, many of which have been closing at an alarming rate, leaving nothing left.

It's gotten to the point where some of our inner-city areas, there's almost the same access-to-health-care problem that you have in rural parts of my State or in the High Plains in the country.

Juvenile Offenders

[*Mr. White discussed the impending release of a juvenile murderer in Rhode Island on his 21st birthday. He then introduced a participant who questioned the fact that a juvenile criminal record would not prevent a handgun purchase under the Brady law.*]

The President. Yes, I heard about it. The people of this State are very upset about this. I mean, I had that—I don't know—3,000 or so people out at the airport to meet me, and I was just working through the crowd and literally a dozen people mentioned this case to me.

Let me say, first of all, I care a lot about this. My first job in public life was as an attorney general in my State, dealing with criminal procedures. Then I was Governor, and I had to enforce the criminal laws in my State, including the capital punishment law. Most States, years ago, before juvenile crime was the problem it is now, had laws which basically said you couldn't be charged as an adult until you reached a certain age. Many times it was 15 or 16, sometimes more, sometimes earlier. And if you were tried as a juvenile, you had to be released either when you became 18 or 21, and your records would be sealed. You'd sort of be given a new chance. That was before. When these laws were passed, you didn't have teenagers going around gunning people down like you do now. Now, I think you have two or three options.

First of all, on this particular case, one thing the State of Rhode Island could do is to pass a law which says that the records of juveniles would not be sealed as it relates to questions under the Brady bill; that is, have you ever been treated for mental illness, have you ever committed a felony or what would have been a felony if you had been an adult? And the State legislature could simply change that law for that purpose and then put those records in. And then the gun store owners and all gun sellers would then be obligated to check that record and not sell a gun to that young man, just like they would be under anybody convicted of a crime as an adult.

The second thing I want to say is, I do not know about the constitutionality of this, but another thing you could do is to say, if you want

the benefit of the State's juvenile law when you could have been prosecuted as an adult—and if you have a law which permits 15-year-olds to be prosecuted as an adult—you have to be willing to voluntarily undergo psychiatric treatment and get some sort of approval before you are released.

Now, those are two things that I would think you ought to consider. But I know on terms of getting—being eligible to buy a gun, you could change that law tomorrow and apply it to this case and this young man and all other people similarly situated. At least you'd have that protection.

Those are my best ideas. I think it's an outrageous thing that this kid could get out—apparently has refused all treatment—get out and buy a gun. I think it's wrong.

Q. I agree with you there. I would like to let you have this because this is an article that was written, and it will give you a little bit more on the case.

The President. Thank you.

Q. He slaughtered two women and two babies and——

The President. Well, I've given you my best ideas. And I think it's terrible. And yes, my eyebrows are raised, and my temperature is hot.

You ought to fix that gun thing. You can do that. I think you can do that, and I hope you will.

Arkansas Record and Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, the Providence Journal recently published a report comparing the States on livability and health care. Rhode Island placed near the top, Arkansas, the bottom. I'm worried. Are you going to do for us what you did for Arkansas?

The President. Do you think that's a fair question? I mean, is that a fair question? Of course not, right?

My State, at the end of World War II, had a per capita income that was 56 percent of the national average. While I was Governor, the last 6 years, we had a job growth rate higher than the national average. Our per capita income increased higher than the national average. We were nationally recognized for education reforms, for welfare reforms, for dramatic improvement. You should judge people based on where they started; now, that's a fair question. That sounds like the kind of thing that President Bush said to me in the campaign.

And I also extended health care benefits to more pregnant women, more little children, improved health care to elderly people—those are things that I did do—and maintained taxes at the same percentage of income of my State when I left office as they were when I took office.

So I think I did a pretty good job as Governor. And by the way, my fellow Governors, including the Governors of New England, once voted me the best Governor in the country. So I did the best I could.

Now, having said that, I did not revolutionize the economy, wipe out all poverty, and end all problems. I plead guilty. But what I did do is just what I'm trying to do as President, which is to fix things.

Now, what you have to decide is whether you think it is acceptable for the United States to continue to be the only advanced country in the world that cannot figure out how to give insurance to all of its people, whether it is acceptable for us to spend 14½ percent of our income on health care. No other country spends over 10 percent. Germany and Japan spend under 9 percent; they cover everybody, and we don't. We have to decide whether this is acceptable. Why does it happen? Because we spend so much more on insurance and paperwork and other things. That, to me, cannot be justified.

And if we want to go on like we are, where more and more people lose their right to choose their doctor every year, more and more people are finding themselves uninsured, we can. Otherwise, we should decide what we're going to do about it and how we're going to do it.

I don't pretend for a moment to have all the answers. All I can tell you is that I've done my best to find them with the help of a lot of brilliant people, most of them, by the way, from your part of the country, not from mine. They came up with the plan. We've worked very hard on it. But I think what we need to do is to talk about how we can solve this problem. That's what I've been in the business of doing all my life.

The Economy

Ginger Casey. President Clinton, do you feel, though, that the economy has turned around for working class people in this country?

The President. Oh, I think the economy has plainly turned around. It hasn't done as much as it should, but let me just give you some

facts. Last month we had 267,000 new jobs come into this economy; in the first 4 months of this year, a million jobs; in the first 15 months of our administration, 3 million jobs. Rhode Island had 8,000 new jobs this year, the first time in 4 years you've had any job growth. So it's beginning to turn around.

We have driven the deficit down. And if my budget is adopted this year, we will have the first time since 1969 that we've got a decrease in domestic spending, except for health care, which is going up. And we'll have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. So I'm doing the best I can to turn it around.

But what we need to do is to get everybody in a room together—Senator Chafee's got a health care bill, and we've got other health care bills—we need to find out how can we cover everybody, how can we hold the cost down, and how can we solve the problems of the country. I don't pretend to have all the answers, but I do intend to keep the same can-do spirit as President that I brought to the Governor's office. And I'm still pretty proud of it. And I think most of the folks at home think that way, too.

Child Care

[*A participant in Springfield, MA, asked about the availability of quality child care.*]

The President. Well, let me just mention a couple of things. We have focused our child care efforts basically on trying to increase the incomes of working parents with modest incomes. This year, one in six American taxpayers will be eligible for an income tax cut because they are working for very modest incomes, hovering just modestly above the poverty line, and it's hard for them to be successful parents and successful workers. So we're focusing on that.

In our welfare reform bill, we plan to also do more to try to help parents with modest incomes afford their child care. Beyond that, of course, there is the Federal child care tax credit, and most States do the same thing.

Have we done as much as we should? I don't think so. But I think if we can help cover the health care expenses of all working parents and their children and help to deal with the income tax structure, I think that would go a long way toward helping you afford child care. And we're doing as much as we can with the money we have.

Reaction to Criticism

[*A participant in Massachusetts asked if the President and his family were being held to a higher standard than their predecessors.*]

The President. Well, I think I've been subject to more assault—[*laughter*]—than any previous President, based on the evidence. But the Vice President said a few days ago that there are powerful forces in this country who basically resent the way the last election came out, so they keep trying to undo it and pretend it didn't happen. But we'll have an election in 1996, and I wish that we could just all settle down and be Americans for a while and work on our problems, and then evaluate me based on the job I do and let—people will have a chance to make another decision. But I think that the constant politics of diversion and division and destruction is not good for America, but I'm prepared to live with it and keep working. So far, it has not interfered with the progress and the record of the Congress and the work we're trying to do for the country. And as long as I can keep it from interfering with it, I can live with it if you can.

Anticrime Efforts

[*A participant asked about the use of probation and parole and then asked if the President could speak Spanish.*]

The President. Let me answer the second question, first. I don't. [*Laughter*] I wish I did, and I probably ought to. And I think before too long, nearly every American President will be expected to, not only because of the high percentage of Hispanic-Americans we have but because of our increasing ties and our common future with Central and South America.

One of the things that I'm quite proud of is that we're going to host a Summit of the Americas in the United States in December. And there are 33 democracies in Latin America, one democracy where the President's been kicked out by dictators, military dictators—that's Haiti—and one Communist country, Cuba. That's a wonderful record.

What was the first question you asked? What was the first question? Oh, the overcrowding of the prisons. I think there should be more probation and parole. Let me say what our

crime bill does. Our crime bill funds more prison places to keep serious offenders in prison but also gives States the flexibility to use some of these monies to keep the nonviolent offenders out of prison with legitimate probation programs and diversion programs like boot camps and other kinds of programs.

I think the lady a moment ago from Connecticut asked the question about shouldn't we keep serious offenders in prison longer. It will be easier if we draw reasonable distinctions between who should not be in and who should be in, so that those who should be in can be kept longer. I think probation is an important part of that.

But as this young man can tell you, since he works in the program, if you want a probation program, you have to pay to have a good one; otherwise, it's just a joke. You can't let it be a joke; you've got to actually invest in one that works. And it's cheaper than prison.

Global Trade

[*A participant asked what could be done to help the failing costume jewelry industry in Rhode Island.*]

The President. I don't know. That's the straight and honest answer. But let me tell you what I have tried to do, and I think the American business community would support me in this assertion.

Our administration has really tried to do two things in the area of trade. We've tried to open up more trade, recognizing it would subject our people to more competition, but we'd be able to sell more things abroad, because we know that's what we have to do, at the same time enforcing our trade laws more vigorously. And I've gotten a lot of criticism for it. I've gotten criticized for enforcing our trade laws against Japan, for example, the disputes we've had there, and some of the other countries we've had disputes with. But I think that is very important.

The second thing I think we have to do is to move to a situation where, over a period of years, these international trade rules begin to take into account our obligations to the environment and our obligations to the working people of each of our countries.

Now, we can't immediately rewrite the rules for all other countries. And we shouldn't tell other people how to live and what rules they ought to have. But we all do ultimately breathe the same air and share a common environment. And if the United States or, for example, there are other countries that may do more on the environment than we do, if these countries are to do well in the global economy, we must at least be moving toward some common accords on environmental standards and ultimately on labor standards. The United States has begun to put these issues in the national debate. When we made the trade agreement with Mexico, the first trade agreement ever, ever in history that had environmental standards in it, it had never been done before. So we are beginning to do that. Meanwhile, we are going to try to firmly enforce our own trade laws.

The reason I said I don't know is, I don't know enough about your industry, I'm sorry to say, to make a comment. But I will look into that.

Thank you.

Ms. Casey. Mr. President, when there are other countries that underprice what it costs for people to manufacture an item here in the United States, countries that don't have to pay health insurance or any other kind of benefits or meet any OSHA requirements or EPA standards, won't business naturally go to where the cheapest widget is?

The President. Some will and some won't. But that's always been the case. That is, if you go back to the whole history of America, first of all, jobs moved from one part of our country to another because of labor costs. Then jobs moved from one sector of the country into another. We used to have a whole lot of people working in agriculture, for example. Now, less than 3 percent of our people can produce enough food to feed all of us and half the world to boot. So they have to find other things to do.

The same percentage of our wealth today comes from manufacturing as it did 15 years ago. But fewer people do it because fewer people can make more output in manufacturing. So we're in this constant struggle to create more new jobs than we're losing. And what's happened in the last 20 years for the first time ever—at least since we've been charting these things—we've been creating new jobs, but they're not better than the ones we're losing. That had not happened to us before. And that's why average wages have been stagnant in the

country for 20 years. Some are better, but some are not.

So what my challenge is is to identify the new technologies of the 21st century, make sure we are targeting investments on those technologies, make sure we are educating and training our people for those jobs, and make sure that the jobs we create are (a) as numerous and (b) better than the jobs we're losing. That is the great test of keeping the middle class alive in America. It's very hard to do, but we're trying to be on the path to do it. I think we're doing the right things.

Defense Conversion

[*A General Dynamics electric boat division worker asked about the Sea Wolf submarine program and retraining for defense workers.*]

The President. First of all let me say, as you know, I supported, against a lot of opposition, doing the second Sea Wolf and to try to keep the electric boat company going and also because we're going to move in—we're going to have a transition, if all goes as planned, into a different submarine. In other words, the Sea Wolf was conceived as a submarine designed specifically to counter a Soviet submarine threat. But we believe if we keep working with the Soviets to reduce, the nuclear problems will not be there. We also, however, know we will need a newer, smaller, lighter, faster, different submarine to take us into the 21st century. So I do think there will be defense work in the submarine industries.

Q. Will we survive that curve, through?

The President. Well, that's why I wanted to do the second Sea Wolf. I'm trying to make sure you do get to the curve.

The second thing we're attempting to do is to—we're spending several hundred million dollars a year now working with defense contractors and their workers to try to help develop other things they can do for a living, again, in high technologies that will be there 10 years from now, so that they can earn the same or greater wages.

Mr. White. They are uniquely skilled, so you are more able to adapt to a certain thing, and you would lose that by going away——

The President. That's right. But I've been amazed, frankly, at the number of adaptations that a lot of these defense corporations are coming up with. I realize it's harder in boat manufacturing, maybe it is some sort of electronic circuitry, for example, or other kinds of weapons manufacturers. But we are working very hard on that.

We've got this advanced technology project where the Government basically funds, on a competitive basis, proposals by defense industries to convert to domestic nondefense purposes. And so far the results of the last year and a half have been incredibly encouraging to me. I can't say there will be a solution for every problem, but I'm confident that we're moving in the right direction on it.

[*The participant expressed his support for retraining programs.*]

The President. I think we have to do that, too. Let me say, I have been twice now on a program that the Secretary of Labor sponsored, Bob Reich, from Massachusetts, who believes that some people will just have to retrain for other high-tech jobs. And one of the people in the program is a 59-year-old—this is another reason I don't want discrimination against older workers in health care premiums—a 59-year-old Bell Lab employee who lost his defense job and had to retrain at 59 and got a job working in a hospital at more or less the same level because he was able to do a lateral transfer through a high-tech training program.

And I think that's going to be very important, because you're right, not every industry will be able to modify its own business. So some of the workers will have to try to get lateral transfers.

Civil Rights

[*A commissioner with the New England Hispanic civil rights commission asked about civil rights policy.*]

The President. Well, if you look at—first of all let me say, we don't have time to go into the specifics, so if you will write me a specific letter, I will give you a specific answer. But I want to mention one thing in particular. Last year, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department was much, much more active in many areas than it had been in the past. The civil rights activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under Henry Cisneros dramatically increased last year over what they had done for years in the past. And then I appointed Deval Patrick, who's a very

distinguished civil rights lawyer, to be head of the Civil Rights Division. And most people who had been following it believe that we have dramatically increased the activism of the division.

But I can't respond to any specific concerns you have, sir, but if you will write them to me, I will get back to you on the specifics, because I intend to be very vigorous in this area. And my impression, just looking from the statistics, and I've gotten reports from the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department and on the Housing and Urban Development, is that we have dramatically increased our civil rights activities, which is what I had intended to do. And so if there are problems, I'll fix them if you will get them to me.

Hillary Clinton

[*A participant expressed his support for Hillary Clinton for President in the year 2000.*]

The President. First let me say that I'm sure my wife would be flattered by your attention.

Q. President Clinton, I started this 2 months ago.

The President. I just—by the way, I just talked to her on the phone right before I came in. She is in South Africa with Vice President and Mrs. Gore for the inauguration of Nelson Mandela. And she's a wonderful person with enormous ability. But she has always told me that she never thought she would ever seek elected office.

Q. Yes, she would. [*Laughter*]

The President. And after this life—I'm not sure she would ever——

Q. Mr. Clinton, never say never. You guys are rolling with the punches. Good, keep rolling. [*Laughter*] You know, they can throw a lot of crap, but you're always——

Ms. Casey. Oh, please, Mickey.

The President. Thank you very much.

Now tell them, I didn't know anything about this, will you? [*Laughter*]

Drug Abuse Treatment

[*A participant asked about treatment programs for drug addicts.*]

The President. Well, that involves two activities of this administration, so let me answer you. The short answer to your question is, yes, if we get the whole health care plan passed. That is, our health care plan will cover treatments for alcohol and drug abuse problems. I think it's very important. And treatment works. I know it does, I've seen it in my own family.

Secondly, this year in the crime bill and in our budget, we have big increases for drug treatment for people who are in the criminal justice system. It's crazy, folks, with such a high percentage of people who get convicted of things because they've got a drug problem, to turn right around and put them back on the street before they've had any drug treatment. It does not make any sense, and it's being penny-wise and pound-foolish, I think. So we're trying to help the States deal with that.

President's Childhood

[*A 9-year-old boy being raised by a single mother asked if the President had missed his father when he was a child.*]

The President. Well, sometimes I did, too. I missed—and you know something?

Q. What?

The President. Sometimes I still do. But my mother did a real good job, and she did the best she could. She worked real hard every day, and she was a real good mother. And I think I had a good childhood.

And there are lots and lots of kids—a big percentage of our young people in America today spend at least some of their childhoods with only one of their parents. Now, and oftentimes that's too bad, but that's the way it is. And so what we have to do is be grateful for our parents that are sticking with us and helping us, and never use that as an excuse and just make the best we can of our lives, okay?

Q. Yes.

The President. Good for you, pal. Thanks.

Give him a hand. [*Applause*]

Child Support Enforcement

[*A participant asked about efforts to collect child support payments from irresponsible fathers.*]

The President. That's a wonderful question. First of all, one of the biggest problems we've got with deadbeat dads is—sometimes deadbeat moms, but usually deadbeat dads—is the ability to cross the State line and not have enforcement across State lines. So a big part of our welfare reform program is going to be to stiffen enforcement of child support across State lines and to try, whenever possible, just to have an automatic withholding from people's checks once they start missing their child support payments,

even if they live in another State, and to have uniform enforcement. That will have a dramatic impact.

Now, in many cases where there was not a marriage in the first place, we're going to have to have some help from the mothers in identifying the fathers. But in every case where we can, in my opinion, once people start to miss their child support, I think you just ought to have automatic withholding. I don't think people should be able to avoid the responsibility for their children just because they're not in the homes raising them. And I think the more automatic, the quicker it can be, the less legal hassle, the less going to court, the fewer lawyers, the fewer pleading with the judges, the more it's just an automatic system, the better off we are. And that is what we're going to work toward as a part of comprehensive welfare reform.

I can tell all of you that your bills as taxpayers to support women and children on public assistance would be much lower if we had a tougher and more automatic system of child support collection, and I think that's what we have to do.

Q. Mr. President, could I ask you when will this begin?

The President. Let me just say this: We're doing better. Many States—one of the things that we did at home that I was quite proud of was, when people came in to have their babies, if they were single, divorced, separated, we started identifying the fathers then and immediately beginning to process the child support and creating a presumption of paternity that could be only overcome with proof.

I mean, there are lots of things that are being done now in State after State, but we'll introduce our welfare reform bill in a few weeks. And then it will pass in a few months, and then it will become the law of the land. And it would be, I think, a big, big advance. We did some things last year to require the States to stiffen child support, but the big thing is, right now, is you've got so many people crossing the State lines and evading their responsibilities. That's what we have to try to attack. And I think you have to have almost some sort of automatic system to do it.

Education

[*A high school student asked about college costs and education funding.*]

The President. Let me answer the second question first. We are, this year, even though we're cutting overall spending at home, we're giving more money to education and training programs. The second question is, don't dismiss this national service thing too lightly. Basically, what national service does is to give young people like you the opportunity to work either before you go to college, while you're in college, and in some cases, after you leave, and earn credit, almost $5,000 a year, against the cost of going to school. We'll have 20,000 young people in national service this year; the year after next we'll have 100,000 people in national service, solving the problems of their communities.

In addition to that, last year when we adopted my economic program, the Congress did, to bring the deficit down, one of the things in that bill that almost nobody noticed was a reorganization of the student loan program to cut the costs of operating it, lower interest rates on student loans, and string out the repayments so that you need never be discouraged about borrowing money to go to college, because now if you borrow money in the student loan program, you say, "Oh, I can't borrow 4 years' worth because I'm going to be a teacher when I get out, and I'll never pay it back." Under the new rules you can now pay that money back over a much longer period of time as a percentage of your income. So even if you're going to take a job that doesn't pay a lot of money, you'll always be able to limit your repayment to a percentage of your income.

So we've lowered the interest rates and made the repayments easier. And that should mean that no one should ever be discouraged from going to college again, even if they have to borrow the money, because they can pay it back in a responsible and bearable fashion.

Ms. Casey. Where do you want to go to school?

Q. URI.

The President. A paid political announcement. [*Laughter*]

Infrastructure Improvements

[*A participant asked about efforts to rebuild America's infrastructure.*]

The President. First of all, we have fully funded for 2 years in a row now the ISTEA program, the intermodal transportation program that was

adopted several years ago, to make sure we can push the money out more quickly. Secondly, I have now our people studying, with the benefit of folks from all over the country who are experts in transportation investment, what other options we have, short of some big tax increase which I don't think we can enact, to increase the funding flowing to infrastructure investments, and especially to road and bridge improvement.

These things, by the way, create a lot of jobs in the economy, and they're basically good-paying jobs. And they often go to people who otherwise couldn't get them. And they dramatically increase the society's productivity.

Many of the Asian countries that we're competing with that have far higher savings rates are spending massive amounts of money on fast trains, on new airports, on major new transportation systems. So it's a big issue in terms of our long-term economic health. And I believe—keep in mind we're keeping a pretty fast pace here. I had to work on the economy first and then pass the education programs. And now we're working on the health care and the crime bill.

Q. A lot of bumpy roads.

The President. A lot of bumpy roads. But I think we will have an infrastructure built to take some advantage of this, but not until early next year in 1995.

Mr. White. Mr. President, thank you ever so much. Unfortunately, we are just about out of time. We want to thank you very much for coming to visit not only Rhode Island but us here at Channel 10.

The President. Thank you.

Mr. White. Our 10 Town Meeting is coming to a close. And we'd like to invite you, Mr. President, if you'd like, to stay behind and say hello to some of our friends.

The President. Thank you. I have very much enjoyed this. The questions were wonderful, and I thank the folks in Springfield and New Haven, too.

NOTE: The town meeting began at 8 p.m. at the WJAR–TV studio. The President was introduced by moderators Doug White and Ginger Casey.

Remarks to the American Nurses Association
May 10, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you for your warm welcome. And thank you, Ginna, for that award.

I arrived a few moments ago, and I remember the first time I ever heard your president speak. I knew that she had worked for Vice President Gore, and I thought it was so interesting to hear the head of a national association who was speaking without an accent. [*Laughter*]

I want to say a special word of appreciation to your first vice president, Ellen Sanders, who's participated in White House and congressional meetings on health reform, and to Diane Weaver, the president of the Association of Nurse Executives, who cosponsored this breakfast.

I am very proud to share the stage today with all the fine nurses in the executive and the legislative branches whom you have honored. And I thank you for doing that. And I thank them for their service. I also want to say a special word of thanks to all of you and to the ANA for the courage and the vision you have demonstrated by fighting for health care reform, and the right kind of health care reform, long before it was a hot issue. As you know, the position paper you put out on national health reform probably more closely parallels the recommendations that our administration has made than that of any other professional health care group in the country. And I thank you for that very much.

I want to thank you, too, for recognizing my mother, who worked for 30 years and then some as a nurse and was deeply proud of what she did. I remember when I was a little boy watching her get up in the middle of the night, always starting work by 7 or 7:30 in the morning, always telling me stories that indicated that there was literally nothing in the world more important to her than dealing with a person frightened, in pain, with a caring and effective manner. This award will help to expand the frontiers of nursing in the areas of women's health, some-

thing that she would have been very proud to be a part of.

My mother, as all of you now know, completed her memoirs, which became her autobiography, shortly before she died. She went over about half of it and was able to do the final editing. And it was my privilege after she passed away to work with the author and just try to make sure all the facts were right. I got very stern instructions from her. She said, "Now, if you have to do this, do not change one word I said about you"—[*laughter*]—"especially the part about your manners not always being great." [*Laughter*] "And make sure you get the facts straight. Otherwise leave it alone."

But I was very pleased with the two book reviews that her book got yesterday, one by the great American author Joyce Carol Oates in the New York Times and then another one here in the Washington Post. But it tickled me, the one in the Washington Post said that if you read this book, you would understand why I perplexed people in Washington. I was actually brought up by real people, and occasionally I still acted like one. [*Laughter*] I didn't know what that—[*laughter*]—I'm trying to get over it, but it's hard even here.

Anyway, here's something my mother said about her work, which would apply to all of you and those whom you represent. But it meant a lot to me. It was just her words: "Nurse anesthetist work is all-consuming. You don't do it halfway. You don't daydream. You don't let your emotions wander. You're the person responsible for putting another human being into a state of unconsciousness, somewhere between life and death. For 30 years, from the minute that I would walk into the operating room and start talking to the patient and begin putting him to sleep, until I got him safely back to the recovery room, nothing in the world could have crossed my mind. I don't care what problems were on the outside. I don't care what problems I might have been having at home. I never thought of my life beyond the moment."

I remember when I was also a child, things were somewhat more informal. My mother used to take me to the hospital and let me meet the other nurses and the doctors and watch the emergency room and watch people go into the operating room. It was utterly fascinating. And the work you do has always sort of captured my imagination.

My own wife had never been in a hospital before in her entire life until our daughter was born, never been in a hospital for any kind of sickness, and learned only a few moments before the happy event that she was going to have to have a C-section. And we had gone through Lamaze, and we had done all this stuff, and I was supposed to be in the operating room. And our hospital at that time had never before let a father into the delivery room if it wasn't a natural birth. It was a big deal. So I said, "Look, I've been watching people get cut on and bleed since I was a little boy. I'll do fine." [*Laughter*] "But she had never been here before, and she may not—you better let me come in." [*Laughter*] So they did and actually changed the policy so that if fathers had been through the Lamaze course and then the mothers eventually had to have a C-section, they got to go. So I felt—that's my one contribution to medical advances. [*Laughter*]

But I owe all that to my mother, who was a remarkably determined woman in the face of often excruciating adversity. I think one of the reasons that the Nurses Association has been so forthright about this health care reform issue is that you see it from the grassroots up in human terms and you don't get so hung up as some people do on all the political rhetoric and the positioning and the characterizations that have, frankly, put a lot of Members of Congress at a severe disadvantage because they haven't had the chance to spend the time and make the effort to deal with this issue that you have. It is, after all, a mind-bendingly complex problem. It's 14.5 percent of our income, and for people who don't live in it every day, it can be a very difficult thing.

But I just wanted to thank you because I believe that the personal experiences you have shared, so many of you, common to the ones that my own mother shared, really animated the Nurses Association to take the position that you have taken.

I want to emphasize today that what I seek, contrary to the attacks, and what you have sought, is not a Government-run health system, it's a private insurance health system that covers everybody, where the health care professionals run it and not the insurance companies. That's what we seek.

We seek private insurance that can never be taken away. It's wrong to treat seriously ill children in an emergency room who could have

been treated more easily and more inexpensively if their parents had just had the coverage. With our reforms, every family will have that kind of quality insurance. We ought to reform the insurance system that today often only covers the healthiest people and even then will deny them coverage for anything they've been sick with before.

When you go to a patient's bedside, you ask, "Why does it hurt? Where does it hurt? How can I help?" You don't ask whether this is a preexisting condition you're looking at. [*Laughter*] It's a very important issue.

If you think about all this preexisting condition business, there are 81 million Americans who live in families where there's been a child with diabetes or a mother that had cancer prematurely or a father that had an early heart attack or some other problem. I see these people everywhere. This is no small number. Now, we get action lickety-split up here all the time when a million people or 2 million people are adversely affected by something if they are well organized. But these 81 million people, they're professionals and blue-collar workers; they're old folks and young folks; they're all different kinds of people; and they are by definition disorganized. There is no national association of people with preexisting conditions. [*Laughter*] You think about it; if there were, and 10 million of them showed up here, we'd have health care reform so fast you couldn't blink.

You must be their voice in an organized way. And you can be. So we ought to cover everybody with private insurance, and we ought to have insurance reforms that deal with preexisting conditions and don't discriminate against people based on age. This is somewhat controversial. I know that. But I believe if we went back to health insurance the way it originally was when Blue Cross first started writing it, where everybody was put in a large group, risk was broadly spread, and people paid a fee against the day when they would be sick, it would be fairer for all Americans. And our economy would work better, our society would have a stronger sense of community, our families would function better. People would be free of a lot of the anxiety that comes to them.

Hillary and I have received about a million letters. And whenever I go somewhere now, they arrange for some of the letter writers to come see me. And it's just gripping to see people just over and over and over and stunning to see how they really do come from all walks of life and how they have been broken by the things which have happened.

The third thing I think we should do is to preserve the Medicare program. It's interesting, the people who criticize our program say this is Government-run health care which, of course, it isn't. And if you tried to take away Medicare, which is a Government-funded health care, well, they would be up in a tree somewhere screaming about it.

But we don't want to do anything to the Medicare program, except to make it better. I do believe we should add a prescription drug benefit and phase in long-term care that is community-based or home-based for two simple reasons. One is, there are an awful lot of elderly people who aren't poor enough to be on Medicaid but aren't well off, who have significant medical bills. We know the elderly use 4 times the prescription drugs that the nonelderly do. And we know from study after study after study that a proper medication regime can keep people out of the hospital and can save money and that we now have—any number of elderly people every month—I was in a grocery store in New York yesterday called Pathmark, which also operates, as many do now, a drugstore. And it was gripping; the CEO was saying, "My workers tell me that every day they watch older people come in this store and go from the drugstore, down the food aisle, and try to make up their mind what food they're going to give up to get their medicine, or whether they're going to give up their medicine to buy their food"—gripping. So I do believe we should do that. But the Medicare program works. It has low administrative overhead. We think it should be secured.

The fourth thing we want to do is to bring greater choice to our people. I guess the thing that has made me the maddest in the relentless campaign against this plan are all those bogus ads where they say, "You're going to have to call some Government office to figure out where you go to the doctor."

There are two realities of modern life that you have to drive home to every Member of Congress, without regard to party or philosophy. Number one, Americans are rapidly losing their choices today. Already, of people who are insured at work, fewer than half have more than one choice of a health plan. That's a fact today. And they're rapidly losing their choices. Number

two, medical professionals are increasingly losing their right to decide unilaterally, may have to have somebody get on the phone to an insurance company executive a long way away to ask for permission to do what anybody knows ought to be done under the circumstances.

Now, most Americans, believe it or not, don't know either one of those things, even though they may be caught up in it, and I think it's very important. Our plan is designed, number one, to increase the choices that consumers have. We're moving to more managed care. There can be a lot of good things in it, but under our plan, every year, every person would have a choice between at least three plans, or among at least three plans but in all probability many more. And number two, under our plan, medical professionals would also be given more choices and would have to do less checking in with the insurance company in advance. Now, being treated by doctors and nurses, you know, is an American tradition. Every time I do one of these town meetings, like I did in Rhode Island last night, I talk to somebody that's just been forced to give up their doctor and just move away from the choices they made.

We believe when all Americans can choose among several health plans, many Americans, many more Americans, will choose to stay with their own providers. And many more of these plans will be organized in such a way that all providers can participate if they'll do it for the agreed-upon fee. That's what we believe will happen. And if we don't do this, if we don't have some legal action to reorganize this, you're going to have less choice by consumers, less choice by providers.

Time and again, we've also seen that the quality of care is directly related to the quality and the quantity of the nursing staff. One of the things that amazes me is how many nurses have been laid off in recent months and been told, well, this is because health care reform is coming. I'll tell you what, one of Clinton's unbending laws of politics is, whenever somebody who's got a tough decision to make can shift the heat from themselves to you, they'll do it every time. They will do it every time. That law never varies.

Now, what is really going on? What's really going on is, a lot of these health care providers are under the gun. Right? More managed care; people bargaining tougher for prices; more and more people who are uncovered where there's uncompensated care that has to be provided; less and less ability to pass on the cost of uncompensated care to other people because they're in these managed care networks they're in: all this stuff is going to happen if we don't do anything. All of us could go on vacation for a year, and this same thing would go on. You know that. And don't let your Members fall for it.

What's going to happen is we'll continue to see these trends occur unless we find a way to give health care providers reimbursement for all the people for whom they care, at an appropriate level in an appropriate way. More than a decade of research now shows that more and better trained nurses result in shorter hospital stays, better survival rates, fewer complications, whether you're dealing with low birthweight babies or older people.

You do not have to work for the Congressional Budget Office to understand that healthier patients and shorter stays means lower health care costs. Sometimes I think if you do work for the Congressional Budget Office you will never get that, but—[*laughter*]—we're working together pretty well on the whole. This is a big deal. This choice issue and maintaining an array of qualified people doing the things for which they are best qualified is terribly important.

Finally, let me say—and this, I guess, is, except for this whole issue of whether this is a Government program, which it isn't, is the most controversial part of it—our reform is based on providing guaranteed benefits at work. Now the reason for that is simple, for the people in this country that have health insurance, 9 out of 10 of them have it at work where there is some shared responsibility between the employer and the employee. For the people who don't have insurance, 8 out of 10 of them have someone in their family who is working.

It seems to me that the fairest and simplest, and if you will, the most conservative way to achieve universal coverage, to have health care security for everybody, is to ask employers and employees who aren't doing anything or barely doing anything to do more so that they can fulfill their own responsibilities and then use tax funds to cover the unemployed, uninsured people for whom you could say, well, there's a general responsibility, just like Medicare and Medicaid, and then organize the market so that smaller businesses and self-employed people (a)

get discounts if they need it and (b) are able to buy good insurance on the same terms that those of us who are insured by Government or larger businesses can.

Now it seems to me that is a fair and simple and obvious way to do this. I think that any other way will sooner or later involve either a radical change, that is, getting rid of the whole health insurance market and substituting taxes for it, or involve people who are already paying too much for their own health care, having to pay something for people who won't do anything for themselves because they say they should be exempt.

Now I think that this is a very important issue. You know, again, we lose sight of the fact that most small businesses are making an effort to cover their employees. We have brought hundreds and hundreds of small businesses to Washington to talk to the Congress, but they are not organized. There is no association called: small businesses who cover their employees and are mad their competitors don't and mad they can't get better insurance rates—[*laughter*]—and wish somebody would help them. So an association that may have a lot of folks in the insurance industry, along with other small businesses, says, "Don't do this; the whole small business economy will break," says this, and there's no association on the other side. You have to be their voice.

Had a car dealer from a town of 7,000 people in Arkansas up staying with me the other night, he and his wife, long-time friends of mine. She's a college teacher. He's a car dealer. He said to me the other night—it was funny—he said, "You know, for 20 years I have been feeling sorry for myself because I've provided a good health plan for my employees, and none of my competitors did." So he said, "I was so happy when you proposed this just because I thought I was going to get even." [*Laughter*] And then he said, "But you know, then I remembered that in the last 20 years I put three of my competitors out of business. And I'm making more money than I ever have. And the reason is I still got the same folks working for me I had 20 years ago because I gave them health benefits."

And yesterday I went to New York and I visited this Pathmark store. They have 175 stores, 28,000 employees, the 10th biggest supermarket chain in the country. We're all told, "Oh, if you do this, the retailing business will go to pieces." These people have put new stores in inner-city areas that other chains would not touch, fine new stores. They are making money, and they have always provided comprehensive health benefits to their employees. And they are now sacking their groceries in a bag that says they favor health care benefits to all Americans, guaranteed through the workplace.

I say this to you because, as you know, there are a lot of nurses that don't have any health care coverage and a lot of nurses who are single parents who don't have health care coverage. And this is the other point I want to make that I did to all those young people working in that grocery store yesterday: Everybody now in Washington is for welfare reform, and I guess it means different things to different people. But I have basically a 3-point strategy to achieve what I think would end the welfare system as we know it: One was embodied in last year's economic plan, lower income taxes for working people who are hovering just above the poverty line with children. This year one in six American working families will be eligible for lower income taxes so they can succeed at work and can succeed as parents.

Strategy number two, give people education and training and then give them a certain amount of time to find a job. And if they don't, require them to take it. And if they can't, provide some public subsidy in the private sector or some publicly funded job so that work is preferable to welfare.

Strategy number three has got to be cover the people with health insurance. Consider this: All these people on welfare in this country who are dying to get off—and by the way, that's most of them—who are dying to get off, most of them have limited education. Suppose they go through a little training program and they get a job that pays a modest wage but is still more than the welfare benefits. But they go to work for an employer who does not provide for health care.

Think about this: You are a mother with two children. You give up being on welfare to take a job that pays more than the welfare check, but you lose health care coverage for your kids. What are you going to do if your kid has to go to the dentist? What are you going to do if your child is desperately ill? How are you going to feel every week, every 2 weeks or every month when you get your paycheck and you see what's taken out of it in taxes and you real-

ize those taxes are going to pay for the health care benefits of people who decided to stay on welfare instead of going to work? You don't have to be as bright as a tree full of owls to figure out that this doesn't make a lot of sense. [*Laughter*]

Now a lot of American nurses are in this situation today, getting up every day, slaving away, trying to take care of people who have children without insurance, caring for people who come into their office who are on public assistance who have children with insurance because of the Medicaid program. It is not fair. It is not right. It is not smart.

And you could say, well, all this inability to cover everybody, if this were fueling some enormous American economic expansion because we were saving so much money on health care, maybe you could deal with that. But the truth is we're spending over 40 percent more of our income on health care than any other country in the world. Oh yes, some of it because we're more violent, and that's something we pay for. Some of it because we have better medical research and technology, and that's worth paying for. But a whole lot of it, as you well know, is because of the way we have financed health care, which has employed hundreds of thousands of people in doctors' offices, in clinics, in hospitals, and in insurance companies to read the fine print on thousands and thousands of policies to see who and what is not covered. And it has rifled inefficiencies through this system that we are all paying for.

We can fix this. We can fix it by having a law which fixes what's wrong, keeps what's right, provides health care security to everybody through a private system, increases the choices consumers have, and increases the decisions that doctors and nurses and other qualified providers make without oversight by others. We can do it.

In order to do it, we have to recognize we have to go through a fog of misinformation, a torrent of labels which aren't right, and recognize, too, that you have to lobby and stand up for, in an organized and very personal way, that great association that doesn't exist, the association of 81 million Americans in families with preexisting conditions, the association of hundreds of thousands of small businesses who are doing the right thing and being punished for it, the association of all the poor women in this country who are out there working their hearts out and their fingers to the bone to do right by their kids without health insurance and paying taxes for people on public assistance who have it for their children. All of those associations are disorganized.

You have devoted your lives to providing health care to all Americans. You have honored my favorite nurse today. You have given me a chance to hope that my mother and my grandmother are looking down on me thinking I was the first generation in three that didn't produce anybody that was caring for other people in health care. So they think at least I walked off with the award today. [*Laughter*] It means more to me than I can say.

But the determination that my mother showed in getting up off the pavement many times in her life is the same sort of determination you have to show for us to get health care reform this year. And remember, most of these Members of Congress want to do the right thing. But they don't know what you know; they haven't spent the time that you've spent; they haven't had the experiences you have had. You have to help them. And the people in their districts that really need their help are not in those great national associations.

You keep them in your mind and keep that example in your mind. Don't let this year go by. We can do this this year with your help and your leadership.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:56 a.m. in the Regency A Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency. In his remarks, he referred to Virginia Trotter Betts, president, American Nurses Association.

Remarks to the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations
May 10, 1994

Thank you for being here and thank you for that warm welcome. As all of you know, this is the first meeting of our Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations and the Intergovernmental and Policy Advisory Committee.

There are a lot of people in this room with whom I have worked for many years on a wide variety of issues, especially on the economy. I am pleased with where we are going. You may know the blue chip forecast came out today, saying that there is no sign of inflation in the economy this year and next year and predicting a growth rate in the range of 3½ percent this year, which means a continued effort to create jobs and move our economy forward. In the last 15 months or so, our economy has produced about 3 million jobs, most of them in the private sector—which is a real departure, in terms of the percentage of new jobs in the private sector, from the last few years—a million jobs in the first 4 months of this year, over a quarter of a million in April alone. So, I'm encouraged about the direction in which we are going.

The Congress is moving rapidly to adopt the budget that I sent up which, if adopted as it is, will eliminate 100 programs, cut 200 more, still save some new money for education and training, for Head Start, for new technologies, for medical research, but represent the first overall reduction in domestic discretionary spending since 1969. And it will produce the first 3 years of declining deficits since Harry Truman was President, if this budget passes.

So I think we are moving in the right direction. But we all know we have to do more to try to spark global economic growth and to spark growth in our country from global economic affairs. Last year we had NAFTA, we had the APEC meeting, we had an export policy which involved removing any number of items from export controls which had previously been placed on them during the cold war, and we've continued that work into this year.

But the most important thing we can do this year, plainly, if we want to create hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs in America, is for Congress to ratify the GATT agreement. The Uruguay round cuts tariffs by over a third on manufactured products. Three-quarters of the world's trade growth over the next decade will come from the developing world, and GATT is expanded to cover things that it formerly has not covered, including intellectual property and services. We have got to adopt the GATT in the Congress this year.

This is about exports and jobs. It's also about our leadership in the world. We broke 7 years of global gridlock last year to get this GATT agreement, and we've proved that we can do things finally around here that haven't been done in the past. It took 7 years to pass the Brady bill, but we did it after 7 years; 7 years for the family and medical leave bill. This crime bill has been hanging around here for 5 years; it's going to be better and stronger than any crime bill we've ever passed, thanks in no small measure to the courage of the House last week in adopting the assault weapons ban. The GATT was around for 7 years. So we're trying, this administration is, to earn a reputation for breaking gridlock at home and around the world. We cannot be the only nation not to ratify the GATT this year.

Now, the problem is our trading partners are just now beginning to understand it's harder for us to do than it is for other countries because we operate under budget rules which require us to replace all the tariffs that we lower and give us no credit for the increased economic activity that will plainly flow and which will generate more tax revenues. The only thing that we can count is the reduced direct spending in agricultural subsidies that will come if we ratify the GATT. So our economic team, Dr. Tyson and Mr. Rubin and Mickey Kantor and the Treasury Department and Mr. Panetta at OMB, they've all been sort of splitting their heads trying to figure out how to get this done this year, because we estimate that over a 5-year period tariffs will be reduced by in the range of $14 billion. And we have to figure out how to replace that. We are working very hard to do it.

But GATT will only pass if there is an American effort to pass it that is bipartisan, that is reasonable, that is credible, and that is consistent. And so I wanted to come here today to say to you, we need your help. We need all

of your help. We're moving to restore a measure of global growth. We are beginning to get good predictions out of Europe, a lot of people thinking that Europe is beginning to turn around. I am very hopeful—I had a nice conversation with the new Japanese Prime Minister yesterday—I am very hopeful that through our efforts—and we have a good relationship—we will be able to resume our trade talks and continue to make progress there, and they'll be able to get some growth back into their economy.

But we have to continue to set the standard. People know that our economy is functioning at a higher level than many of our trading partners. They expect us to take the lead. And even though this is harder for us than it is for our partners, we've got to try to find a way to do it. I am convinced we can do it, just like we did with NAFTA, if, but only if, there is a bipartisan effort and if there is a business-government-labor effort and if there is a State, local, and national effort. If it is broad-based, if it is deep, and if it is real, and if it is constant, we can do this.

But I really need your help if we're going to do it. And I hope you will resolve to make sure that we do achieve this so that we can go on to other areas. But it's a good agreement. It's good for America. And it will be a real shame if we walk away from it. Besides that, we need to keep our record of breaking gridlock going. I'm depending on you to help.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. in the Indian Treaty Room of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Tsutomu Hata of Japan.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on Aeronautics and Space

May 10, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year 1993, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involve 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as this report reflects, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation as a whole in a variety of ways.

Fiscal year 1993 brought numerous important changes and developments in U.S. aeronautics and space efforts. It included 7 Space Shuttle missions, 14 Government launches of Expendable Launch Vehicles (ELVs), and 4 commercial launches from Government facilities. Highlights of the Shuttle missions included the first in a series of flights of the U.S. Microgravity Payload that contained scientific and materials-processing experiments to be carried out in an environment of reduced gravity; the deployment of the Laser Geodynamic Satellite (a joint venture between the United States and Italy); the deployment of a Tracking and Data Relay Satellite; and, the second Atmospheric Laboratory for Applications and Science mission to study the composition of the Earth's atmosphere, ozone layer, and elements thought to be the cause of ozone depletion. The ELV missions carried a variety of payloads ranging from Global Positioning System satellites to those with classified missions.

I also requested that a redesign of the Space Station be undertaken to reduce costs while retaining science-user capability and maintaining the program's international commitments. To this end, the new Space Station is based on a modular concept and will be built in stages. However, the new design draws heavily on the previous Space Station Freedom investment by incorporating most of its hardware and systems. Also, ways are being studied to increase the Russian participation in the Space Station.

The United States and Russia signed a Space Cooperation Agreement that called for a Russian cosmonaut to participate in a U.S. Space Shuttle mission and for the Space Shuttle to make at least one rendezvous with the Mir. On September 2, 1993, Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., and Russian Prime Minister Victor Chernomyrdin signed a series of joint statements

on cooperation in space, environmental observations/space science, commercial space launches, missile export controls, and aeronautical science.

In aeronautics, efforts included the development of new technologies to improve performance, reduce costs, increase safety, and reduce engine noise. For example, engineers have been working to produce a new generation of environmentally compatible, economic aircraft that will lay the technological foundation for a next generation of aircraft that are superior to the products of other nations. Progress also continued on programs to increase airport capacity while at the same time improving flight safety.

In the Earth sciences, a variety of programs across several agencies sought better understanding of global change and enhancement of the environment. While scientists discovered in late 1992 and early 1993, for instance, that global levels of protective ozone reached the lowest concentrations ever observed, they also could foresee an end to the decline in the ozone layer. Reduced use of ozone-destroying chlorofluorocarbons would allow ozone quantities to increase again about the year 2000 and gradually return to "normal."

Thus, fiscal year 1993 was a successful one for the U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in both areas have contributed to advancing the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge and furthering an improved quality of life on Earth through greater knowledge, a more competitive economy, and a healthier environment.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 10, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development
May 10, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 3536, I transmit herewith the 28th Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which covers calendar year 1992.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 10, 1994.

Remarks at the National Fire and Emergency Services Dinner
May 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that warm welcome; and distinguished head table guests. I don't know about being America's Fire Chief, but I do know whenever I ring the bell, Steny Hoyer shows up. [*Laughter*] So today he rang the bell, and I showed up. And I am honored to be in your presence tonight.

I want to recognize, not only Steny but the other Members of Congress who are here. I'm sure they've been introduced already, but Congressman Curt Weldon and Congressman Sherry Boehlert, Senator William Roth, Congressman Howard Coble. I think you will find that support for fire and emergency services is a bipartisan affair in the United States Congress. And I think you will find that I have tried to be a good partner to them. I also want to recognize some people who are not here, including Congressman Dick Durbin and Congressman Bill Emerson, who are the cochairs of the House Task Force on Natural Disasters; and to acknowledge the legislators of the year you identified, Chairman Norm Mineta and Senator Dan Inouye. I also want to thank, for their work in the administration and their work to come, our Fire

Administrator-designate, Carrye Brown. And I'd like to say with a special word of pride how very much I appreciate the extraordinary work of one of my fellow Arkansans, James Lee Witt, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

You know, when I became President there were many jobs, but there were two or three jobs that I thought had suffered under previous administrations without regard to party, because they had not been filled with people who had actual experience doing what they were hired to do. One was the Small Business Administration, and I put someone in the Small Business Administration, not who had been a long-time political associate of mine, although he is a friend of mine, but someone who had spent 20 years financing and starting and expanding small businesses. It occurred to me that a person that did that job, since that's where most of the job growth is in America, would be better off if he or she had known something about it before they showed up at the door.

And when it came time to pick a FEMA Director, as a Governor in the State that had the highest death rate per capita from tornadoes in the country, I knew a little something about what it was like to deal with FEMA over a very long period of time, under administrations of both parties in Washington. And that's why I asked the person who had done the emergency services work in our State and had gone through fires and floods and tornadoes and seen whole towns blown away, to do that job.

Most people think that our administration has done pretty well in responding to earthquakes in California, floods in the Middle West, hurricanes in the South, severe winter weather that hit so many of our States last year. But we know that all the Federal responses in the world only work when it is matched with and really supports the courage that you show on a daily basis in all of your States and communities.

I used to tell people that when I was the Governor of my State I had a real life. And back when I had a real life, one of the things I did was to work on trying to extend fire service to our rural areas with a direct funding stream every year that went to volunteer fire departments and with a number of other training and other legislative initiatives that made it possible during my 12 years of service to create over 700 volunteer fire departments in our State. I'm very, very proud of that. And I'm proud of the work that all of them did and what it did for people's fire insurance rates and how many homes and lives were saved as a result of that effort.

On Monday, yesterday, I went to Engine 24 and Ladder 5 in New York City, in Greenwich Village, to honor three firemen who 40 days ago paid the ultimate tribute: John Drennan, of Staten Island, who hung on for 40 days with massive injuries over most of his body—his funeral Mass will be said at St. Patrick's Cathedral tomorrow—a captain, 49 years old, with a wonderful wife, a schoolteacher, and four children; and two young firemen, James Young, of Queens, and Christopher Siedenburg, of Staten Island, who was only 25 years old when he died. Sometimes I think that we forget how dangerous it can be to put yourself in the line of natural disasters and sometimes manmade disasters for your fellow human beings.

I was deeply moved when I met the partners of those three firemen who died, and I will always remember them. Especially will I think of them when I have the privilege and the honor of signing the arson prevention act. I am going to be proud to sign this law, not just to make your lives easier, but to reduce the number of wasted lives and wasted dollars we lose to arson every day, needless and senseless tragedies that might otherwise be prevented.

I want to thank all of you who worked so hard on that law, all of you at the grassroots, all of you in the Congress, and the chief sponsors, Senator Dick Bryan and Representative Rick Boucher. I can't wait to have the chance to sign that. And I'm sure that Congressman Hoyer and Congressman Weldon and some of the others here will have some idea about exactly how we ought to sign that. And once again, when they ring the bell, I will show up.

I noticed that the title of your annual report was, "Protecting a Nation at Risk." I thought you were describing my job. [*Laughter*] I'll say this, there will always be risks involved in the work of freedom and the work of holding a civilized society together. The great tension we face today all around the world, in some ways, can be seen in the work you're doing against arson.

There is today no cold war, no imminent threat of nuclear annihilation, although nuclear dangers remain. It is wonderful to think that in just the last 15 months, three of the four countries in the former Soviet Union that had

nuclear weapons have committed to getting rid of them, and Russia, which still has nuclear weapons, and the United States no longer point their warheads at one another. That is a wonderful thing to consider.

But it's also true that we are fighting a constant battle all around the world between order and chaos and between those who wish to live in harmony and freedom and those who would abuse that very freedom. You see it whether it's in the ethnic brutality and the civil war in Bosnia or the rise, the lamentable rise, of organized crime in Russia where organized criminal thugs murder bankers at will who are trying to see free enterprise take root there or in the work of the gangs and some of the horrible tragedies within our own cities and communities.

Those of you who are willing to literally put your lives on the line for other people's interests, for people who are in trouble, are the ultimate rebuttal to the cynics who believe we cannot create a world of justice and freedom where people live together in peace and honor. But we will, all of us, for the rest of our lives be fighting and working to make sure that our Nation is not put at risk and that our world can become safer by making sure the forces of order win over the forces of chaos and that the people who wish to have freedom are also willing to exercise it with responsibility. Every day, your lives symbolize that, the first and most enduring lesson of our democracy, and I thank you for it.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President was presented with gifts, including a statue of an American eagle.*]

The President. I promise when I was invited to come, I had no idea I was going to receive any of these things. And you probably don't know this, Congressman Hoyer, but I have for some time been a collector of eagles. I love them very much. And in our State, Mr. Witt and I, we did a lot of work trying to preserve the American eagle. And by the time I left office, we had the second largest number of eagles of any State in the country. They do symbolize what is best about our country, and I will treasure this. Of all the ones I have collected, I think I have none that is as beautiful as this, and I'm very, very grateful.

Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:03 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. H.R.1727, the Arson Prevention Act of 1994, approved May 19, was assigned Public Law No. 103–254.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report of the Trade and Development Agency

May 11, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by section 201(d) of the Jobs Through Exports Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–549; 22 U.S.C. 2421(d)), I transmit herewith the annual report of the Trade and Development Agency for fiscal year 1993.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Lee H. Hamilton, chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Federal Council on the Aging
May 11, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 204(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3015(f)), I hereby transmit the Annual Report for 1993 of the Federal Council on the Aging. The report reflects the Council's views in its role of examining programs serving older Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 11, 1994.

Nomination for the Office of Management and Budget
May 11, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate John A. Koskinen as Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

"John Koskinen has just the right qualifications for this job," the President said. "He has extensive management experience in both the private and public sector. Improving the management of the Federal Government is a top priority of this administration, and I expect John to be a great point man for that effort."

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

Nomination for Ambassador to India
May 11, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Frank G. Wisner, of the District of Columbia, as Ambassador to India.

"I am pleased to announce Frank to this most important post," the President said. "He brings an experienced background and skilled diplomacy to this important assignment."

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

Nomination for Ambassador to Saudi Arabia
May 11, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Raymond Edwin Mabus, Jr., of Mississippi, as Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

"Ray is a good friend who I had the honor of serving with as a fellow Governor. As Governor of Mississippi, he represented the people of that State with distinction," the President said. "He brings the leadership and vision he has demonstrated throughout his years of public service to this critical assignment. I am pleased to nominate him as my personal representative to Saudi Arabia."

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

Nomination for Ambassador to Tunisia

May 11, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Mary Ann Casey, of Colorado, as Ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia.

"Mary Ann Casey's extensive foreign service experience will be a great asset in her role as Ambassador to Tunisia," the President said. "I am delighted to announce her nomination."

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

Statement on Signing the Farmers Home Administration Improvement Act of 1994

May 11, 1994

I am today signing into law S. 1930, the Farmers Home Administration Improvement Act of 1994. This Act is intended to give the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture (USDA) an additional tool with which to reduce the substantial backlog of delinquent farm loan debt. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use USDA's Office of General Counsel or private attorneys acting under contract, in addition to the current authority to refer matters to the Department of Justice, to resolve loan delinquencies.

My Administration is committed to more aggressive Government action to resolve the problem of delinquent farm loan debt. There are too many borrowers, many of them of substantial means and not full-time farmers, who have been delinquent on their farm loans for years. Resolving these cases will return resources to taxpayers and provide additional opportunities for beginning farmers.

Because the Attorney General has overall responsibility for the conduct of litigation by the United States, I have directed the Departments of Justice and Agriculture to work together to implement this authority.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House
May 11, 1994.

NOTE: S. 1930, approved May 11, was assigned Public Law No. 103–248. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 12.

Memorandum on Use of Private Attorneys by the Department of Agriculture

May 11, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General

This directive sets forth the terms and conditions under which the Department of Agriculture will exercise the authority granted to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to section 331(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981). That authority permits the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with private attorneys and use Department of Agriculture attorneys for legal services necessary to prosecute and defend any claims arising under subsection (b)(5) of section 331 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981), concerning farmer program loans made by the Farmers Home Administration.

This directive permits, subject to the conditions set forth below, foreclosure, deficiency

judgment, and debt collection litigation by private contract attorneys arising from Farmers Home Administration farmer program loans and loan guarantees made pursuant to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, 7 U.S.C. 1921 *et seq.* (hereinafter referred to as "actions"). The Department of Agriculture will refer all other matters arising under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, including all matters in bankruptcy, claims of fraud, and appellate proceedings to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice will prosecute such referrals expeditiously, and may, in its discretion, with the Department of Agriculture's concurrence, refer any action back to the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture agrees that the decision to contract with private attorneys for prosecution of actions will be made only upon its determination that (a) the private attorney will provide competent and cost-effective legal representation and (b) representation by the private attorney will accelerate or improve the process by which the actions are brought to conclusion.

Thirty days prior to initiating the process to contract with a private attorney for prosecution of actions, the Department of Agriculture will inform the appropriate United States Attorney of the intent to contract and the basis for such decision.

Prior to referral by the Department of Agriculture of any action to a private attorney, or Department of Agriculture attorney, the Department of Agriculture shall notify the Department of Justice. The Department of Agriculture shall require that the private counsel or Department of Agriculture attorney promptly provide to the appropriate United States Attorney copies of all significant pleadings, motions, memoranda, orders, and opinions filed in State or Federal court.

Should any legal or policy issue of general importance to the Government arise that pertains to the conduct of actions under this agreement, the Department of Agriculture will ensure that the private contract attorneys or Department of Agriculture attorneys are made aware of guidance issued by the Department of Justice.

If the Department of Justice determines that the interests of the Government are better served through representation by the Department of Justice because there exist any significant factors, such as counterclaims, claims for equitable relief, multiple Federal agency interests, or significant legal or factual issues, of major importance to the Government, the Department of Agriculture will promptly withdraw the action from private counsel or the Department of Agriculture attorney and refer the action to the Department of Justice, for expeditious disposition. The Department of Agriculture will reserve the right to withdraw any case from the control of a private attorney.

The Department of Agriculture will fulfill its obligations under this directive through its Office of General Counsel. The Department of Justice will fulfill its obligations under this directive through the Civil Division or such other office as the Attorney General may direct.

The Department of Agriculture will provide to the Department of Justice a quarterly report tracking the status of all actions within the scope of this directive being pursued by the Department of Agriculture attorneys and private contract attorneys, including summary statistics to permit evaluation of this directive.

The Department of Justice will provide to the Department of Agriculture a quarterly report tracking the status of all actions within the scope of this directive being pursued by the Department of Justice, including summary statistics to permit evaluation of this directive.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 12.

Teleconference on Community Policing Grants and an Exchange With Reporters

May 12, 1994

The President. Mayor Archer?

Mayor Dennis Archer. Mr. President, how are you, sir?

The President. Mayor Peters?

Mayor Mike Peters. Yes, how are you?

The President. Mayor Darrah?

Mayor Joan Darrah. Yes, President.

The President. And Mayor Campbell?

Mayor Bill Campbell. Hello, Mr. President, how are you?

The President. I'm fine. I'm here with the Attorney General, who's also on another phone right here with me.

Attorney General Janet Reno. Good morning.

The President. We want to congratulate all of you for working so hard to make your communities safer. I'm proud to announce today, as all of you know, that the four of you, along with the leaders of 142 other cities, counties, and towns all across this country, will get a downpayment on this administration's pledge to put another 100,000 police officers on the street.

I want to specifically note some Members of Congress who are not on the phone call but whose districts have winners: Congressman John Lewis, Congresswoman Barbara-Rose Collins, Congressman John Conyers, and Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly, all of whom have worked closely with us on this initiative.

The Justice Department received applications from nearly 3,000 communities in every State and territory for these community policing grants and awarded them now to more than 200 cities and towns. It's obvious that communities all across the country are coming to the conclusion that if they have more police officers on the street who are properly trained and properly deployed, we can drive the crime rate down and make our people safer. That is at the heart of this administration's crime bill and has been at the heart of our strategy from the beginning. When I ran for President, I pledged to do my best to break gridlock and pass the most sweeping, effective, and comprehensive crime bill in history and that that bill would include 100,000 new police officers.

Now, the bills have passed both the House and the Senate; they're going to conference. Especially with the courageous passage of the assault weapons ban by the House last week, I think you can feel comfortable that all those officers are on the way. This program, as I said, is our downpayment. And we're very encouraged about it.

The American people have waited for this bill long enough. And I do want to take this opportunity in talking with you to say that it is imperative that we not let politics any more delay for one day the passage of this crime bill. We have got to get the House and the Senate together and go through with it. And I want to urge you, even as we celebrate your winning these awards for these new police officers, to urge you to keep pressing the Congress to push forward.

Freedom from violence and freedom from fear are essential to maintaining not only personal freedom but a sense of community in this country. And I think now we have the best chance at forging a bipartisan consensus for dynamic, aggressive, and sustained efforts to bring the crime rate down that we have ever had. And that is in no small measure due to all of you.

So I thank you for what you've done. I congratulate you on your award today, but I urge you to help us pass the crime bill so that we can continue to put the police officers out, do something about the weapons, do something about prevention, do something about punishment.

I want to ask now the Attorney General to say a few things, and then I'd like to hear from each of you.

General Reno.

[*At this point, the Attorney General and Mayor Archer of Detroit, MI, made brief remarks supporting the community policing initiative and the pending crime legislation. Mayor Archer commended the President on his efforts to ban assault weapons and conveyed greetings from President Carter, who was visiting Detroit.*]

The President. That's great. Well, you tell him, first of all, I enjoyed being with him last week. And I thank him and President Ford and Presi-

dent Reagan for the work they did on the assault weapons ban. And tell him that I'm going to be calling him in a day or two.

[*Mayor Peters of Hartford, CT, Mayor Darrah of Stockton, CA, and Mayor Campbell of Atlanta, GA, made brief remarks supporting the community policing grants and the pending crime legislation.*]

The President. Well, thank you, Mayor. I just want to point out, you know, when you and I talked last week, we emphasized that it's not just important to have more people, it's important to do the right things with them. And I know that you will do that. I know the other mayors will.

I think we also need to hammer home the message that we all believe that we can have substantial reductions in the crime rate. We believe that the streets of America can be made safer again. That is the ultimate objective of all these initiatives, to allow the American people to live in safety and security and freedom with a real sense that we're part of a community again, that we don't have to be afraid of each other. And I am convinced it can be done. And we're going to do what we can here, knowing that grassroots leaders like you have to make the difference.

General Reno, do you have anything to say?

Attorney General Reno. No. Just amen. [*Laughter*]

The President. Have a great day. Thank you. Goodbye.

Mayors. Goodbye.

Supreme Court Nominee

Q. President Clinton, have you decided on your Supreme Court nominee, will you announce today, and who is it?

The President. Well, you won't have to wait much longer. When I have a decision, I will announce it. But let me answer—there was a question earlier. There was an interesting comment in the paper today by a—I'm sorry, I don't remember the gentleman's name, but an expert on this whole process who pointed out that the most important thing is for the President to appoint someone that the President feels very good about and a high level of confidence in. I know that this has now become the most pressing story in the Capital. But this is really a story that will have implications for years, indeed, perhaps for decades to come.

I think one of the benefits, and perhaps one of the burdens, the American people got when I was elected President is that I believe I know a lot about this issue, and I care a lot about it. I used to teach constitutional law. This is not a decision I can defer to aides, even though I have been well assisted in this and I appreciate it. So I am going to attempt to do what I did last time, even against all the pressure of time deadlines, and that's to make a really good decision that I feel good about.

I think that I did that with Judge Ginsburg. The Attorney General advised me on that issue, and I appreciate her advice. And she's given me some advice this time, and I appreciate that. But you won't have to wait much longer. And when I do it, it will be something that I'm convinced will be good for the United States for a long time to come. And if it takes just a little time to work through these questions that I have, then it's worth doing.

Q. Does that mean you just haven't reached a decision yet?

The President. It means just what I said. When I have something to announce, I will announce it. On these matters, I tend to keep my own counsel more than on other things. I think it is the right thing to do. It is one of the few things that the President just does on his own, of course ultimately with the advice and the consent of the Senate. I'm going to do my best to do a good job with it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:14 p.m. from the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Statement on the Death of Lewis Puller
May 12, 1994

I am saddened by the death of my friend Lewis Puller, who served his country with honor and distinction. As the son of America's most decorated Marine veteran of World War II and a winner of the Pulitzer Prize for his moving story of his personal struggle, "Fortunate Son," Lewis Puller was a true American hero. His death reminds us all of the grief that still haunts so many of America's veterans today, of the wounds that never heal, and the loved ones left behind.

My most memorable moment with Lewis was on Memorial Day a year ago at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, when he appeared at that ceremony unexpectedly and wheeled himself up next to me on the platform. I want his wife, Toddy, and his children, Lewis and Maggie, to know that it was an honor for me to be by his side on that day, and as Memorial Day approaches again, Lewis will hold a special place in my thoughts and prayers.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Convention and Protocols on Conventional Weapons Restrictions
May 12, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects (the Convention), and two accompanying Protocols on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I) and on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II). Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Convention and its Protocols.

The Convention was concluded at Geneva on October 10, 1980, was signed by the United States on April 8, 1982, and entered into force on December 2, 1983. More than 30 countries have become Party to the Convention. It constitutes a modest but significant humanitarian effort to protect the victims of armed conflict from the effects of particular weapons. It will supplement prohibitions or restrictions on the use of weapons contained in existing treaties and customary international law, including the prohibition on the use in war of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the Geneva Protocol of June 17, 1925. It will provide a basis for effective controls on the widespread and indiscriminate use of landmines, which have caused widespread civilian casualties in recent conflicts.

The Convention and its Protocols restrict, for humanitarian reasons, the use in armed conflicts of three specific types of conventional weapons. Protocol I prohibits the use of weapons that rely on fragments not detectable by X-rays. Protocol II regulates the use of landmines and similar devices for the purpose of reducing the danger to the civilian population caused by the indiscriminate use of such weapons, and prohibits certain types of booby-traps. Protocol III restricts the use of incendiary weapons in populated areas.

The United States signed the Convention on April 8, 1982. Since then, it has been subject to detailed interagency reviews. Based on these reviews, I have concluded that the United States should become a Party to the Convention and to its Protocols I and II. As described in the report of the Secretary of State, there are concerns about the acceptability of Protocol III from a military point of view that require further examination. I therefore recommend that in the meantime the United States exercise its right under Article 4 of the Convention to accept only Protocols I and II.

I believe that United States ratification of the Convention and its Protocols I and II will underscore our commitment to the principle that

belligerents must refrain from weapons or methods of warfare that are inhumane or unnecessary from a military standpoint. I am also mindful of the strong sense of the Congress that the Convention should be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, as evidenced in section 1365 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (October 23, 1992, Public Law 102–484) and section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (November 30, 1993, Public Law 103–160).

More specifically, by becoming Party, we will encourage the observance by other countries of restrictions on landmines and other weapons that U.S. Armed Forces and those of our allies already observe as a matter of humanity, common sense, and sound military doctrine. The United States will be able to take the lead in negotiating improvements to the Mines Protocol so as to deal more effectively with the immense threat to the civilian population caused by the indiscriminate use of those weapons. It will strengthen our efforts to encourage adoption of a moratorium on export of all anti-personnel landmines.

I therefore recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention and its Protocols I and II and give its advice and consent to ratification subject to the conditions contained in the report of the Department of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 12, 1994.

Remarks at the Gallaudet University Commencement Ceremony
May 13, 1994

Thank you. Thank you so much for the warm reception and for the honorary degree.

I must tell you at the beginning that I have been deeply moved by the wonderful statements of your students, Jeanette and Andre. I think they have already said everything I could hope to say as well or better. And I wish only that I could say it to you in their language as well.

I'm delighted to be here with Dr. Jordan, whom I have admired so much, and Dr. Anderson, a native of my home State; with my great friend and your champion, Senator Tom Harkin; with many Members of Congress, including Major Owens, who will receive an honorary degree, Congressman David Bonior, Congressman Steve Gunderson, and your own Representative in Congress, Eleanor Holmes Norton.

I honor, too, here the presence of those in the disability rights community, the members of our own administration, but most of all, you the class of 1994, your families, and your friends. You have come to this extraordinary moment in your own life at a very special moment in the life of your country and what it stands for.

Everywhere, nations and peoples are struggling to move toward the freedom and democracy that we take for granted here. Our example is now over 200 years old, but it continues to be a powerful magnet, pulling people toward those noble goals. This week we all watched in wonder as a former prisoner stood shoulder to shoulder with his former guards to become President of a free and democratic South Africa.

Yet each day, across the globe from Bosnia to Rwanda and Burundi, and here in America in neighborhood after neighborhood, we wonder whether peace and progress will win out over the divisions of race and ethnicity, of region and religion, over the impulse of violence to conquer virtue. Each day we are barraged in the news as mutual respect and the bonds of civility are broken down a little more here at home and around the world.

It is not difficult to find in literature today many who suggest that there are large numbers of your generation who feel a sense of pessimism about the future. People in my generation worry about that. They worry whether young people will continue to try to change what is wrong, continue to take responsibility for the hard work of renewing the American community.

I wish everyone who is worried about America could see your faces today and could have heard your class speakers today. Our whole history and

our own experience in this lifetime contradict the impulse to pessimism. For those who believe that nothing can change, I say, look at the experience of Rabin and Arafat as the police representing the Palestinians begin to move into Gaza and to Jericho. For those who proclaim there is no future for racial harmony and no hope in our common humanity, I say, look at the experience of Mandela and de Klerk. For those who believe that in the end people are so vulnerable to their own weakness they will not have the courage to preserve democracy and freedom, I say, look to the south of our borders where today, of almost 3 dozen nations in Latin America, all but two are ruled by democratically elected leaders.

Here at home, with all of our terrible problems, for every act of craven violence, there are 100 more acts of kindness and courage. To be sure, the work of building opportunity and community, of maintaining freedom and renewing America's hope in each and every generation is hard. And it requires of each generation a real commitment to our values, to our institutions, and to our common destiny.

The students of Gallaudet University who have struggled so mightily, first for simple dignity and then for equal opportunity, you have built yourselves, and in the process you have built for the rest of us, your fellow citizens of this country and the world, a much better world. You have regiven to all of us our hope. Gallaudet is a national treasure.

It is fitting, as Dr. Anderson said, that President Lincoln granted your charter because he understood better than others the sacrifices required to preserve a democracy amid diversity. And ultimately, Lincoln gave his life to the cause of renewing our national life. He signed your first charter in the midst of the Civil War where he had the vision to see not just farmland and a tiny school but the fact that we could use education to tear down the walls between us, to touch and improve lives and lift the spirits of those who for too long had been kept down.

Over the years, pioneers have built Gallaudet, sustained by generations of students and faculty, committed to the richness and possibility of the deaf community and the fullness of the American dream. This school stands for the renewal that all America needs today.

Lincoln's charter was an important law. But let me refer to another great president to make an equally important point, that just as important as laws are the attitudes that animate our approach to one another. The president I'm referring to is your president, King Jordan. When the Americans with Disabilities Act passed, he said, and I quote, "We now stand at the threshold of a new era for all Americans, those of us with disabilities and those of us without." He went on to say that in this pursuit, as in every pursuit of democracy, our task is to reach out and to educate each other about our possibilities, our capabilities, and who we are.

I ran for President because I thought we were standing on the threshold of a new era, just as President Jordan says. I felt we were in danger of coming apart when we ought to be coming together, of arguing too much about going left or right, when we ought to be holding hands and going forward into the future together. I grew weary of hearing people predict that my own daughter's generation would be the first generation of Americans to do less well than their parents. I was tired of hearing people say that our country's best days were behind us. I didn't believe it in 1992, and I sure don't believe it after being here with you today.

My responsibilities to you and your generation are significant. That's why all of us have worked hard to restore the economy, to reward work, to bring down the deficit, to increase our trade with other nations, to create more jobs; why we've worked to empower all Americans to compete and win in a global economy through early education and lifetime training and learning, through reforming the college loan program to open the doors of college to all Americans; why we have worked to strengthen the family through the Family and Medical Leave Act; why we have worked to create a safer America with the Brady bill and the ban on assault weapons and putting more police on the street and punishing more and preventing more crime as well.

But I say to you that, in the end, America is a country that has always been carried by its citizens, not its Government. The Government is a partner, but the people, the people realize the possibility of this country and ensure its continuation from generation to generation.

I think there is no better symbol of this than the program which I hope will be the enduring legacy of our efforts to rebuild the American community, the national service program. Six Gallaudet students, including four members of this class, will be part of our national service program, AmeriCorps' very first class of 20,000

volunteers. I am very proud of you for giving something back to your country.

By joining the Conservation Corps and committing yourselves to rebuild our Nation, by exercising your freedom and your responsibility to give something back to your country and earning something for education in return, you have embodied the renewal that America must seek. As King Jordan reminded us, Government can make good laws, and we need them. But it can't make good people. In the end, it's our values and our attitudes that make the difference. Having those values and attitudes and living by them is everyone's responsibility and our great opportunity.

Look at the changes which have occurred through that kind of effort. Because previous generations refused to be denied a place at the table simply because others thought they were different, the world is now open to those of you who graduate today. Most of you came here knowing you could be doctors, entrepreneurs, software engineers, lawyers, or cheerleaders—[*laughter*]—because over the years, others spoke up for you and gave you a chance to move up. And you have clearly done your part. You have made a difference. You have believed in broadening the unique world you share with each other by joining it to the community at large and letting the rest of us in on your richness, your hearts, your minds, and your possibilities. For that, we are all in your debt.

Perhaps the greatest moment in the history of this university occurred in 1988 when the community came together and said, "We will no longer accept the judgment of others about our lives and leadership in this university; these are our responsibilities, and we accept the challenge." In days, what was known as the "Deaf President Now" movement changed the way our entire country looks at deaf people. The Nation watched as you organized and built a movement of conscience unlike any other. You removed barriers of limited expectations, and our Nation saw that deaf people can do anything hearing people can, but hear.

That people's movement was a part of the American disability rights movement. Just 2 months after King Jordan took office, the Americans with Disabilities Act was introduced with the leadership of many, including my friend Tom Harkin. In 2 years it became law and proved once again that the right cause can unite us. Over partisanship and prejudice we can still come together. For the now more than 49 million Americans who are deaf or disabled, the signing of the ADA was the most important legal event in history. For almost a billion persons with disabilities around the world, it stands as a symbol of simple justice and inalienable human rights.

I believe that being deaf or having any disability is not tragic, but the stereotypes attached to it are tragic. Discrimination is tragic. Not getting a job or having the chance to reach your God-given potential because someone else is handicapped by prejudice or fear is tragic. It must not be tolerated, because none of us can afford it. We need each other, and we do not have a person to waste.

The ADA is part of the seamless web of civil rights that so many have worked for so long to build in America, a constant fabric wrapped in the hopes and aspirations of all right-thinking Americans. As your President, I pledge to see that it is fully implemented and aggressively enforced in schools, in the workplace, in Government, in public places. It is time to move from exclusion to inclusion, from dependence to independence, from paternalism to empowerment.

I mention briefly now only two of the many tasks still before me as your President and you as citizens. Our health care system today denies or discriminates in coverage against 81 million Americans who are part of families with what we call preexisting conditions, including Americans with disabilities. It must be changed. If we want to open up the workplace and if we are serious about giving every American the chance to live up to his or her potential, then we cannot discriminate against which workers get health care and how much it costs. If you can do the job, you ought to be able to get covered. It's as a simple as that. And that simple message is one I implore you to communicate to the Congress. We have fooled around for 60 years. Your time has come. You are ready. You are leaving this university. You want a full, good life and you do not wish to be discriminated against on health care grounds. Pass health care reform in 1994.

The last thing I wish to say that faces us today also affects your future. The Vice President has worked very hard on what is called the information superhighway. We know that America is working hard to be the technological leader of the information age. The technologies in which we are now investing will open up

vast new opportunities to all of our people. But information, which will be education, which will be employment, which will be income, which will be possibility, must flow to all Americans on terms of equal accessibility without regard to physical condition. And we are committed to doing that.

Finally, let me just say a very personal word. A few days ago when we celebrated Mother's Day, it was my first Mother's Day without my mother. And so I have been thinking about what I should say to all of you, those of you who are lucky enough still to have your parents and perhaps some of you who do not. On graduation, it is important for us to remember that none of us ever achieves anything alone. I dare say, as difficult as your lives have been, you are here today not only because of your own courage and your own effort but because someone loved you and believed in you and helped you along the way. I hope today that you will thank them and love them and, in so doing, remember that all across this country perhaps our biggest problem is that there are too many children, most of whom can hear just fine, who never hear the kind of love and support that every person needs to do well. And we must commit ourselves to giving that to those children.

So I say, there may be those who are pessimistic about our future. And all of us should be realistic about our challenges. I used to say that I still believed in a place called Hope, the little town in which I was born. Today I say, I know the future of this country will be in good hands because of a place called Gallaudet. For 125 years, young people have believed in themselves, their families, their country, and their future with the courage to dream and the willingness to work to realize those dreams. You have inspired your President today, and a generation. And I say to you, good luck and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Jeanette Anne Pereira and Andre Laurent Thibeault, students; I. King Jordan, president; and Glenn B. Anderson, chairman, board of trustees, Gallaudet University.

Remarks Announcing the Nomination of Stephen G. Breyer To Be a Supreme Court Associate Justice and an Exchange With Reporters

May 13, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. Today I am proud to nominate Judge Stephen Breyer to serve on the United States Supreme Court.

I believe a President can best serve our country by nominating a candidate for the Supreme Court whose experience manifests the quality in a Justice that matters most, excellence: excellence in knowledge, excellence in judgment, excellence in devotion to the Constitution, to the country, and to the real people. It is a duty best exercised wisely and not in haste.

I have reflected on this decision now for the last several weeks, about 37 days. I have been well served by the White House Counsel, Lloyd Cutler, and the other members of our legal staff who have worked very hard, by our Chief of Staff, Mr. McLarty, who's kept the process going in an orderly way, and by others who worked on it. We have worked hard to achieve the pursuit of excellence. In that pursuit, I came again to Judge Breyer, who serves today, as most of you know, as the chief judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the first circuit. And I will nominate him to be the Supreme Court's 108th Justice.

Without dispute, he is one of the outstanding jurists of our age. He has a clear grasp of the law, a boundless respect for the constitutional and legal rights of the American people, a searching and restless intellect, and a remarkable ability to explain complex subjects in understandable terms. He has proven that he can build an effective consensus and get people of diverse views to work together for justice's sake. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Stanford, a graduate of Oxford University, a magna cum laude graduate of the Harvard Law School. He served the late Justice Goldberg as a law clerk, spent 2 years in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, and served as chief counsel

of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, where he had the opportunity to work with Senators of both parties.

Judge Breyer has had a private law practice, has written dozens of scholarly articles, published in distinguished law reviews and legal texts. And he's been a member of the Federal Sentencing Commission. For more than a decade he served with true distinction on the U.S. Court of Appeals in the First Circuit. His writings in areas ranging from the interpretation of legislation and analysis of the sentencing guidelines to the underpinnings, regulation, and the interplay of economics and the law reveal a keen and vital mind. His record displays a thirst for justice. His career personifies both public service and patriotism.

As you know, I had a wealth of talent to choose from in making this nomination. In addition to Judge Breyer, whom I considered very seriously for this position the last time I had a Supreme Court appointment, I'd like to take just a moment to comment on two of the gentlemen who made this decision a difficult one for me.

Secretary Babbitt was attorney general and Governor of his State, and during that time, a colleague of mine. He was a candidate for the Presidency in a race which everyone acknowledged raised the serious and substantive issues of the day. He has been a very effective Secretary of the Interior for me, one of the most sensitive, complex, and difficult posts in this administration. He would bring to the Court the responsibility and discipline of service in public life. He would bring a feel for law at the State level and, most important perhaps, for life at the grassroots. Although I know he would be a good addition, indeed, a superb addition to the Court, frankly, I came to the same conclusion I have every time I've thought about him: I couldn't bear to lose him from the Cabinet, from his service at Interior, from his service as an adviser to me and a vital and leading member of our domestic policy team.

Judge Richard Arnold, the chief judge of the eighth circuit, has been a friend of mine for a long time. I have the greatest respect for his intellect, for his role as a jurist, and for his extraordinary character. I think a measure of the devotion and the admiration in which he is held is evidenced by the fact that somewhere around 100 judges, one-eighth of the entire Federal bench, wrote me endorsing his candidacy for the Supreme Court. But as has been widely reported in the press, Judge Arnold has cancer and is now undergoing a course of treatment. I have every confidence that that treatment will be successful. And if I am fortunate enough to have other opportunities to make appointments to the Court, I know I will be able to consider Judge Arnold at the top of the list.

Five decades ago, Judge Learned Hand defined the spirit of liberty as the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women, the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own bias, the spirit which lies hidden in the aspirations of us all. When our citizens hear about Judge Breyer's nomination and learn about his background and beliefs, I believe they will join me in saying, here is someone touched by that spirit of liberty, who believes in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, who is graced with the intellectual capacity and the good judgment a Supreme Court Justice ought to have, and whose background and temperament clearly qualify him to be an outstanding Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

So I will send his nomination to the Senate for confirmation with great pride and high hopes.

Q. Mr. President, you have forgone the opportunity to name someone with greater political experience, such as Secretary Babbitt. What makes you think that Judge Breyer will be able to reshape the Court or forge a new consensus——

The President. No, I think, Judge Breyer actually has quite a lot of political savvy, and I would say two things. First of all, as you know, when I talked about Senator Mitchell, I would not have offered the position to Senator Mitchell if he were running for reelection and were willing to stay as majority leader of the Senate. And I felt the same way in the end about Secretary Babbitt. I mean, here's a man that is dealing with issues of incredible magnitude, especially in the West, a very important part of our country. And so I just couldn't bear to think about that.

And then, the more I thought about Steve Breyer and the time I spent with him last time I had a vacancy on the Court, the more I realized he had proved that he had the kind of political capacity and judgment we need because he'd been exposed to the full range of issues working here as the chief of staff of the Senate

Judiciary Committee. He obviously has a lot of political skills because of his reputation as a consensus builder on a court where most of the appointees were made by Republican Presidents. And look at the people supporting his nomination. I mean, he's gotten Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch together. I wish I had that kind of political skill. [*Laughter*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]—between two others who might not be as easy to confirm enter into your selection process?

The President. No. I'm convinced all three of them would have been handily confirmed. I know—I mean, I've heard all this, but I'm convinced all three of them would have been handily confirmed. I have no doubt about it whatever. And I spent quite a lot of time on that.

Q. Mr. President, in the end, why do you think that there was so much—maybe it's our fault as much as it is your aides' fault—so much confusion in which direction you were leaning? Earlier in the week we thought that Secretary Babbitt had the best choice. Then later, it was Judge Arnold. Now, of course, you've made your decision.

The President. Because you all didn't talk to me. When we have these appointments that only I make, especially if it's something where, with all respect to my aides, I think I know as much or more about it as they do. And I told you all, they worked hard for me, and they did a wonderful job. There's an enormous amount of work to do, but—one of the best jobs I ever had was teaching the Constitution of the United States to law students. I care a lot about the Supreme Court. I read people's opinions. I read articles. I read letters that people send me about prospective candidates. I think about this a lot, and I care very deeply about it. And I was going to take whatever time I had to take to think this through.

In the course of those conversations with my staff, I always try to take, when we get down to the finals, where I'm down to three or four folks, I try to take every strong suit I can about a candidate and work through it, every weakness and we work through it.

But I think, you know, on these Supreme Court cases—we may never get another appointment, but if I get another one you're just going to have to ride along with me because in the end, I'm going to make the decision. I'm going to do what I think is right.

But I've told you what happened today. All three of them had a great claim. I couldn't bear to lose Bruce Babbitt. With Judge Arnold, I think we have to have the progress of his health ultimately resolved. He is a magnificent man, and I think a lot of the stated opposition to him was based on a misunderstanding and was flat wrong. And I would have been happy to defend him against all comers from now to doomsday. But I think I have done the right thing by my country with this appointment, and I feel very good about it.

Q. Mr. President, when you look at the mark that you want to leave on the Court, what specifically does Judge Breyer bring to the Court?

The President. I think he brings three things that I think are important, besides the ability to get people together and work with them. I think he brings, one, a real devotion to the Bill of Rights and to the idea that personal freedoms are important to the American people. And I think he will strike the right balance between the need for discipline and order, being firm on law enforcement issues but really sticking in there for the Bill of Rights and for the issue of personal freedoms. You know, this country got started by people who wanted a good letting alone from Government. And every time we think about doing anything around here, we have to recognize that Americans have always had a healthy skepticism about Government reaching into their lives. I think he understands that.

The second thing I think he understands is the practical implications of governmental actions that the Court may have to review. I know that some of his writings have been a little bit controversial in some quarters in analyzing the economic impacts of governmental actions and things of that kind. But I think that he shows that he really understands that.

The third thing that I think he can do is cut through the incredible complexities that surround so many of the issues that we're confronted with in our world today and render them simple, clear, and understandable, not only—first of all, to himself, secondly, to his colleagues, and thirdly, to the American people. I think it is important that the American people have confidence in the Supreme Court and feel that somehow it is accessible to them. And I

believe that Judge Breyer will do a good job of that.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Nomination for the Department of Education
May 13, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Gilberto M. Moreno as Assistant Secretary of the Education Department's Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs. He also named officials to four other positions at the Department of Education. They are: Maria S. Mercado, Region II Representative; Patricia H. Parisi, Region II Deputy Representative; Trini Garza, Region VI Deputy Representative; and Suzanne G. Ramos, Region IX Deputy Representative.

"These individuals will bring to the Federal Government and the Education Department a wealth of experience in education and public service," the President said. "Their talents and expertise will advance a strong community outreach and interagency communication program within the Education Department."

In commenting on the nominee for Assistant Secretary, the President said, "Gilberto Moreno will complement the excellent team of senior officials at the Education Department who have already helped us achieve so much in the way of education reform."

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

The President's Radio Address
May 14, 1994

Good morning. This week we're reminded once again that miracles are born of hope. Seven thousand miles from our shores, in a land divided for over 300 years by the most pervasive form of racial hatred and violence, blacks and whites participated in free elections that elevated Nelson Mandela to the Presidency of South Africa.

Democracy's triumph in that distant land owes much to our own history and our own people. For over two centuries we have led the world by example, showing how human beings of different complexions, ethnic origins, and religious beliefs can come together under the great umbrella of freedom.

Yet, ironically, as we hear the call of liberty sound around the world, we find our own freedoms tested here at home, not by the enemies of totalitarianism and oppression but by those of cynicism, intolerance, incivility, and violence here at home.

Today I'm speaking to you from Mount Helm Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis, courtesy of WIBC Radio, not far from the site where Senator Robert Kennedy spoke in 1968 just moments after learning that Reverend Martin Luther King had been assassinated. On that awful night 26 years ago, Robert Kennedy beckoned Americans of all races to show compassion and wisdom in the face of violence and lawlessness. Many cities in America erupted in flames after Dr. King was killed, but here the citizens of Indianapolis heeded his call. Once again, it is time for us to heed those words, time to build up instead of tear down, time to renew our faith in freedom and to refurbish our own democracy.

During the next few weeks we'll be reminded of moments in our history like that one in April of 1968 when Americans joined together to overcome great challenges. On Tuesday, we'll celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which gave Americans of all races equal access to our Nation's public schools. A few weeks later, I'll travel to Europe to rep-

resent all Americans as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of D-Day, a day on which we thank an entire generation for risking their lives so that democracy would not fall victim to tyranny.

Celebrating these great occasions is important, but not enough. The pride we feel as Americans must inspire us to renew the society we live in today. It must inspire us to overcome racial, social, and political divisions and the sheer weight of violence that threaten the very freedoms we've worked so hard to secure. After all, our Nation's motto is, *E Pluribus Unum*—out of many, one.

That's why our administration has worked hard to restore our economy, to reward work by bringing down the deficit and increasing investment and trade and creating more jobs; why we've worked hard to empower all our people to compete and win in a global economy through lifetime education programs; why we've worked to strengthen our families through the Family and Medical Leave Act, tougher enforcement of child support orders, tax breaks for lower income working families with children; why we've worked to bring our diverse culture together with the most diverse and excellent national administration in history and a real commitment to our civil rights laws; and why we're working so hard to create a safer America with the Brady bill and the crime bill now before Congress, with its ban on assault weapons, it's 100,000 more police officers, its more punishment and more prevention to give our young people something to say yes to.

But in the end, all our progress as a nation depends more on the attitudes and the values of our citizens than by the actions of our Government. In Washington, DC, recently, the residents of a local housing project became so fed up with drug dealers and gangs that they put up a big fence around the complex and stationed guards at the entrances to keep unwanted visitors at bay. In other words, poor people in a housing project did what a lot of wealthy Americans have been doing in their neighborhoods for some time. Now their children can play on the lawn again, and people can visit each other on outdoor benches. One resident called it the freedom of the nineties. Well, I applaud that community for refusing to give in to criminals who tyrannize the neighborhoods with their guns and took their children's freedom away.

But I wonder what it says about our country and our democracy when freedom has come to mean that we barricade our children from the outside world in order to protect them from harm, that we install floodlights and foot patrols in the backyards of our homes to feel secure. That isn't the kind of freedom our Forefathers conceived of 200 years ago, not the kind of freedom that Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy gave their lives for, not the kind of freedom that Nelson Mandela dreams of in a land newly introduced to democracy and looking to us for support.

As we reflect on the recent events in South Africa and celebrate times of renewal in our own history, let each of us find within ourselves the courage to overcome old animosities that get in freedom's way. And I hope each of us will find a reservoir of hope deep inside that will help to lead our Nation to a brighter and better future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. from the Mount Helm Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis, IN.

Remarks at the Groundbreaking Ceremony for the Landmark for Peace Memorial in Indianapolis, Indiana

May 14, 1994

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, now we're all being tested by a little rain. Those of us who grew up in farming areas know that rain is a gift from God. It's going to help us all grow a little.

Let me say how honored I am to be back in Indianapolis with your Governor, your mayor, the prosecutor who supported this fine project. I'm glad to be here with Congressman Jacobs and the other Members of Congress and with Senator Lugar, who was the mayor here that

fateful night in April in 1968 so long ago. I thank Mrs. Kennedy and Senator Kennedy and Martin and Dexter King for coming here, as well as others from Indiana that came down with me, Congressman Roemer, Congressman McCloskey, Congressman Lee Hamilton.

Let me tell you, folks, even in the rain I can say in a much more brief manner what I would have taken longer to say if it hadn't been raining, and it is this: I sought the Presidency because I was inspired by what you just saw on that screen when I was a young man, and I believed we could do better. I believed that we could build a country where we would go forward instead of backward and where we would go forward together, where people would deal with one another across the bounds of race and region and income and religion and even different political parties and philosophies with respect and honor, to try to pull this country together and push our people forward.

We just have witnessed a miracle in South Africa. We hope we are witnessing a miracle in the Middle East, as the Palestinians cheer and the police officers move into Jericho and they try to take control of their own destiny.

Everywhere in the world people have looked to us for an example. And I ask you today, have we created that miracle here at home? What you saw in Robert Kennedy's speech was a miracle that night. He was advised not to come here. The police said, we're worried about your safety. Cities all over America erupted in flames when Dr. King was killed. But a miracle occurred here in Indianapolis. The city did not burn because the people's hearts were touched. Miracles begin with personal choices.

Yes, I would like to say to you, the things I can do as your President to create jobs, to empower people through education, to reform the welfare system, to give health care to all Americans, to pass this crime bill, these things will change America. Oh, yes, they will. But in the end, America must be changed by you, in your hearts, in your lives every day on every street in this country. And you can do it.

In our Nation's Capital, just a few days ago, there was a news story about people living in a poor neighborhood who got sick and tired of seeing their children shot and living in fear, so they put a big fence up around their neighborhood. And they hired guards, just like they were rich folks in a planned development. And they got exactly the same result: people could go outside and sit on the park benches, and the children could walk and play. And one of the men was interviewed. He said, "I guess this is freedom in the nineties." Is it freedom in the nineties when we have to put up walls between our own people even as we celebrate the walls coming down from Berlin to South Africa? Is that our freedom? Are we going to live in a time when all of our political dialog becomes a shouting match? You heard what Diane said. That's absolutely true. "If you preach hate, you can get a talk show. If you preach love, you'll get a yawn."

What we have to decide today is whether we are going to live by the spirit that animates this park and this project. I want to thank the Indiana Pacers. I want to thank your prosecutor. I want to thank everybody who's responsible for this gun buy-back program. But when they melt that metal down and they make this statue to the memory of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, you ask yourselves, why don't we keep giving these guns up? Why don't we keep melting them down? Why don't we make a monument to peace where all of us can live together, not with walls coming up but with walls tearing down, so we can go forward together.

God bless you, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at the Martin Luther King Memorial Park. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Evan Bayh of Indiana; Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis; Jeffery Modisett, Marion County prosecutor; Ethel Kennedy, widow of Robert F. Kennedy; Martin Luther King III and Dexter King, sons of Martin Luther King, Jr.; and Diane Simon, wife of Indiana Pacers owner Herb Simon, whose team spearheaded the memorial project.

Remarks at the Democratic Governors Association Jefferson-Jackson Day Luncheon in Indianapolis

May 14, 1994

Thank you for that wonderful, rousing welcome. Thank you for your support of the Democratic Governors. And thank you, you folks here in Indiana, for your support of my good friends Evan and Susan Bayh.

You know, like Evan Bayh, when I was elected Governor of Arkansas, I was the youngest Governor in the country. Indeed, I was the youngest person elected in 40 years. Now 40 years before me, the person who was elected slightly younger than me was Harold Stassen—[*laughter*]—who later ran for President eight times. Which shows you that there may or may not be significance to being the youngest Governor in the country. [*Laughter*]

But nonetheless, when I met Evan Bayh, I really resented him. [*Laughter*] I mean, he was so young and handsome, and I realized I'd never be that young again, I'd never look that good again. Come to think of it, I still sort of resent him for that. [*Laughter*] When we play golf he hits the ball longer than I do. When we come in, he graciously fabricates the truth and tells people that I won when I didn't. Then he puts the burden on me to try to correct it. Occasionally, I do. [*Laughter*] I really admire Governor Bayh and his wife and his whole administration and all the people who have done so much to change Indiana.

I'd also like to thank your Members of Congress who came with me today: the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Lee Hamilton; Congressman Phil Sharp, who is retiring against my will, but who is going to be replaced by another good Democrat, Joe Hogsett; Congressman Frank McCloskey; Congressman Tim Roemer. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Andy Jacobs, who did so much to put over our assault weapons ban last week. I want to acknowledge your former Congressman and your nominee for the Senate, Jim Jontz, wish him well, and say a word of thanks to the other Democratic Governors who are here who have all been recognized but who were colleagues of mine in my former life when I was a Governor or, as my wife says, back when we had a life. [*Laughter*] Governor Mel Carnahan, Governor Ben Nelson, Governor Bruce Sundlun, and Governor Joan Finney. I thank them for their personal friendship and for their leadership. I want to thank Katie Whelan of the Democratic Governors Association and Ann DeLaney, the chair of the Democratic Party, her husband, Ed, Sally Kirkpatrick, Diane Simon, and all of you who did this today, this wonderful, wonderful lunch, thank you.

I feel almost like I don't have to say anything. I mean, I saw the movie and I heard everybody else's speech. [*Laughter*] It reminds me of the first time I got up to give a speech. This is a true story. In 1977, the first speech I ever gave as an elected official—I was an attorney general, I was 30 years old, I was sort of scared—I spoke to 500 people at the annual Rotary Club dinner in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. It was one of these deals where they installed officers and gave out awards, and all but three people who were there got introduced, and they went home mad. [*Laughter*]

The dinner started at 6:30 p.m., and I got up to speak at a quarter to 10 p.m. And the guy who introduced me was more nervous than I was—he later became a great friend of mine—but here is how the introduction to my first public address as an elected official started. He said, "You know, we could stop here and have had a very good evening." [*Laughter*] Now, he didn't mean it the way it came out. But I feel that way today. You could stop here and have had a wonderful meal, a wonderful celebration of our party and our prospects and our future.

I was glad to see the tribute paid to Evan Bayh and his leadership in Indiana. He proved some things about Democrats that the Republicans kept trying to deny in all their rhetoric and with all their media barrages. He proved that Democrats can govern in an austere fiscal climate by cutting spending and without raising taxes. He proved that Democrats understand the importance of jobs in the free enterprise system. And he has worked relentlessly to bring more jobs to this State. He understands the link between economic growth and education. Indiana's Step Ahead program is a real model for this country. The new Gateway Education standards

mirror what we're trying to do at the national level.

In 1988, he ended 20 years of Republican governance of the statehouse. The Democrats have come a long way since that election. When he was elected secretary of state, he was the only Democrat in statewide office. Republicans controlled both houses of the legislature, half the seats in Congress. Today, you've got five statewide elected officials, including your distinguished attorney general, the first African-American woman elected to statewide office in the history of this State. You have 7 of the 10 seats in Congress, and I hope after this next election, Mayor Mike Harmless will give us 8 of the 10 seats in Indiana.

I owe a lot to the years I spent as a Governor. Basically, I ran for President because I was tired of what I thought was the stale rhetoric in Washington, the incredible partisan gridlock, and the politics of division and diversion and often personal destruction, everybody arguing over left and right and liberal and conservative and how this process was and who was up and down and who was in and out. And people in this country were being lost in the whole process, and we were at risk of losing the American dream as we moved toward the 21st century.

I saw hard-working people, business people and laboring people, work hard in the 1980's to improve their productivity and to try to come to grips with the realities of the eighties and the economic competition of the world. I saw all these wonderful teachers and other people trying to revitalize education. I saw community leaders standing against the tide of rising violence and declining family structure to make good things happen.

I knew a lot of Members of Congress who were honest, good, honorable people who wanted to make a difference. And yet always, always, always, what we seemed to be getting out of our National Government was more politics and less performance.

I ran for a very simple reason: because I wanted to get this country moving again and I wanted to see the American people pull together again. I wanted us to go into the 21st century a strong, united, wonderful place, living up to our promise, our potential, our past, and our own ideals. And I was tired of reading all these prognostications that my daughter was going to grow up to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. And I believed we could do better.

I thought we could do it by organizing ourselves around three little words: opportunity for all Americans, responsibility from all Americans, and a belief that we are one community, that we really believe in our national motto, *E Pluribus Unum*, that we are one from many and that we are all in this together and that ultimately we will go up or down together.

I believed that if we followed those three little words in all of our policies and we looked at the real world, that we could find new ways to rebuild our families and our communities, to honor the American people who elect us all. I believed we could go beyond partisan gridlock. It's been, frankly, a little tougher than I thought it would be. And it's been even tougher to get the message to the American people that we are doing what we said we would do.

Last year, the Congress had the courage to pass an economic program which went beyond rhetoric to reality. It drove down the deficits; it drove down interest rates; it increased investment in critical areas. The Congress had the courage to take on a lot of tough trade issues. We did more to foster the expansion of global trade last year than in any single year in a generation. The Congress was willing to work with me to invest in new technologies and take the controls off exporting many of them in the aftermath of the cold war. And what has happened: 3 million jobs in the first 15 months of this administration, a million in the first 4 months of this year. I'll tell you, my fellow Americans, the other party talked a lot in Washington about delivering for the free enterprise system. They talked, but we delivered.

This week the Congress passed our budget for this year. A budget that, without new taxes, will increase funding for education, for training, for new technologies, for medical research, and still, for the first time since 1969, reduce overall domestic discretionary spending, along with defense reductions—for the first time since '69—by eliminating 100 Government programs and reducing 200 others. This will give us, for the first time since Harry Truman was President—and with all respect, when it had to happen at the end of World War II—3 years of declining deficits in a row, for the first time since the Truman Presidency. They talked about it; we delivered it.

The Vice President has led a path-breaking effort that we call reinventing Government to try to examine how we do things and how we can serve you better, how we can make Government less bureaucratic and act more quickly and push decisions down to the grassroots level. I'll just give you one example that you can find now if you need to apply for an SBA loan. We've got it down to a one-sheet form, and it takes 2 days to process. And I could give you 50 other examples like that if time permitted. Perhaps the most graphic example is this: Under our budget, we will reduce the size of the Federal Government not by firing people but by attrition, by 252,000 over a 5-year period, so that at the end of the period, the National Government will be below 2 million employees for the first time since 1960. And all of the savings will be put into a trust fund to pay for the crime bill—100,000 more police officers on the street. The other party always talked about reducing the size of Government and empowering people at the local level, but we have delivered. That is our job.

We are breaking new ground in education, developing a system of lifetime learning, helping the young people who don't go on to college but do need further training, lowering the cost of college loans and stringing out the repayments but toughening the collection procedures, so that we can open the doors of college education to everyone. You heard a little talk the other day—a few moments ago about our national service program. I think in so many ways that embodies what this administration is about: opportunity, responsibility, and community. Twenty thousand young people this year will be working in their communities in national service to revolutionize places where they live, to solve problems, and earning money for their education. And year after next we will have 100,000 young Americans doing that.

I'm proud of the work we have done to stand up for the American family. You heard on the film that wonderful woman talking in the Rose Garden about the problems they had been through because that family that you saw, speaking at the signing of the Family and Medical Leave Act, had been wrenched by a childhood illness and being forced to deal with the question of whether the parents would be with the children and lose their jobs or keep their jobs and not be with the children.

I think the most moving personal encounter I've had actually in the White House since I have been President occurred on an early Sunday morning when I came in from my run, and I noticed a family taking a tour, which is very rare on a Sunday morning at about 9 a.m. And I went over and shook hands with them. There was a father, a mother, three children, all girls. And it turned out that the child that was in a wheelchair was one of these Make-A-Wish children, a child with a very serious illness. And I asked them to excuse me, and I went up and changed clothes, came down with my uniform on so we could take a picture. And I was walking away, and all of a sudden this father grabbed me by the arm. And I turned around, and he said, "Let me tell you something, Mr. President," he said, "I imagine that a lot of days you think that the work you do up here really doesn't matter and doesn't affect people's lives. But," he said, "my little girl is desperately ill, and she's probably not going to make it. Because of the family leave law, I have been able to take some time off from my job to be with my child, without thinking that I am disadvantaging my wife and other two children by losing my job." And he said to me, "It's the most important experience of my life. And it would not have happened if it hadn't been for the family leave law. Don't ever think what you do here doesn't make a difference."

Folks, the family leave law was tied up in gridlock for 7 years. The Brady bill was tied up in gridlock for 7 years. The GATT treaty took 7 years to pass. The crime bill that the Congress is now in conference on has been tied up for 5 years. It is too long for Americans to wait while partisan differences get resolved and people's lives hang in the balance. We are trying to deliver for you up there.

Let me say we have had some support from the other party on some important initiatives, on national service, and I'm grateful for it; on the education bills, and I am grateful for it; on the crime bill, and I am grateful for it. Thirty-eight brave Republicans stood up with the Democrats the other day and voted on the assault weapons ban, and I am grateful for it. But the point I want to make to you is this: A lot of you probably didn't even know some of the things I have said because our national debate is so shrouded in this shrill, uncivil, diversionary rhetoric.

We are moving to break gridlock. But we also have to break the gridlock that is in people's minds. Because no matter what we do in the Government, very few of our specific actions will affect a majority of the American people. If you just take the welfare reform issue, for example, something I care deeply about, we're going to propose a remarkable welfare reform bill which will go with the other things we're doing to try to help people move from dependence to independence, lowering taxes for working people with modest incomes. This year, one in six working families will be eligible for a tax break so they can be successful workers and successful parents, and there will be no incentive to leave work and go to welfare.

Providing for health care for all Americans will mean that no one will want to stay on welfare just to get health coverage for their kids. One of the reasons that people don't leave welfare has nothing to do with the welfare check, it's because if you stay on welfare the Government will pay for your children's health care. If you get off welfare and you take a low-wage job with an employer that in today's market can't afford health insurance, you then pay taxes to pay for health care for people who didn't make the decision you did. That is not pro-family; it is not pro-work; it is not good policy.

We need a tax structure, a health care structure, a tough child support enforcement system, and an education and training system and ultimately a requirement that people work so that we can change this system as we know it. But to do it we have to know that we share values and we're trying to get this done because it's the right thing for our country, not because it will affect most of us, because most of us aren't on welfare.

That is the problem I face all the time, how rhetoric sometimes gets in the way of reality when we're up there trying to do things that I know embody the values of the people of this country and I know will give us a chance to move ahead. But I know ultimately we cannot prevail unless there is a new spirit among the American people, a new determination to change the way we evaluate politics and politicians and to change the way we live at the grassroots level. And let me just mention two issues.

The first is health care. My fellow Americans, we cannot ever—and you can book this—we cannot ever get control of the Federal deficit as long as the Government's health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid, are going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. We cannot hope to be fully competitive in a global economy as long as we spend 45 percent more of our national income on health care than any other country does.

Some of it is money well spent on medical research and new technologies and new drugs and the things that make us special. Some of it is money we have to spend because we're more violent than other countries. But a lot of it is money we spend because we are the only country that employs hundreds of thousands of people, literally, in doctors' offices, hospitals, insurance offices all across America to see who and what is not covered on the insurance policy. No one else does that. That adds tens of billions of dollars to our system.

Now, if this were easy to fix, somebody would have done it long ago. For 60 years Presidents have tried. Our system is based on—I mean, my plan is based on some simple ideas. And I don't ask everybody to agree with every detail, but it's based on some simple ideas. If 9 out of 10 people with insurance get it in the workplace and 8 out of 10 people without health insurance have somebody in their family that works and you want the system to be as private as possible, wouldn't the best thing be to say that people who haven't assumed any responsibility for themselves and their workers should assume some responsibility and should do their part as well? Because any student of the health care system will tell you, until you cover everybody, you're going to have massive cost-shiftings, you're going to have uncontrollable elements and costs in the system, and you're going to have abject unfairness. That's why I propose to extend the requirement of covering health care for everybody through employers and employees, not a Government mandate. It's a private system.

The second thing—what has been the objection to the health care thing? This is what I want to get at, what's happening to our national debate, because I want to talk about your responsibilities as citizens, one, in the national debate and, second, in action in the grassroots level. What's happened to the national debate? They say support for my plan has gone down. It has, under the weight of tens of millions of dollars of adverse efforts to try to convince you that it is a Government-run system, that

it is horrible for small business, that it is a mindless bureaucracy where crazy people will be making decisions for you. I've seen all these ads. [*Laughter*]

Now the truth is—and I've read some of the letters that have gone out—the truth is quite different. The truth is, it's private insurance, private providers. The Government does the following things: The Government says everybody has to be covered. The Government establishes a pool to give discounts to small business people who would be otherwise in real trouble if they had to pay the full value of a health care policy to try to protect the small business economy. And the Government organizes buying groups so that small businesses and self-employed people can buy insurance on the same terms as Government employees and big business people. Now, that's what we do.

With all respect, the other—last Sunday, I saw on television a man I very much admire and like, President Ford, giving a speech attacking our health care program that was doubtless prepared for him by the other party. And one of the lines in this speech—it was devastating, I mean, it was a humdinger—it said, "They want to set up a national health care board where there are seven people in Washington to decide what is necessary and appropriate for your health care. I don't think we ought to let seven bureaucrats in Washington make decisions that you and your doctors ought to make, do you?" And I said, "Goodness, no. Shoot the guy that put that plan out there." [*Laughter*] Right? So I go to the office the next day, and I said, "You know, that was not a fair characterization of our plan. But he wouldn't knowingly misstate that. Let's do a little research," because I remembered something. I remembered that President Ford and President Carter, in a nonpolitical atmosphere, were the honorary cochairs of a bipartisan effort to reform the health care system. They had a detailed health care plan very much like ours in which they—and they wrote an op-ed piece about it, signed by President Ford, proposing two national boards not—to be fair to them—not to regulate the health system or make decisions for your doctors but to do exactly what our little board was going to do, which was to evaluate claims by people that there ought to be new benefits added to health care packages and funded. And somebody needed to evaluate it in a nonpolitical, professional atmosphere to see how much these things were costing.

Now, how are you supposed to be active citizens if that's the way the debate's going? So I'm going to write a funny little letter to President Ford and send a copy of his article and underline the board deal, you know. But the point is, he didn't know that, I mean, he just was given a speech. And he is a good man. But don't you see how this kind of debate obscures what really matters?

What matters? What matters is 39 million Americans don't have any health insurance. At any given time during the year, 58 million Americans don't have any health insurance. Now, keep in mind, there's 255 million people in this country. So you add up the statistics. Eighty-one million of us live in families with preexisting conditions: a child with diabetes, a fine mother who has had premature cancer, a father who had a heart attack at an early age, people who, under the present system can't ever change jobs because they can't get insurance or they'd have to pay more than they could ever afford. Three-quarters of us who have insurance in the workplace have lifetime limits, which means if we should happen to have a baby with a terrible health problem that doesn't take the child's life away, we could run out of insurance before the child is old enough to get out of the house, at the very time we need it.

Now, those are the real problems. And I say to you, you should demand, not as Democrats but as Americans, that we face this problem this year, not with smoke and hot air and rhetoric but sitting down across the table as compassionate Americans and resolving it this year, not later.

Let me mention one last issue. Before I came here today, I was honored to go with Mrs. Ethel Kennedy, who is here with us, out to that wonderful site where Robert Kennedy spoke here in Indianapolis the night Martin Luther King was killed, to break ground for a memorial which will be made to both those men and what they have meant to our country and to the lives of so many of us. And we know that at least some of what will be used in the sculpture will be metal that comes from weapons which were turned in in the weapons buy-back program here and melted down.

The thing I liked about that more than anything else was that this was something that I

could go and celebrate as President but that I didn't have a thing in the world to do with. The citizens of this community, your basketball team, your prosecutor, your local officials, church leaders, they're going to make this work, and in the process, they will change the attitudes and the behavior of people all across this community, without regard to race or income or political party. They are going to give, around this project, thousands of people around here the chance to be Americans in the best sense again.

Now, we're going to pass this crime bill. There will be 100,000 police in it. And if they're deployed properly, they'll make a real difference on your streets. They can drive the crime rate down. And we are going to have some tougher punishment in the bill. And we're going to have a lot of prevention money to give these kids something to say yes to before they get in trouble, as well as just telling them to say no. And we're going to have this ban on the 19 assault weapons.

But let me ask you, what is it you wish to discuss about this, and what are your responsibilities? Yesterday in Greenbelt, Maryland, right outside of Washington, there was a 13-year-old boy from a poor family, standing, minding his own business—just won a scholarship to one of the most distinguished private schools in Washington—standing there on the street minding his own business. These nine kids got in a fight, started shooting, and that boy's dead today.

There's a poor neighborhood in your Nation's Capital that got sick and tired of this kind of stuff, so they just built a fence around their neighborhood and hired guards just like they were rich people in private developments. And they had the same results. Now, old folks are sitting on park benches talking, and the kids are playing, because they've constructed a wall between themselves and the rest of America.

When this assault weapons ban was voted on, it should not have been as difficult as it was. It shouldn't have been as painful as it was. But a lot of good, honest people in Indiana and in other places were told that it was a threat to their right to keep and bear arms. And I understand that. I grew up in a State where more than half the folks have a hunting or a fishing license or both. And most of us grew up shooting 22's and 410's long before we were old enough to drive a car. I understand that. But very few of those Americans were told that that bill contained explicit, I mean written protection for more than 650 sporting weapons even as we were trying to make our streets safe for the police and the people in the face of the awful, bloody assaults we see on our children every day. Why? Because of the rhetoric.

And I say to you, I will do my best as your President to fight these things. I will do my best to work with the Congress. I'll do my best to stick up for the Democrats when we're leading the way but to also give the Republicans credit when they help, just like I have today. But you have got to change the dimensions of the debate in every community in this country. And you have got to take some personal responsibility for how this happens.

The President and the Congress cannot save all those 13-year-old kids that are standing in front of bus stops today. But you can and your police officers can and your churches can. And maybe the best we can do in the short run is to put those walls up. I say hallelujah to those poor folks. Why should you have to be rich to have a wall behind which your children and your grandparents are safe? That's fine. But consider the irony of that.

In a few months, I will go to Europe to celebrate D-Day, the victory of freedom. I will go to Germany to celebrate our victory in the cold war. Do you remember what President Kennedy said when he gave that wonderful *Ich bin ein Berliner* speech? At the Berlin Wall he said this, he said, "Freedom has many difficulties, and our democracy is far from perfect, but we never had to put up a wall to keep our people in." No, we never did. But now millions of us have to put up walls to keep our people out. Is that what Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy gave their lives for? I don't think so.

And I tell you, it doesn't matter who the President is; it doesn't matter how hard the Congress labors. Unless we can change the dimensions of our conversation away from all this division, destruction, the shouting, this uncivil, this often outright dishonest talk, to a calm and more hospitable and more open and more respectful tone and unless people at the grassroots level take personal responsibility for all these kids whose lives are at risk, then the political system cannot produce the results you want.

Of those little words opportunity, responsibility, and community, I believe with all my heart, by far the most important is community. We're still around after two centuries, folks, yes, because we had good leaders, but most of all because we had good people with good hearts and good values and good minds. And more than half the time they did what was right. It is now required of all of us that we do what is right.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. in the Sagamore Ballroom at the Indianapolis Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to fundraiser Sally Kirkpatrick; Pamela Carter, Indiana attorney general; and Mayor Michael M. Harmless of Greencastle, IN.

Remarks at the National Police Officers Memorial Service
May 15, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you so much, Dewey Stokes, not only for that very fine introduction but for the 13 years that the Fraternal Order of the Police has sponsored this National Police Officers Memorial Service and for your many terms as leader of this distinguished organization. Thank you, Karen Lippe, for your service. It's an honor for me to be here with so many of our distinguished Federal law enforcement officials, including Chief Gary Albrecht, the chief of the Capitol Police; John Magaw, the Director of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau, formerly the Director of the United States Secret Service and once a member of the FOP as a trooper in Ohio, a person who's given his entire life to law enforcement. I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to our Attorney General for bringing to the National Government a real understanding of what it's like to be involved in the world of law enforcement at the grassroots level, where the crimes are committed, where the violence is greatest against our law enforcement officials, where so much of our work needs to be done.

My fellow Americans, you know better than anyone else for every name that is added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, there's a face, a family, and a human tragedy. Three months ago in Columbus, Ohio, I met the widow and the precinct sergeant of police officer Chris Klites, who was shot to death on duty after he stopped a suspicious car. He had married just a month before he was killed. This morning I met the families of police officer Stephen Faulkner of Kansas City—and I had met Mrs. Faulkner earlier at a health care forum; I saw her two fine sons today—and Deputy Sheriff Norman Tony Silva of Denver, I met his wife and his wonderful young son today. Raymond Silva wrote me a letter at age 7, which I still have and which I reread this morning before I came over here. He said in his letter, "My Dad was 30 years old when he got shot. He used to play games with us and make us laugh. His badge number was H7048. I wish you could know him. He was the best Dad ever."

We owe a lot to that young boy. We owe a lot to every spouse, every child, every grandchild, every parent, every uncle, every aunt, every brother, every sister, every friend of all those whom we come here to honor today. We pay tribute not only to those who have died but to those who have lost them, to the survivors. And we pay tribute to the more than half million law enforcement officers who still go to work every day, not knowing for sure if that day they will be required to make the ultimate sacrifice.

I hope all of you today who come here with your personal grief bear also a continuing pride in the work that your loved ones did. I hope those of you who come to honor others will not flinch in your pride and will continue to pray for the safety of those who serve.

Today I would say that more than anything else, we ought to rededicate ourselves to becoming a country worthy of the heroes we come here to honor. Every day, law enforcement officers take the oath to uphold the law and defend citizens. Fear is a constant companion; still, law enforcement officers go out every day wearing

the badge and the uniform that symbolize that commitment. These are, these commitments, in a way, acts of faith that most Americans most of the time are going to do what is right and deserve to be protected, deserve to be honored, deserve to have the risks of life, as we all work together to be the country we ought to be.

That is why I say today as citizens, we are the ones who should be taking a solemn oath to the law enforcement community that this next year we will all work harder to be the country we ought to be. Because if we don't restore the fabric of civilized life in this country, then it is ultimately futile for us and unfair for you to ask you to go out on the streets and risk your lives. We must determine that we are going to become a less violent, less dangerous, less crime-ridden, more hopeful, more unified society. We owe that to the people who we will honor today, to their families, and to the future of this country.

We are clearly moving in the right direction, but sometimes it takes us too long to do the right thing. I appreciate what Dewey said about the Brady bill. Those of you who understand how it works know it is already moving to save lives, but it should not have taken 7 years and a whole national election to get that done. We are moving in the right direction, but we must move more quickly.

Under the leadership of the Attorney General, the Justice Department has already granted funds to 250 American communities of all sizes to increase their police staff. Much of what we still need to do is in the crime bill now before the Congress to which Dewey Stokes referred. If we pass it, as we should, it will put another 100,000 police officers on the street in community policing settings, not only working to catch criminals but to work with each other to make policing safer and to reduce crime before it occurs.

This bill will take assault weapons off the street, 19 different ones, making sure that police officers will not be outgunned by criminals armed with weapons of mass destruction. It should not have taken this crime bill 5 years to get to this point, but it has, and now we are moving. Against enormous odds, 216 courageous Members of the House of Representatives stood up and were counted in favor of the assault weapons ban. I hope all of you in law enforcement will go home to the districts of those 216 Representatives, without regard to their political party, and stand up for them because they stood up for you.

Many of them put their political lives on the line in the hopes that it would help you never to have to put your life on the line. That is the sort of attitude we need among the American people today. This bill has tougher penalties, including the "three strikes and you're out" provision. We recognize that there should be capital punishment for people who kill law enforcement officials in the line of duty. And we recognize, too, something that Congress will be called upon to grapple with as we finish this crime bill, and that is that we must invest in prevention and use law enforcement officials in the work of prevention.

Law enforcement officials tend to be much more supportive than many politicians in the work of keeping young people away from crime in the first place, because people in law enforcement know how some tender, smart, intelligent act to a young child may head off a whole life of crime and another tragedy 1 or 2 or 5 or 10 or even 15 years down the road. And I thank the law enforcement community for their leadership to keep prevention a part of our efforts to make America a safer place.

I also want to thank all of you who personally give your time to that. I'll never forget the first time my daughter came home from school and talked to me about her D.A.R.E. officer in her fifth grade class. And I'll never forget in that year how I learned more about that man and his work and his family than I did about anything else going on in the school. Do not ever think that you don't have a big impact on the young people of this country when they see you in the uniform, standing up for what's right and showing that you care for them. There are so many kids in this country in so much trouble. They need you, and you can make a difference.

The job of law enforcement is so dangerous today not only because criminals are better armed but because our society is too often coming apart when it ought to be coming together, because too many of you deal with the wreckage coming from the breakdown of family and work and community. And I think you know that we all have to do something about that.

Just yesterday I saw the tragic story of the young 13-year-old boy here in a community near Washington, DC, who came from a poor family and had just won a scholarship to a fine school to give him a chance to live a better life. And

he was standing, waiting for a bus when he got caught in the crossfire between two gangs, senselessly killed, his whole life taken away just when so much hope was opened up.

There is something profoundly wrong when so many children are out there killing other children with no thought, apparently no understanding of the consequences. And I tell you, my fellow Americans, it is still true that the vast majority of us are law-abiding, God-fearing, family-loving, hard-working people. But too many of us are falling between the cracks of life.

And so I say again, today we must dedicate ourselves, all of us, to making America worthy of the sacrifice of the law enforcement officials who have fallen and those who still risk their lives every day. I ask today that we say a prayer on this beautiful Sunday for the law enforcement officers and their families who paid the ultimate sacrifice, for our fellow citizens who have been victims of crime and violence, and for those who live halfway in prison, behind locked doors and barred windows, and a prayer, ultimately, that somehow we can change the heart and mind of America. We must change our country so that more of us live up to its best hopes and its ideals.

I am encouraged that we are moving in the right direction. The Brady bill, the grants to communities for police, the crime bill: this means America is awakening to this problem. But in the end, it is you, the people who live in our streets, in our neighborhoods, who work in our communities, who go to our churches on Sunday, who must help to teach America to keep faith with justice, with our fellow citizens, and with our country's proud heritage. The whole future of America is riding on it. We have turned the tide, now we must continue until the work is done.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:22 a.m. on Capitol Hill. In his remarks, he referred to Dewey Stokes, national president, Fraternal Order of Police, and Karen Lippe, president, Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

May 14, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report on November 10, 1993, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979, and matters relating to Executive Order No. 12613 of October 29, 1987. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c). This report covers events through March 31, 1994. My last report, dated November 10, 1993, covered events through September 30, 1993.

1. There have been no amendments to the Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560, or to the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535, since the last report.

2. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury continues to process applications for import licenses under the Iranian Transactions Regulations. However, a substantial majority of such applications are determined to be ineligible for licensing and, consequently, are denied.

During the reporting period, the U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the Iranian Transactions Regulations. The FAC and Customs Service investigations of these violations have resulted in forfeiture actions and the imposition of civil monetary penalties. Additional forfeiture and civil penalty actions are under review.

3. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the "Tribunal"), established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since

my last report, the Tribunal has rendered 4 awards, bringing the total number to 551. Of this total, 371 have been awards in favor of American claimants. Two hundred twenty-three of these were awards on agreed terms, authorizing and approving payment of settlements negotiated by the parties, and 148 were decisions adjudicated on the merits. The Tribunal has issued 37 decisions dismissing claims on the merits and 84 decisions dismissing claims for jurisdictional reasons. Of the 59 remaining awards, 3 approved the withdrawal of cases and 56 were in favor of Iranian claimants. As of March 31, 1994, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported the value of awards to successful American claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank stood at $2,344,330,685.87.

The Security Account has fallen below the required balance of $500 million almost 50 times. Until October 1992, Iran periodically replenished the account, as required by the Algiers Accords. This was accomplished, first, by transfers from the separate account held by the NV Settlement Bank in which interest on the Security Account is deposited. The aggregate amount transferred from the Interest Account to the Security Account was $874,472,986.47. Iran then replenished the account with the proceeds from the sale of Iranian-origin oil imported into the United States, pursuant to transactions licensed on a case-by-case basis by FAC. Iran has not, however, replenished the account since the last oil sale deposit on October 8, 1992, although the balance fell below $500 million on November 5, 1992. As of March 31, 1994, the total amount in the Security Account was $212,049,484.05 and the total amount in the Interest Account was $15,548,176.62.

The United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed last year, to require Iran to meet its financial obligations under the Algiers Accords.

4. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies, and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran. In November 1993, the United States filed its Consolidated Final Response in A/15 (IV) and A/24, a claim brought by Iran for the alleged failure of the United States to terminate all litigation against Iran as required by the Algiers Accord. In December, the United States also filed its Statement of Defense in A/27, a claim brought by Iran for the alleged failure of the United States to enforce a Tribunal award in Iran's favor against a U.S. national. Because of this alleged failure, Iran requested that the United States Government be required to pay Iran for all the outstanding awards against U.S. nationals in favor of Iran.

5. As reported in November 1992, José María Ruda, President of the Tribunal, tendered his resignation on October 2, 1992. On December 4, 1993, Professor Krysztof Skubiszewski was appointed Chairman of Chamber Two of the Tribunal, filling the vacancy left by Judge Ruda's departure. On February 16, 1994, Professor Skubiszewski also was appointed the President of the Tribunal. Before joining the Tribunal Professor Skubiszewski served as Minister of Foreign Affairs in Poland from 1989 to 1993. He joined the "Solidarity" movement there in 1980, and served on several councils before becoming Minister of Foreign Affairs. In addition to his political experience, Professor Skubiszewski has had a long and distinguished academic career in the field of international law. He is currently on leave from the Institute of Law, Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, and has lectured at universities throughout Europe. He is also the author of a number of international law publications. In announcing the appointment, the Tribunal's Appointing Authority, Charles M.J.A. Moons, emphasized Professor Skubiszewski's "extensive experience in the management of state affairs and the conduct of international relations," in addition to his "scholarly renown."

6. As anticipated by the May 13, 1990, agreement settling the claims of U.S. nationals for less than $250,000.00, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (FCSC) has continued its review of 3,112 claims. As of March 31, 1994, the FCSC has issued decisions in 2,538 claims, for total awards of more than $40 million. The FCSC expects to complete its adjudication of the remaining claims this year.

7. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly

the Algiers Accords. Similarly, the Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12613 continue to advance important objectives in combatting international terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 14, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16.

Remarks on the Nomination of Stephen G. Breyer To Be a Supreme Court Associate Justice and an Exchange With Reporters

May 16, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. The distinguished Members of the Congress, Attorney General and other members of the Cabinet, the family and friends of Judge Breyer, ladies and gentlemen, tomorrow is the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* one of the greatest and most important decisions ever rendered by a court of law. We celebrate the *Brown* decision, and as we do, we are reminded of the central and powerful role the United States Supreme Court plays in our national life and in our society, addressing profound questions of law and justice, of liberty and equality.

Today we pay tribute to one Justice who has served the Nation magnificently and we announce the nomination of another who we hope and expect will also grace the Court with greatness. We celebrate the service of Justice Harry Blackmun, a distinguished member of the Court to which we entrust our legal and constitutional rights. He discharged that trust with fortitude, vision, fairness, and enormous courage and passion. After a long season of service, at the start of a new season of fulfillment for him and his family, I offer Justice Blackmun our deepest appreciation for his devotion to duty and to the Supreme Court.

Today we also celebrate the nomination of a jurist who I deeply believe will also take his place as one of our Nation's outstanding Justices. I ask the Senate to consider and to promptly confirm the nomination of Judge Stephen Breyer as the 108th Justice of the Supreme Court.

The case for Judge Breyer's confirmation is clear and compelling: his sheer excellence, his broad understanding of the law, his deep respect for the role of the courts in our life and in protecting our individual rights, and his gift as a consensus builder. In addition to his extraordinary intellectual talents, Judge Breyer will bring to the Court an abiding sense of decency and an unswerving dedication to ensuring liberty and justice for all.

Judge Breyer has devoted his entire life to public service, as a law clerk to Justice Arthur Goldberg, as a young lawyer at the Justice Department, as a teacher opening young minds to the promise and discipline of the law, as a member of the Watergate Special Prosecutor's office, as chief counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and for 14 years, as an exceptional judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

He has served in all three branches of Government with the heart and head of a reformer, always succeeding at what he has tried to do. His career shows that he understands how Government works and how laws are really made, knowledge that is indispensable for much of the litigation which comes before the Supreme Court. As chief counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee, he won the admiration of Senators of both parties for his fairness and commitment to justice and for his principled advocacy of economic reform.

He also served as a key member of the United States Sentencing Commission. Before the Commission was created, there was law but little order when criminal sentences were applied. His

decisive behind-the-scenes work enabled the Commission to give us less disparate and more truthful sentences and a more principled system of justice for the victims and the perpetrators of crime.

In 14 years on the Court of Appeals, his influential decisions have protected the civil rights and individual rights of Americans, even at the cost of making powerful people uncomfortable. His insight and clarity have established him as an unquestioned leader of the judiciary. He has spoken loudly for fairness and justice.

What does it mean to the average man and woman who will read tomorrow or see tonight on the news that Stephen Breyer is a consensus builder? We would do well to recall, on this day especially, that the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* spoke strongly and clearly in one unanimous voice. That momentous decision was joined by Justices who hailed from all regions of our Nation, by Justices who had been appointed by Presidents of both parties, by Justices who thought they espoused very different philosophies.

Judge Breyer will bring to the Court a well-recognized and impressive ability to build bridges in pursuit of fairness and justice. In the generations ahead, the Supreme Court will face questions of overriding national importance, many of which we cannot today even imagine. That is why it is so important to appoint someone whom we can predict will be a Justice who seeks to ensure that the Court speaks in a clear voice, as unified a voice as it is possible to speak in furthering the goals of liberty and equality under the law.

We are honored that Judge Breyer could share this day with his family, his wife, Joanna, a clinical psychologist who relieves the pain of children undergoing cancer treatment, and his children, Chloe, Nell, and Michael. We welcome them to the White House as we acclaim Judge Breyer's supreme, superb qualifications for the Supreme Court.

Ladies and gentlemen, Judge Stephen Breyer.

[*At this point, Judge Breyer expressed his appreciation to the President and discussed the importance of the justice system in America.*]

Q. Mr. President, Judge Breyer talked about the selection process. We're wondering why——

The President. Well, first of all, the Constitution—let me give you a general answer—the Constitution requires the President to seek not only the consent but the advice of the United States Senate, and I did that. And when people made suggestions to me, I discussed it with the folks who work around here. And the more advice you seek, the more leaks you have in here. [*Laughter*] And I might say that at least—far more than half of those that I've read concerning this appointment have been downright wrong, absolutely wrong, factually wrong. But nonetheless, if you seek advice, you will have leaks. I decided that I would pay the price of the leaks, even the wrong ones, to follow the duty of the Constitution.

I think that when you do consult broadly and you think about it and you're personally involved in it, as I've tried to be, you tend to make the right decision. I think everybody around here today thinks I made the right decision. I think that's all that really counts.

Q. If I could ask the judge a question. There are many liberal Democrats who have been hoping someone would be named who would serve as a strong counterpoint to Justice Scalia. Do you envisage yourself as someone who can stand up to his more conservative principles and argue the merits of the sort of liberal case effectively and move that Court to a different direction?

Judge Breyer. If I'm confirmed, I envisage myself as a person who will do the best possible job I'm capable of as a Justice of the Supreme Court.

The President. I wish I could answer questions like that. His constitutional privilege is my burden. [*Laughter*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]

Judge Breyer. I believe at some time in the near future, there will be confirmation hearings at which I expect to have lots of questions and difficult ones, too, on matters of substance. And I think that I'll reserve questions and answers of substance for that time.

Q. Mr. President, Judge Breyer said over the weekend that he saw the role of judge in the Court as making life better for ordinary citizens, something to which he alluded to here as well. What do you mean by that, sir? Do you have a goal or a special agenda that——

Judge Breyer. No, no. Well, what I think of in respect to that is if you think of law in general, there's the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, dozens of guarantees for people, laws and statutes, regulations, rules, common law. There's a whole mass of material that somehow, sometimes, in some way is supposed to fit together.

And what is it supposed to do, seen as a whole? What it's supposed to do seen as a whole is allow all people, all people, to live together in a society where they have so many different views, so many different needs, but to live together in a way that is more harmonious, that is better so that they can work productively together. That's a very general statement, but that is a very general purpose, I think, of law.

The President. It's hard to be better than that. Thank you. We're adjourned.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I think we should let him speak for himself. I think we let him speak for himself. I don't think—if we do it right, there's not necessarily a dichotomy. We can't be free individually unless we're a responsible society. And I think he'll do very well on that.

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about the critics over the weekend who said you caved into pressure from Senator Hatch?

The President. That's just not right.

Q. ——said you're not willing to fight for someone you believe in, like Bruce Babbitt.

The President. That's just not right. I believe in this guy.

Q. Were you surprised by the Western Senators?

The President. No, we—[*inaudible*]—we could confirm all three of them. It was not an issue. I'll say again, that was not an issue. I realize these process things can—more than half the stories I read about this were wrong, and that's one of them.

Q. Which ones were wrong?

The President. [*Inaudible*]—we could have confirmed them all.

Q. What about the stories you saw on TV? [*Laughter*]

The President. They're always right. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:49 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks in a Video Conference Call on Health Care Reform
May 16, 1994

The President. Hello, Roger.

Deputy Secretary Roger Altman. Hello, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

The President. Good afternoon.

[*At this point, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Roger Altman discussed technological advances in video conferencing and then introduced Norman Gott, chairman and chief executive of PictureTel, a company in that field which provides health care coverage to all its employees.*]

Norman Gott. Thank you, Roger.

Good afternoon, Mr. President.

The President. Good afternoon, Norman.

Mr. Gott. We welcome you up here on, hopefully, technology that will help to carry us into the 21st century.

The President. It's carrying me through the afternoon. I'm amazed by this. [*Laughter*] I'm trying to figure out how to get it.

[*Mr. Gott expressed his support for universal health care coverage through the workplace.*]

The President. Well, I appreciate your support. You know, it is clear to me, having studied this problem for years and talked to literally hundreds of employers, that we're never going to get control of costs and have a fully efficient and effective system that is also compassionate and humane until we have guaranteed health insurance for everybody. We've got to cover everybody. And the simplest and most direct way is to do it through the workplace.

Now, as you know, all the bitter opposition we're getting here in Washington is coming from people who say it will cost jobs and it will hurt small business. But they overlook the fact that many small businesses provide health insurance today at very high rates because they don't have any market power. And under our plan, we'd have discounts for small businesses, and we'd give them market power. We would let them go into buyers co-ops so they would be able to have the same sort of muscle that larger companies do.

And over the long run, unless we do this, we're neither going to be a humane country, from a health care point of view, or as productive as we ought to be, and we're going to lose jobs. All these serious studies of the economy, such as the one done by the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office, say that we'll actually create more jobs and we'll help the small business sector over the long run as we put this universal coverage in.

So I can't tell you how much I appreciate this because the organized groups here in Washington are always complaining about this mandate as if it's the end of the world when, in fact, it's just private insurance for everybody. It keeps the Government out of it except to require people, employers and employees, to be responsible. And I really applaud what you said.

[*Mr. Gott asked if there was any way business could assist the health care reform effort.*]

The President. Absolutely, there is. I think the most important thing you can do is to contact as many Members of Congress of both parties as possible, describe your business, make it clear that you're a business of the future, and make it clear that the American economy in the future depends upon providing health care for all of our citizens and that the way to do it is through the workplace.

I think that if the Members of Congress could just see over and over and over again all the responsible employers who want to do the right thing and who understand that it's good for business and will create jobs to solve the health care crisis, I think that will do more than anything else to give them the courage to overcome the intense, almost unbelievable pressure from the organized groups who are basically trying to protect the right of business to walk away from their employees and their own responsibility so that the rest of us will pick up the bill when those folks get sick.

I think that if we can just have enough real-life examples like yours that represent the future to the Members of Congress, so they can feel a higher confidence level in doing this, I believe we can get this done. And we can get it done this year. I think it's very, very important that we do this this year. This problem's been studied to death. There's no point in just taking more time. We ought to move, and move now.

Again, I would urge you to reach out to Members of both parties. Tell them, "Don't play politics with this. Do what's right for America and do it this year." And tell them that you know it will be good for America's jobs. That, I think, is really critical, because you'll have a lot of credibility. And you might even set up one of these phone calls with congressional leaders. And you would certainly have a big impression on them.

Mr. Gott. We're going to leave that unit in there so that you can talk to a lot of leaders like this and not waste a lot of time.

The President. You'll save us a lot of travel time.

Mr. Gott. Yes, well, I want you guys to join the 21st century in technology on this information highway. And here's your best example.

The President. You are. This is—the Vice President's always telling me about virtual reality. I virtually feel like I'm there in the room with you today.

Mr. Gott. Well, we appreciate very much your taking the time to talk to us today about this because we think it's important, and I know you do, too. We'll do our part.

The President. Thank you. Thank you for your support for health care. Thank you for helping to take the American economy into the 21st century. I want to again urge all of you, just do what you can to personally contact the Members of Congress and, again, without regard to party. Say this is an American problem. We need an American solution. We need to do it in 1994, not later.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Gott. Terrific.

Deputy Secretary Altman. Mr. President, I'm bringing back 535 video conferencing-equipped PC's for every Member of Congress so Norman can plug into all of them just like this. [*Laughter*]

The President. Good for you. Thank you very much. Thanks. That is amazing.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 2:47 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Remarks on Goals 2000 Education Reform

May 16, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Gore, Secretary Riley, Secretary Reich, Hillary, distinguished Members of Congress and educators, business and labor leaders, church leaders, community leaders, ladies and gentlemen, as I look out at this crowd, I see people in this audience with whom I was working on these problems more than a decade ago. I see people who have lectured me about what we had to do. [*Laughter*] Probably more than half of you have lectured me about what we had to do. I see my good friend Marian Wright Edelman over there. When Hillary was the board chair of the Children's Defense Fund, they said, "Well, you can't have these national education goals unless all kids start school ready to learn." Well, this is part of it. Now, when we make sure they all have health care, we'll know they're ready to learn when they start.

There are people here who work with me in the Education Commission to the States and the Southern Regional Education Board and the Carnegie Council. There are people here who have written books that I have read and learned from, whose lives have been a real inspiration to me. I'm hesitant to mention any of them, but I see Marc Tucker and Ernest Boyer, and I read their books, and now I'm trying to sell them. [*Laughter*] I read Governor Kunin's book, too; it's really good. But if you will forgive me a personal indulgence, I'd like to recognize one man who has been through a particularly painful time in his own life whose work has graced American education everywhere, our friend Jim Comer from Connecticut. Please stand up and be recognized. Thank you, sir.

I see Mike Cohen and Gloria Cabe, who stayed up all night with us in Charlottesville when we were writing the national education goals. All of you here today—I can barely contain myself—here you are clapping for things that matter. Here we are, all of us, the Members of Congress without regard to party, celebrating something that will move America forward. This is why I ran for President, not to pull this country to the right or the left but to move it forward, to get people together, to cross the divide, to face the problems, to deal with the issues.

In the next decade, more than 7 million children will enter our Nation's schools. That's the largest number since my crowd started; I'm the oldest of the baby boomers. That means that we have an especial responsibility to make sure that we have done everything we possibly can to guarantee real freedom and opportunity to our people through an education for all that will enable our people, without regard to their race, their income, their standing in life, or where they happen to live, a chance to compete and win, to live up to their God-given capacities. That's what all these goals mean.

These goals were just a way that people could put into words what it would mean if we actually produced results which guaranteed us the kind of educated citizenry that will keep America strong, leading the world well into the 21st century.

We insist, with Goals 2000, that every student can learn. We insist that it's time to abolish the outdated distinction between academic learning and skill learning. We know now that most academics has practical application and that more and more practical problems require academic knowledge. And I hope to goodness we don't do anything else—we've finally erased that divide so that we can teach our young people to learn in the way that best suits their own capacities and the work they have to do.

This law tells us that we need a national mobilization for education reform but that it has to be carried out at the grassroots level. The President, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Labor, well, we can work together, but we have to put you in charge.

A lot of you have heard me say this for a decade because I've had the chance, I guess, to be in more schoolrooms than any person who ever was able to serve as President. But I am absolutely convinced that there is not a single, solitary problem in American education that has not been solved by somebody, somewhere. Now, that's the truth. And the longer you live with this and the longer you spend time with teachers and kids and parents and the more schools you visit, the more you know that is true.

What we have done as a nation is to resist learning from each other, to resist institutionaliz-

ing change, to resist, therefore, holding ourselves accountable for our results as a nation. Many of us who were Governors had tried our darnedest to do that at the State level, and we found that, even in every State, people would repeatedly resist learning from each other, borrowing from each other, capturing each other's best ideas.

The Founding Fathers were as smart a group of people as we ever got together in this country. And the seminar they had on how to get things done, which produced our Constitution, was just about as good as any we've ever attended. And when they conceived of the States as laboratories of democracy, they intentionally thought of a scientific model in which people would learn from one another what works and then build on it.

What we try to do here with Goals 2000 is to say: Here are the goals. You figure out how to get there. You learn from each other. Come up with aggressive plans. We will help you fund them and go forward, but you are in charge. That is the sort of partnership the United States ought to be engaged in. The Federal Government can't tell you how to do it, but we can help you get it done.

We do establish these national education goals. We also established a skills standard board, and I want to thank the Congress for that. We do need to know what skills are required of our people and our workers in the competitive world in which we are living and the one toward which we are going. We do seek to create the information superhighway that the Vice President's always talking about to bring to bear technology in all of our classrooms. But behind all of this, there is a simple moral premise, and that is that the promise of educational opportunity and educational excellence is for everyone. And we are determined to fulfill that promise in this time.

Forty years ago tomorrow, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education.* We are still striving to fulfill the promise of *Brown.* You can read articles that are accurate, talking about how we have not fulfilled the promise. You can know that there is still inequality of opportunity. You can know that some places are more segregated than they used to be. But no one can doubt we are better off than we would be had that decision not been handed down.

What this Goals 2000 movement, with the school-to-work program, with the adult education program, with the retraining program, and the reemployment program, what it all seeks to do is to give America a system by which at the grassroots level we can fulfill the promise of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* for all our people, not a set of national rules and mandates but a national set of goals, of objectives, and a sparking of an enormous grassroots reform effort all around this country, which will lead in every community in this country, in every school in this country, in every learning environment to more responsibilities for principals and teachers, to the courage for people who think they need to, to try new experiences and new experiments, everything from charter schools to other forms of management that will give teachers in many cases the chance to teach other teachers and to engage in operating their own schools more, that will bring parents into these schools where they have been shut out.

But I will say again: In order to make this work, we have to both foster reform and foster a humble, willing, listening attitude that permits us to learn from one another. The Founding Fathers knew that was one of the great strengths of establishing State governments and making us what we are as a federation with National, State, and local governments.

We must remember this: Goals 2000 is a new way of doing business in America. It represents the direction our Government must take in many problems in the 21st century. But I know the reason it has a good chance to work is because of you and the thousands and thousands like you who have been out here working on these same issues that are finally codified in law for 10 or more years. I thank you for that. Please leave this place with the determination to make this law fulfill its promise.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Marian Wright Edelman, president and founder, Children's Defense Fund; Marc Tucker, president, National Center on Education and the Economy; Ernest L. Boyer, president, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Madeleine Kunin, Deputy Secretary of Education; Mike Cohen, director of Goals 2000; and Gloria Cabe, educational adviser to the President when he was Governor of Arkansas.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the Prevention of Nuclear Proliferation
May 16, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required under section 601(a) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–242; 22 U.S.C. 3281(a)), I am transmitting a report on the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It covers activities between January 1, 1993, and December 31, 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 16, 1994.

Remarks at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Dinner
May 16, 1994

Thank you, Elaine. Thank you, I think. It's pretty hard to follow Elaine Jones, especially when she's on a roll like she was tonight. [*Laughter*] And the rabbi, sounding more like a Baptist preacher every day. [*Laughter*] And Vernon, who speaks well when he's asleep. [*Laughter*] And Dan Rather with a sense of humor. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, I come here overwhelmingly to do one thing, to say on behalf of a grateful nation, thank you. Thank you to the Legal Defense Fund. Thank you to Thurgood Marshall, in the presence of his wonderful wife. Thank you to Bill Coleman. Thank you to Jack Greenberg. Thank you to Julius Chambers. Thank you, Elaine Jones. Thank you, all of you who have made it possible for us to come here today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of *Brown*. Thank you. I thank Bob Bennett and Chester Davenport and all those who made this dinner possible. But most of all, I just wanted to say thank you.

I was sitting out there looking at Elaine, listening to her say all these nice things, waiting, wondering how many days it would be before I would get my next lecture—[*laughter*]—and what new challenge would be presented.

Thurgood Marshall and this organization won 29 victories before the Supreme Court but none as important as *Brown*. It changed our country and our lives. In a clear voice it said that we could no longer be two nations, separate and unequal. We are one people, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That's what it said. And it said that about the schools. And I was thinking what a difference it had made. I was thinking tonight as Elaine gave me my report card on judges and told me to do a little better—[*laughter*]—that today, since I have been privileged to be your President, there is a new minority in the Nation: A minority of those who have been appointed to the Federal bench are white men. A majority are women and people of color. And yet, the appointees that I have sent to the Senate have the highest percentage of people rated well-qualified by the American Bar Association of any President since those nominations have been made. And I am proud of that. And *Brown* v. *Board of Education* helped to make that possible.

Oh, there's lots of other good things that happened because of *Brown*. I wonder if some of the people who are in my administration today could be there were it not for *Brown*. Thurgood Marshall and Bill Coleman and Jack Greenberg, they believe we're one nation indivisible under God, we're all going up or down together. What I wonder is whether the rest of us still believe that and, if so, whether we are prepared to endure the rigors of this time to make that real.

You know, I was raised in the South when I knew a lot of people who were second-class citizens. I lived in a State where it took the President of the United States calling out the National Guard simply to let my friend Ernest Green and eight other people go to high school.

And thanks to the work of this organization, my daughter got to go to that school system and never know that, and I'm grateful.

I think it's important for us not to let young people today forget that. Tomorrow, Secretary Riley and Ernest Green and Thurgood Marshall, Jr., and I are going to Martin Luther King Junior High School in Beltsville, Maryland, to teach young people why *Brown* and its ideas are still important, why they still matter. But we have to ask ourselves whether we think they still matter.

Recently in various speeches, my good friend Vernon Jordan and then, last weekend at Howard, General Colin Powell have reaffirmed the fundamental meaning of *Brown* in the face of blacks and whites alike who seem to be retreating from its lesson, either out of fear or resignation that it is no longer possible to make it real in our lives.

We see an alarming new study among African-Americans that warns of a pervasive sense of alienation, especially among the young, so that fully half of them want to opt out of the American system. They want to separate themselves. They believe that they're already a nation within a nation. That's why so many large crowds, I think, are drawn to the message of those who preach separatism in a negative way. There are too many extremists of all kinds across the entire political and racial spectrum who think the only way they can advocate their own ideas and build themselves up is by putting other people down, sometimes in the most devastatingly vicious ways.

I say to all of you, we have to ask ourselves: Do we still believe in *Brown*? And if we do, what are we prepared to do, not only to stand up for it but to make it real in our time?

Tomorrow we must celebrate *Brown* with the realization that a lot of folks have a mood that threatens to sever the ties that bind us. And we must confront a new segregationism that would tear us apart. To do it, we must recognize that *Brown* was ultimately not an answer but a challenge. And now 40 years later, you and the LDF must challenge me and our Government, and together we must challenge the Nation to revitalize the meaning of *Brown* in our time.

When the courts were hearing *Brown*, America was reading a book by Ralph Ellison, called "Invisible Man." He died just a month ago today. That book had an incredible impact on me. And still today when I see people denying each other's humanity, I remember the words of Ralph Ellison, and I think we are trying to make people who make us uncomfortable, who threaten us, who frighten us, invisible. But they will not go away. There are too many of us in this country today who simply don't accept one another's legitimacy.

Last March, the leading moral voice for tolerance and reconciliation in Northern Ireland came to our country. His name is John Hume. He's a Catholic member of the British Parliament who represents a city in Northern Ireland where Catholics and Protestants have waged fights and built walls of hatred for 300 years. The day after he had dinner with us at the White House, he gave a speech in which he said this: "The essence of the Irish problem is a division in the hearts and minds of our people . . . let us walk to Abraham Lincoln's Memorial and look at the message of peace that's written there for everybody, *E Pluribus Unum*—from many, one. The essence of unity is the acceptance of diversity."

To be sure, there can be no unity when people have not learned to accept one another as they are and when they think they can only fulfill themselves by denying others' humanity. But accepting diversity is only half the story. And that is our challenge today. Diversity is not an end in itself, although it is a very good thing; it is simply the only way we can build in a free society a larger community to which everyone belongs, in which everyone has a common stake in the future, and in which everyone can have a decent life.

Anyone who knows the history of this organization knows you don't have to have the same skin color to have the same values. But we also have to be able to frankly speak about our problems and our differences.

You know, I thought a lot about what I should say here tonight, and I got all kinds of advice. Like I normally do when I get in trouble, I discarded it all and decided to say what I thought. [*Laughter*] If you think about what's going on today—what motivated Vernon to say what he did in his Urban League speech and General Powell to say what he did, what motivates people to go hear Mr. Farrakhan in large crowds—what are all these cross currents? Why is it that we're having trouble living with *Brown* and living by *Brown*? Well, it's because *Brown* didn't solve all of our problems, and we've got

some new problems. And in the face of those, there's more than one response, and it's really tough.

No one can doubt that we are much, much, much better off today because of *Brown* and all those other decisions that said we had to be one people. It changed us forever for the better. But no one can doubt that it couldn't solve all the problems. There's still racism. There's still inequality. There is more trouble with violence and the breakdown of family and community and the absence of work in parts of our country. The vacuum that has created has given rise to all kinds of terrible conditions.

We had, in a town near here, last weekend, a 13-year-old boy who just won a scholarship that could have led him out of poverty through an excellent education—the promise of *Brown*—shot dead on a street corner because he happened to be in the wrong place; two groups of people were feuding and shooting at each other.

We have here in this community a poor neighborhood where people decided that if they wanted their kids to be able to play in the yard and their old folks to be able to sit on park benches, they'd have to do what rich folks do. So they just built a little fence around their living quarters, and they got some security guards. And sure enough, they might as well have been out in some fancy neighborhood in southern California: The kids could play again and the old folks could sit again in safety.

But we have these problems. Now, what are we going to do about them? There seems to me four things we can do, and three of them are wrong. One is, we can come to a dinner like this and talk about how wonderful *Brown* was and preach until the day we die and not do anything to deal with the problems of this time. If so, we will lose a whole generation of young people to other courses of action.

Or we can do what I said—Elaine mentioned if you preach venom, you get a talk show; if you preach love, you get a yawn. Deborah Tannen, a professor at Georgetown, has written a book called "You Just Don't Understand." She says we're caught up in what she calls a "culture of critique," where shouting matches drown out constructive conversation and where you only really have any status at all in society if you're just slamming somebody else and putting them down and you don't really have to do anything as long as you just talk. So you can do that, you can say the wrong things and reject the spirit of *Brown* and do nothing but cash in, and that's wrong.

Or you can do what is disturbingly working: You can say the wrong things; you can preach division; you can deny the Holocaust ever occurred. But you can help people solve real problems. You can tell families they've got to stay together, and daddies they've got to take care of their kids, and people they ought to stay off drugs and everybody ought to show up for work every day. And that is a very dangerous thing, because in the end, we will still lose; because in the end, you cannot have a democracy where you lift up one group by putting somebody else down. But it is a tempting thing when people are doing things that change lives.

I say this to make this point. People desperately wish their lives to change. They want to do something that will make a difference. They want safer streets, not nice talk. They want schools that work, not nice talk. They want children to be raised by caring parents, not nice talk. So we have to recognize that the only acceptable thing to do is to do what Thurgood Marshall and Bill Coleman and Jack Greenberg did 40 years ago. We have to not only talk the talk, we have to walk the walk. We have to not only advocate *Brown*, we have to deal forthrightly and aggressively with the problems we face today in a way that actually changes people's lives. That is what we have to do.

There are a lot of people that don't think we can do this. There are a lot of people that are filled with doubt. I had Members of Congress walk right up there and vote for the Brady bill last year—after 7 years of fooling around with it and looking for excuses and caving in and finally passing it—who did not believe it would make a difference. But it has. It's just like *Brown*: It hasn't solved all the problems, but it has saved lives already. We had people put their political careers on the line here last week, walking down the aisle in the House of Representatives to vote for the assault weapons ban, putting their necks on the line, afraid it might not make a difference. But it will.

And I'm telling you, that is the kind of thing we have to deal with, knowing that there is no ultimate perfect answer but that we expect something that will not occur if we think we can simply advocate the ideas that are embodied in the *Brown* decision and not change our own behavior and the behavior of our country to

give our kids a safe and decent and well-educated childhood to put things back together again. There is no alternative for us if we want to keep this country together and we want, 100 years from now, people to celebrate the 140th anniversary of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in the greatest country the world has ever known, fully diverse, where everybody, all God's children, can live up to the fullest of their God-given potential.

And in order to do it, we all have to overcome a fair measure not only of fear but of resignation. There are so many of us today, and all of us in some ways at some times, who just don't believe we can tackle the big things and make a difference. But I tell you, the only thing for us to do to honor those whom we honor tonight is to tackle the big things and make a difference.

I'm proud that Elaine Jones and all the rest of you are trying to deal forthrightly with the problem of violence and the fear it produces and what it's doing to drive our people apart. I want you to think about what we can do to honor the sacrifices of those whose shoulders we stand on tonight. They did not do all this work to preside over the collapse of American society, to give people an equal opportunity to get an inferior education, to give people an equal opportunity to be unemployed, to give people an equal opportunity to stand on the street corner and be gunned down by some kid that nobody ever loved enough or disciplined enough or cared enough about to give a different way of living to.

We cannot stand chaos and destruction, but we must not embrace hatred and division. We have only one choice.

Let me read this to you in closing. It seems to me to capture the spirit of *Brown* and the spirit of America and what we have to do today, starting with what is in our heart. These are lines from Langston Hughes' wonderful poem "Let America Be America Again": "Oh yes, I say it plain, America never was America to me. And yet I swear this oath, America will be." Let that be our oath on this 40th anniversary celebration.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Washington Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Elaine R. Jones, director counsel, LDEF; Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Vernon Jordan, dinner chairman; Dan Rather, dinner host; Cecelia Marshall, widow of Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall; William T. Coleman, former Secretary of Transportation; Jack Greenberg, Columbia University law professor; Julius L. Chambers, chancellor of North Carolina Central University; Robert Bennett and Chester Davenport, dinner corporate cochairs; Ernest Green, one of the Little Rock Nine who integrated the public school system in Little Rock, AR; Thurgood Marshall, Jr., Deputy Counsel and Director of Legislative Affairs for the Vice President; and Minister Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway

May 17, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve seems likely to increase interest rates today. How is that going to affect economic growth and your calculations for deficit reduction if you have to spend more to service a $4 trillion debt?

The President. Well, first of all, if it happens, it will be because we have growth. I mean, now let's get the fundamental facts out here. We have more jobs, lower inflation, and a lower deficit and expectations for high growth this year, good growth.

And so—I make it a practice generally not to comment on what the Fed does. There is clearly some room for short-term interest rates over the rate of inflation that won't slow down our economic growth. And I have every confidence that we're still going to have another good year this year and that we will be able to offset any modest increase in interest rates

with increased growth. And so far—I talked to Mr. Panetta yesterday—we're well within our projections on deficit reduction.

Norway

Q. Mr. President, have you ruled out the possibility of sanctions against Norway because of whaling?

The President. We are working on this whaling issue. You know, the United States has taken a position opposed to commercial whaling, and we're working through this with Norway. The Vice President and I had a conversation about it this morning. We are working through the issue, and we feel comfortable about what we're doing. We think we're doing the right thing.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—environmental groups say you——

The President. Some environmental groups do. The most mainstream environmental groups have not joined these rather extreme claims that have been made against our country. Give us a chance to work through this. I think we'll come out in the right place.

Q. Madam Prime Minister, do you agree with the Commerce Department's opinion that your country's resumption of whaling goes against efforts to save the whale, so to speak?

Prime Minister Brundtland. No, I certainly don't. We would never have a policy which is not in accordance with international law. We would never have a policy which is not long-term sustainable development, not on this issue, not on any other.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Q. [*Inaudible*]—whaling, Mr. President?

The President. We are working—we'll work through that. I have confidence that we will be able to work through it.

Q. Mr. President, in that letter to Congress last October, you said that you're going to work with Norway to create an inspection regime for commercial whaling within scientific limits. Is that still the U.S. position?

The President. What were you going to say, Mr. Vice President?

The Vice President. I was going to say, we're opposed to commercial whaling. We have always been committed to good, sound science. And as the President said, we're working with Norway to work through this issue. We're opposed to commercial whaling. We hope that we'll also, incidentally, be able to establish a sanctuary in Antarctica. We hope Norway will support that. But we're just going to work through the issue.

Q. Are you going to visit Norway, Mr. President?

The President. I hope I'll be able to go back. I went to Norway once when I was a young man. I loved it. I'd love to be able to go back someday; one of the best trips I ever made in my life.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:07 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Question-and-Answer Session on the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* Supreme Court Decision in Beltsville, Maryland

May 17, 1994

The President. Good morning. Do you know why we're here? Why are we here, somebody?

Q. To talk about the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision and how it affects us today.

The President. That's right, we are. What was the ruling in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*? What did the Supreme Court say?

Q. That "separate but equal" was unjust and unconstitutional.

The President. And what were the facts in the case? What gave rise to the case? What was the case about?

Q. Unsegregating schools in the South.

The President. In the South and in Topeka, Kansas. It was about a little schoolgirl named Linda Brown whose parents thought she should not be sent to a segregated school. The United States Supreme Court made that decision in 1954, 40 years ago today. Before that, the Su-

preme Court had ruled that "separate but equal" was constitutional, right? And when the Supreme Court makes a ruling like that, it's the law of the land until they change their minds.

During the Civil War, President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves, in 1863 in the White House, on the same floor that I sleep every night, in what is now the Lincoln Bedroom—the room where your father spent the night last night, right? Secretary Riley's 93-year-old father spent the night last night in the room where President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves.

Secretary Riley. He said he heard Lincoln all night long. [*Laughter*]

The President. Then, after the Civil War was over, the 14th amendment to our Constitution was adopted, which declared that everybody had to be equal under the law. But there was still a lot of racial prejudice in the country and a lot of discrimination. And a few years after that, the Supreme Court decided a case called *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. Have you studied that? And the problem with *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was that blacks and whites had to sit in a different place on the train, and the 14th amendment said that nobody could be discriminated against under the law. And by law, they were required to sit in a different place on the train. So what did the Supreme Court say in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*?

Yes?

Q. That trains or whatever were equal, and they could be separate.

The President. That's right. If the facilities were equal, they could be separate without violating the 14th amendment, right? So the *Brown* decision overruled that. Now, why did they overrule that? What was the argument? Why was "separate but equal"—what's the matter with that?

Go ahead.

Q. Well, people were still being——

The President. So they——

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. One argument was that even though they were supposed to be separate but equal, they weren't really. Right? Okay, what else? What else is wrong with "separate but equal"?

Q. That if they are separated, they wouldn't be equal.

The President. That's the heart of it. Because they were separated, right, they wouldn't be equal. That's very important. The argument was that if they were separated, the act of separating people by race under the law itself was a message of inequality.

Do you believe that? Do you believe that? Nearly everybody believes that now, right?

You look around this room today. This is America: people from all different racial and ethnic groups. We have one county in America, maybe more than one but at least one, Los Angeles County, that now has people from 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And someday, if the population trends continue, the number of nonwhites in America will be greater than the number of whites, so that everybody will be ultimately protected by a requirement that no one can be discriminated against by the law based on their race.

But the essence of *Brown* was two things, and you guys got them. One is, well, they're not really always equal, these separate facilities. The other is, the act of separating people by their race under the law is itself an act of inequality.

Now, since then, we've had all kinds of problems and challenges with the aftermath of the *Brown* decision. You know, what do you do when people's living patterns are separate? That's how busing got into the whole issue of how to integrate the schools. And what do you do when people in one place are a lot poorer than people in another place? And how do you deal with the practical problems? There are all kinds of practical problems. Many of them have been solved more satisfactorily in places like in magnet schools, where people come as a matter of choice. And they come together and you try to get different kinds of people, both different races and different incomes.

So I wouldn't—by no means have all the problems that were dealt with in the *Brown* decision, the problems of racial inequality and income inequality and the history of discrimination, those problems have not all been overcome. And today we have some new problems, at least problems that are more severe. There's more violence. The families and communities are under greater stress. There are a lot of problems that you face that people our age 40 years ago didn't face. We know that.

But the number one lesson I want to leave with you is that this is a very much better coun-

try because of that *Brown* decision, and it is a very different country because of the *Brown* decision. And the three people who are here with me today each have a different insight on that.

But I want you to think about how different the country might have been. We're in the basketball playoffs now, so I'm thinking about this is the first one in a long time where Michael Jordan hasn't played. Michael Jordan played at the University of North Carolina: Would he have been able to play there, would he have even gone there if there had been no *Brown* decision? We're not sure.

So I want to introduce these three people, each in their own turn, and ask them to say something. First, I'd like to start with Thurgood Marshall, Jr. His father argued the *Brown* decision and many other decisions before the Supreme Court and became the first African-American Justice on the Supreme Court. He now works in the White House on the staff of Vice President Gore. And I'd like to introduce him and have him say a few words.

Mr. Marshall.

[*At this point, Mr. Marshall made brief remarks on the importance of the case and the responsibility of society and all individuals to advance the spirit of the case.*]

The President. I'm going to give you a chance to ask them questions, too. But I want all of them to talk first.

One of the big issues that was inevitably a part of the *Brown* decision was, okay, the Supreme Court says you can't have any "separate but equal" school districts anymore. They're unconstitutional. Well, it's one thing for a court to issue an order and another thing for millions of people to change their lives, right?

I mean, how are you going to integrate all these schools? And what happens to the teachers, and what happens to the principals? And how do the kids get to new schools? And do the white kids go to the black schools, or do the black kids go to the white schools? Do you have to build new schools? There are mind-bending details that had to be worked out, plus the fact that in many parts of the country, there were still millions of Americans who didn't agree with the decision who were determined to resist it at every turn.

So the Supreme Court's in the news this week because I just appointed Judge Breyer from Boston to the Supreme Court. And he's a very distinguished judge. I think he'll do a wonderful job. And they'll have these hearings in a couple of months, and you'll be able to follow that. And I urge you to follow these hearings, see the questions they ask him and the answers he gives. Supreme Court's very important.

But the Supreme Court is nine people. They don't have any enforcement authority. So, then the lower courts have to somehow figure out how to enforce an order and approve plans and do things to try to figure out how was this *Brown* decision going to be implemented.

One of the States involved in the *Brown* decision in addition to Topeka, Kansas, was the State of South Carolina. Secretary Riley, the Secretary of Education, was the Governor of South Carolina before he became Secretary of Education. His father was the lawyer for one of the school districts involved in the desegregation effort in *Brown* 40 years ago. And he, as a Governor, made a national reputation for his commitment to improving the education of all the children of South Carolina, which is why I named him the Secretary of Education. So I'd like for him to talk a minute now about this *Brown* decision and what happened after it was decided and how it affected his life.

Secretary Riley.

[*Secretary Riley described growing up in a segregated environment, his experience in integrating the schools of South Carolina, and his regret for the lack of social interaction with African-Americans during his youth.*]

The President. After the *Brown* decision was decided, like I said, all people had to figure out, well, how are we going to integrate our school system, and how fast? So they went back to the Supreme Court, and there was a second *Brown* decision that said "with all deliberate speed." So, who knows what that means, right? For people who didn't want to integrate, they said "with all deliberate speed" might be 4 or 5 years. For people who did want to integrate, they said it would be 4 or 5 weeks.

So that was the issue there: How long could they take to integrate? And the court order in Greenville said, "'All deliberate speed' is 30 days. Do it." And they did it, because they had leaders like Secretary Riley and his family who believed it was the right thing to do and who made it work. I'll say a little more about that in a minute. But believing in your heart that

something is the right thing to do makes a big difference in whether it gets done or not.

Now, after these things happened, there was still resistance to integration all across the South and in other parts of America, and there were still other questions that had to be resolved and other issues about how this would be done.

In my home State and Mr. Green's home State of Arkansas, in Little Rock, there was a case that went all the way to the Supreme Court involving the Little Rock school system, called *Cooper* v. *Arens,* which was also a very large decision in the whole history of the Supreme Court law affecting the schools.

In Little Rock, the then-Governor of our State called out the National Guard to stop the integration of the school, which had been ordered by the Supreme Court, devised by the local school board. And then the President of the United States, as you saw in the movie, took over the National Guard and used it to protect the right of Ernest Green and eight other people to attend Little Rock Central High School.

I want him to talk a little bit about his experience, how he felt, what he went through. You saw the movie, which was premiered, interestingly enough, in the auditorium at Little Rock Central High School, and he and I were there the night that it was premiered in the auditorium where he became the first black student to go and to graduate. He's done rather well. I want him to tell you a little bit about what he's doing with his life now so you'll understand the enormous consequence of this decision. But first, I think you need to understand a little more about what happened. So I'd like to ask Mr. Green to talk now.

Ernest Green.

[*Mr. Green described his experience in integrating Central High School in Little Rock and pointed out the connection between the* Brown *decision and developments in South Africa.*]

The President. I want to give you a chance to ask questions, if you have any questions of any of them or me. But let me just follow up on one thing Mr. Green said.

You heard Dick Riley say how much he regretted the fact that he grew up in a segregated society. A lot of us who were southerners, who grew up in the South, really knew better. We knew that segregation was wrong. And we knew that—those of us who were white knew that it was hurting us, that we were being deprived of the opportunity to know people, to share their feelings, to share their life experiences, to share their music, their culture, to deal with people who were just being cut off.

And the things which happened to integrate the country integrated the South, at least in the beginning, more than any other part of the country because it was the most segregated part and it was the part that had the highest percentage of African-American population. And I am convinced that those things, first the education decisions and then the voting rights decision, they did help to inspire and give energy to what ultimately happened in South Africa.

The United States contributed $35 million last year to helping to build democracy in South Africa, helping train people to vote, helping conduct, show people how to run the elections, helping to figure out how this could be done. But I also have to tell you that I think it is virtually inconceivable that I would have ever become President of the United States had it not been for the *Brown* decision because of the relationships—and the voting rights decision—and the relationships that subsequently I developed with the African-Americans in my State whose support helped to make me Governor and with people around the country who made me President. So there is a sense in which, in very tangible, real ways, these decisions freed a lot of Americans to be more than they otherwise would have been.

So, do you have any questions to any of them or me that you want to ask? Yes, in the back.

[*A student asked Mr. Green what kept him going in that very difficult situation. Mr. Green said that his main motivation was the goal of opening up opportunities in Little Rock, but that support from the other eight students involved and their families and churches was important.*]

Q. When you were in school, how did integrating your school affect you?

The President. My public schools were not integrated until 2 years after I left. That's the point I was trying to make with Ernest. The integration of the schools throughout the South basically took about 15 years after the *Brown* decision. So I'm a little bit younger than Ernie, not much.

And so our school—what happened was, a lot of these school districts sat around and waited for the Justice Department to come after them, the Federal Government to say, where

is your plan, or for somebody to force the States to adopt a plan. And that's why I wanted to make the point that after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, all of these schools didn't integrate overnight, and it took a significant number of years before it happened throughout the South and throughout the country.

Ernest Green. Mr. President, I think one of the things you want to point out about the Little Rock case is that Little Rock was much earlier than many of the other cases, and that the fact that the Federal Government finally used their power and might to underscore it may have helped, I like to think, fuel part of the modern civil rights movement.

As you know from the movie, we had 1,000 paratroopers that came to Little Rock to enforce the Court order. But this was the first time that school desegregation had been undergirded by Federal support in that manner.

The President. I also want to make another point that I think might have been passed over. Ernie mentioned this. Arkansas was actually a good candidate for a peaceful, successful integration of Little Rock Central High School. We were the first State in the South to integrate our law school. We had an integrated medical school. We had a newspaper in Little Rock, the Arkansas Gazette, which was, I think, one of the—by any standard—one of the finest papers in the country, which was strongly supportive of integration. We had a lot of leadership, white leadership, in Little Rock that was strongly supportive of integration.

And in cases like this, when countries or cities or States can go one way or the other, the impact of leadership is pivotal. When the Governor called out the National Guard to stop the integration, it wasn't even all that popular in Little Rock; a lot of the white people didn't like it. But it was wildly popular out in our State in the more rural areas where the racial animosity was greater and the fear of change was greater. And so it was a politically popular decision. But it wrecked the chance we had to become the first southern State that would really have a beginning statewide successful, peaceful integration.

Later when Atlanta began to integrate, a lot of leaders in Atlanta looked at what happened in Little Rock and said, "We don't want that to happen here, and we're not going to permit it." Very interesting.

So how people behave in times of crisis is very important and makes a big difference. The Court decision still is carried out by people, and as I said, what's in their heart makes a difference.

Do you have any questions for them? Any more?

[*A student asked Mr. Green how he felt on his first day at Central High School. Mr. Green replied that he and his companions were fearful, but television coverage of their struggle reinforced their determination to continue.*

Another student asked how Mr. Green's brother felt about the situation. Mr. Green said his brother thought he was a little crazy at the time but that his brother was now in the building trades, an opportunity he thought was directly attributable to the Brown *decision.*

A student then asked Mr. Marshall how the Brown *decision affected his life. Mr. Marshall responded that it gave him a perspective on current problems such as racism and violence and reminded him of the need for common efforts to oppose the politics of division.*]

The President. Go ahead, you're next.

Q. This is for both Mr. Green and you, Mr. President. While the integration was going on, did you ever feel like taking the law into your own hands and doing something drastic? [*Laughter*]

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. President. [*Laughter*]

The President. There are some benefits to this job. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Green explained that he and the other eight students faced 2,000 white students and that fighting was not an option. He advocated nonviolence as a real and effective tool for resolving conflicts.*]

The President. I want to make two points about it. First is, back then, the law was our friend and lawlessness was our enemy. In other words, the Supreme Court was the friend of integration. The President was enforcing the Supreme Court order. And after President Kennedy was elected, Robert Kennedy was the Attorney General. He was out there killing himself trying to get the schools integrated and enforce the law. So the law was seen as the friend of the people who wanted change.

The second point I'd like to make is, people were willing to put themselves on the line, these

people like Ernie. Mr. Marshall's father worked for years and years and years. They were willing to pay the price of time. What you have today in a lot of communities is young people taking the law into their own hands either because they can't manage their own aggressions and they've got a gun handy, or because they're doing it for some—because it arises out of drug dealing or something like that, where people want a quick benefit instead of a long-term benefit.

And I think one of the things the schools have to drum into our kids today is that you always have to be living for your lifetime. You always have to be thinking about what it's going to be like down the road. No one is entitled to instant gratification all the time, to get what they want when they want it, right now. You have to be willing to pay the price of time.

And these nine young people of whom Ernie was the leader were willing—they paid an enormous price for themselves as well as for everybody they represented by saying, "In my life this will be better." And if I could change one thing about what's going on today, when there's so much mindless violence among young people and kids are just getting shot at random, it's because people are going around acting on their impulses in the moment.

And the law can still be your friend if you're willing to work and have discipline and take time with it. Nobody gets everything they want just when they want it. You have to pay the price of time and be willing to take the kind of disciplined risks that Ernie Green did. And that, I think, is one of the things we really have got to somehow hammer home to everybody in your generation.

You've been great. The teacher's telling me it's time to stop. The principal is. Thank you all very much. You were terrific. Thank you, gentlemen.

[*At this point, the President was presented with several gifts.*]

The President. The great thing about the United States is that all the history of our country lives in the present and helps to pave the way for the future.

I had Senator Byrd in my office last night, who is the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They have to approve all the money that gets spent, like if we send any money to your school, it comes through that committee. And he had just finished reading "The Federalist Papers" written by Madison and Hamilton, just read them all again, because he said they have relevance to today.

Brown is important today. It's living in your life today. And what you have to do is to make the most of this experience and make the most of your own life, so that 40 years from now young people will be sitting in this school and other schools around the country, and they will be living the accumulated history of America.

That's the only way this works. That's the brilliant thing about our country. That's why we wanted to come here and talk about it, because we know the spirit and the meaning of that decision is alive in your lives today. And as long as you believe that and you do your part, then this country is going to be around a long, long time.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:35 a.m. at Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School.

Remarks on the 40th Anniversary of the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* Supreme Court Decision in Beltsville

May 17, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much. My good friend Ernie Green; Secretary Riley; Attorney General Reno; your principal, Bette Lewis. I'd also like to recognize in the audience today two of my partners in trying to make America a better place, two of your distinguished Representatives in Congress, Senator Paul Sarbanes and Congressman Steny Hoyer. Thank you for being here.

I have a number of people here who work in the White House, but I want to recognize one in particular. We just finished teaching a

class here on *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. I was joined in that class by Secretary Riley, who as a young man was involved along with his father with the integration of public schools in South Carolina; and with Ernest Green, whose background you know; also with Thurgood Marshall, Jr., now a member of the Vice President's staff in the White House, whose father argued the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* case before the Supreme Court and later became the first African-American ever to sit on the United States Supreme Court. Thurgood Marshall, Jr., I'd like him to stand up and be recognized.

I'd like to thank Robin Wiltison and the students who were in her class today. They certainly showed us why Martin Luther King Middle School is a blue-ribbon school. I was deeply impressed with the students. And they asked good questions, and they were very well-informed. And I think it's fair to say that those of us who came here to participate may have enjoyed the class even more than they did.

We are here today because, as all of you know by now, 40 years ago on this day the United States Supreme Court handed down the decision called *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. The Supreme Court has been in the news a lot lately because I've just announced the appointment of a distinguished judge, Judge Stephen Breyer, from Boston, to be the new Justice to the Supreme Court to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Justice Blackmun.

Many Americans don't think about the Supreme Court very much and only hear about it when it issues a great decision. I can tell you that every American thought about the Supreme Court when *Brown* v. *Board of Education* was decided. Forty years ago, in some parts of this great country, African-Americans couldn't vote, couldn't be served in certain restaurants or stay in certain hotels, couldn't even get medical care in certain hospitals. Before a brave woman named Rosa Parks refused to budge off a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, and a brave minister named Martin Luther King helped her fight back, African-Americans were told they had to sit in the back of the bus and give up their seats to white people. They were told many other things that deprived them of the freedom today we all take for granted.

Forty years ago, a school like this one, with white and Hispanic and African-American and Asian-American students, a real kaleidoscope of America's great diversity, it was unthinkable, it wouldn't even have existed in major parts of the United States. The decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* helped to change all that.

We have to remember two things about this: First of all, the change didn't happen overnight. And secondly, the people who helped to bring that change didn't wait around for anybody to do the hard work for them; they did it for themselves. They knew that the future is not something you inherit; it's something you have to earn by your own efforts.

When I say it didn't happen overnight, let me explain exactly what I mean. We talked about this somewhat in the class today. The Supreme Court can hand down a decision and say schools that are separated solely on the basis of the race of the students are unconstitutional; stop it. Then millions of people had to figure out, well, what does that mean? Where do the teachers go? Where do the students go? Whose schoolbooks do you use? What do you do? What are the mechanics of integrating the schools? But then there was another *Brown* decision in which people said, "How fast do we have to do this?" And the Supreme Court said, "With all deliberate speed." And in every school district in the country where they were working it out, somebody had to say, "What does 'all deliberate speed' mean?" There were still millions of Americans who were against it. They thought "all deliberate speed" meant several years. Then the millions who were for it thought "all deliberate speed" means tomorrow.

So these things took a long time. It took, at least, I'd say, 15 years after the *Brown* decision before the public schools in this country were basically integrated through the system. It did not happen overnight. There were a lot of people who had to keep working. And that's an important lesson for you today: Nothing worth doing happens immediately. You have to make efforts that take time.

Brown laid a foundation—you heard Ernest Green talking about the connection between the *Brown* case and the ultimate liberation and reconciliation of South Africa. We had a Civil Rights Act in 1964. We had a Voting Rights Act in 1965. The struggles for freedom in this country were seen as a symbol of what could be done by people all over the world. There are always going to be people who fight for these kinds of changes and, frankly, always going to be people who resist them. The *Brown* deci-

sion gave courage to people like Ernest Green. It also gave moral backbone to our Nation's leaders. When Ernest Green—for those of you who have seen the movie about his life story, you know that when he attempted to integrate Little Rock Central High School just a few years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the Governor of my State then tried to stop him by calling out the National Guard, on the theory that people were too upset about it. But the President, under the authority of the Supreme Court decision, instead turned the National Guard into a United States force and enforced the integration order.

That's the kind of thing that a Supreme Court decision can do if there are people like Ernest Green who are willing to pay the price to carry out the promise of equality and opportunity in America, even if it takes years to do. Thurgood Marshall, the man who brought the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* case to the Supreme Court and who later served on the Supreme Court, literally spent his life fighting for these principles and these opportunities.

Now, I say this to make the second point. There have been a lot of—you may see this if you watch these sort of things on the evening news, you'll see a lot of people your parents' and grandparents' age talking, or even younger than that, talking in very cynical terms saying, "Well, this is still a society with a lot of segregation," or "Well, this is still a society with a lot of racial discrimination," or "Well, this is still a society where racial minorities don't have the same economic opportunities others do," or "Well, we're still more violent than we were 40 years ago." And all those people will be saying that sort of as an excuse. They'll be saying, "Therefore, maybe this decision didn't count for so much." Well, I want to tell you that's flat wrong. This is a much better country today because of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and because there were people who came before all of you who were literally willing to put their lives on the line to see you got an equal education, to see that you had a chance to make something of your lives. The world and this country are markedly better because of this decision and these principles. It is better today. And just because not all the problems of this country have been solved, that's no excuse for people to say that this *Brown* v. *Board of Education* decision didn't make a huge difference.

You heard the Attorney General and the students in the class heard the Secretary of Education and me say all three of us grew up in the South in segregated societies. And we suffered, too. We were deprived of the right to play and go places with and know and live with people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. And we paid a terrible price for it. And when it began to go away, our lives were also very, very much enriched. I do not believe I would be here as President today if it hadn't been for *Brown* v. *Board of Education* and the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act that gave all the people of my State a chance to come together as one people.

What I do want to say to you today is that this generation faces a whole lot of challenges that are part of the unfinished business of helping us to live together as one people. And we need some more miracles like *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. And they have to begin, however, the same way *Brown* did, by individual Americans making choices.

You look at what the problems are today. Is there still racism in America today? Of course there is. Is there too much violence today, especially among young people? Of course. Are there still too many people who don't think they're going to get a fair shake in life and don't think they have much of a future to look forward to? Of course there are. So what are you going to do about it? And what am I going to do about it?

What we should say is we are going to build on the things which have gone before that are good. You have to make choices. If you look at what's wrong with our country today—too much violence, too many guns in the hands of young people that are too willing to use them, too many people victimized by the breakdown of family life and community life, too many people victimized by the fact that they don't have a good job or a good education, too many young people who are willing to make decisions in the flash of a moment that may ruin their entire lives, too many schools that still don't work as well as this one does—it all begins with personal choices. I ran for President because I made a personal choice that I did not want my daughter to grow up in a country that was coming apart instead of coming together, and I didn't want you to be the first generation of Americans to do worse than your parents, and I thought there were things we could do about it. And

we're working hard to do those things, to create more jobs, to improve our schools, to deal with our health care problems, to make our streets safer and our schools safer and take on some of these tough law enforcement issues that relate to crime and drugs.

The Congress voted last week to ban assault weapons. It's high time to put more police officers on the street, to give young people more programs that will help to prevent them from getting involved in a violent life. We have made some personal decisions. But you have to make some personal decisions, too. The magic of education starts in every school, in every classroom. You have to decide that you will not drop out of school and that you will stay in and that you will do well. You have to decide that you will not use alcohol or drugs or take up guns. You have to decide that you will not become a mother or a father before you're old enough to understand and take responsibility and do the job right, instead of wrecking your life with it. You have to decide that you are going to have the discipline and commitment necessary to continue your education and to tone down the frustration and anger that every person feels.

A lot of these kids getting killed today are getting killed with the same sort of anger and frustration that people have always felt when they were fighting over things, except now they can go pick up a gun and do something about it. You have to take the lead, every one of you, in dealing with your own lives and your own schools to try to stop this. This is crazy, all this violence among young people. And a lot of these kids that are killing their lives by shooting other people are people who don't even have prior criminal records. You've got to get together and talk about what makes people mad, and what do you do when you get mad and when you get frustrated, and how do you walk away from that. And that's something that the President and the Congress and all the people in the world can't do for you if you won't do for yourselves.

We are very fortunate in this country today that 40 years ago the people did what was necessary to bring that case to the Supreme Court and that every Justice on the Supreme Court said separate but unequal educational facilities are wrong. And if they are separated by race by law, they are by definition unequal, and they are unconstitutional. We are all a better people because of that. And you all wouldn't be here together, doing what you're doing in this school today, if that hadn't happened.

But what you have to do now is to say, "That didn't solve all the problems, but it got me to the starting line. It gave me a chance to live in an America that was more honest in living up to its creed that we are all equal under God. And now I have a chance, and I'm going to make the most of it." The whole future of America is riding on whether we can have young people who are well-educated, well-disciplined, hopeful about the future, and more interested in helping each other than hurting each other, more interested in books than guns, more interested in 5 years from now than 5 seconds from now. You have to do that. Your country is counting on you.

I will do everything I can as President. And all these people will do everything they can to make sure that you have a good country to grow up in, that you can succeed, that you can have a good life. But a lot of it is in your hands. I urge you, on this 40th anniversary of one of the greatest decisions for freedom ever made, to stand up for your own freedom and make the most of it.

God bless you, and good luck. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. at Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School.

Statement on the Report of the Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless

May 17, 1994

Last year, I directed the Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless to forge a single, coordinated plan to break the cycle of homelessness and prevent future homelessness.

Today the Interagency Council released their report, which recognizes the magnitude of the problem of homelessness for the first time and proposes a comprehensive, innovative approach, the continuum of care, to move millions of Americans off our streets and back into our communities and our families. The 17-member agency, under the leadership of the Secretaries of HUD, HHS, and VA, and with the unprecedented consultation of thousands of people across the country, deserves credit for a thorough and honest examination of this complex problem.

"Priority Home: The Federal Plan to Break the Cycle of Homelessness" is part of a larger strategy of health care reform and welfare reform which will give every American the opportunity to break the cycle of dependence, become self-sufficient, and work towards a better life for themselves and their families.

NOTE: The report was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. An additional release of May 18 announced that the President proposed funding increases for homeless programs in cities across the country, and a State-by-State breakdown of dollar amounts was also made available.

Nomination for United States Marshals
May 17, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Robert Henry McMichael as U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Georgia, John W. Caldwell as U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Georgia, Roy Allen Smith as U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Ohio, and David William Troutman as U.S. marshal for the Northern District of Ohio.

"I am pleased to nominate these individuals as U.S. marshals," the President said. "They are well-qualified, and I am confident they will make a positive difference in our fight against crime."

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

Appointment for the American Battle Monuments Commission
May 17, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Joseph S. Laposata as Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

"I am happy to name Joseph Laposata as Secretary to the American Battle Monuments Commission," the President said. "His career with the Armed Forces will provide the Commission with a wealth of experience that will certainly prove beneficial."

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

Remarks on Signing the Human Services Amendments of 1994
May 18, 1994

Thank you so much. I think Dr. Johnson is a stronger statement for the merits of what has been done and what is about to be done than anything any of the rest of us can say. If every American child could grow up to be like him, we wouldn't even have more than half the conversations we have every day in this town. So I thank President Johnson and all those wise

people, including the founders of Head Start who are here and the Members of Congress who were there then, for starting this program 29 years ago. I thank the Members of Congress here today for working together across party lines, across philosophical lines, across racial lines, across district lines, from the city and from rural areas, to make this dream real in our time and to make the improvements and the changes in the Head Start program that we ought to make. I'm glad that Jeanne Kendall was here from Kentucky to make her profession about the Head Start program. And she brought one of her children, too, who's down there, a fine young man. Stand up. I want him to—[*applause*]—see, he's done quite well—to remind us that children everywhere need this program.

Everybody knows that this is not just a national Federal program, not the kind of preconceived thing that people think when they think about the Federal Government, you know, "I'm from the Federal Government, and I'm here to help you." [*Laughter*] This is not a program involving bureaucrats in Washington making decisions that individuals and families and teachers have to live by. This is a program that is built at the grassroots by families and teachers and communities.

I've often said that governments can't raise children, that people have to do that. But parents need help in a lot of places in this country today, just like they did 29 years ago. As I traveled America in 1992, I'd meet children in every corner of this country who would still be on the verge of showing up for school not knowing their colors, their shapes, their numbers, how to spell their names. And you ask, well, is that all that important? You bet it is.

You heard the doctor talk about how he got his degree in biology. Maybe there is nothing new under the sun, but when the Scripture says that people perish without vision, I think there's something to that. And the flip side is plainly true: In order to visualize, to imagine the future, you have to have some structure in your head, some way of organizing all the things that are coming in. And there's no doubt in my mind that one of the reasons we have so much violence among our young people today is they have no way of organizing and processing and dealing with and turning outward a lot of the things that they are forced to confront day-in and day-out.

Head Start helps these little children—can you believe—I mean, first of all, they're the second best advertisement. How can they sit here and listen to all these politicians and people talk—[*laughter*]—and behave in this way? Look at them. I mean, it's been amazing. But it helps these children to know they're special and to begin to see the world in a wonderful but still organized way. And that is a very, very significant thing.

I do want to say to the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion and to Secretary Shalala and to Secretary Riley and to all those who worked on this program, we all knew that there were some things we ought to do to help Head Start move into the 21st century. We knew we had to invest in reform and put quality first. We knew we needed performance standards because if we're going to spend the public's money to make the program work at the grassroots level, we want children to turn out like the man who introduced me.

We knew we had to expand the program, that it was no longer justifiable with all the kids in trouble in this country and needing help, to do that. So Head Start will go from serving 621,000 children in 1992 to about 840,000 in 1995. And we're struggling hard, Marian, with the budget—we met yesterday—[*laughter*]—so that we can keep expanding it beyond 1995. We're going to give local communities the option to meet the new needs of parents and children with full-day and full-year programs, which I think is very important.

The bill contains new provisions to meet families' needs who have infants and toddlers from birth to age 3. And I'm especially pleased by the broad coalition in Congress and the executive branch and among concerned Americans all across the country that focused on this vital area. Just a few years ago, this would have been enormously controversial. You would have had all kinds of ideological arguments, unrelated to the reality of these children's lives. And because of the spirit of primarily the leaders of Congress who are here present and those who are not here who supported it and those of you who brought information to the table about the real lives of these children and their families, you made that happen. And that is a dramatic change.

The third thing that this bill does is to act to keep the gains that Head Start makes going through the later years, because we learned,

much to our sadness, that some children kept the gains all the way through their lives and others were lost because of intervening events. So we had to ask ourselves what could we do to make these gains keep going, to make sure that these children would take the richness and the vision and the hope and the self-esteem that they leave this program with and be able to hold it close and live by it and gain from it throughout their lives. So I think that that is a terribly important advance in this program that will help not only the children but their parents.

Well, this is in some ways maybe the biggest part of the lifetime learning program we've been pushing, all of us, through the Congress with remarkable bipartisan support: the Goals 2000 program to establish national standards for our public schools and to erase the difference between academic learning and skill training; the school-to-work program to help those young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need greater skills; now, the reemployment program that we're going to try to develop out of the unemployment system, recognizing that most people don't get their old jobs back. But today we begin where our parents always told us we ought to begin, at the beginning.

And this is a wonderful day, I say again, a tribute to those whose vision made it possible 29 years ago, a tribute to those who have worked on these significant, dramatic improvements today, a tribute to the parents and the students who have proven by their statements today and the lives they have lived that together we really are one community and we can pull together and help each other in ways that make us all better people, better citizens, and later, better parents.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

Now, let me tell you what's going to happen. This is Brian Rivera; he's 5 years old. He's the best dressed man here. [*Laughter*] And I'm going to ask him to join me with the congressional leadership; we don't have room here for all the Members who are here. I would like for Senator Kennedy, Senator Kassebaum, Senator Mitchell, and Congressman Ford, Congressman Goodling to come up here and stand behind me. And as they come, I'd like for all the Members of Congress who are here to stand and be applauded by the rest of us, because without them this would not have happened. Please stand up. [*Applause*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:17 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Ansel Johnson, former Head Start student, and Jeanne Kendall, parent of a former Head Start student. S. 2000, approved May 18, was assigned Public Law No. 103–252.

Statement on Signing the Human Services Amendments of 1994

May 18, 1994

Twenty-nine years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson announced a program of hope for our Nation's most vulnerable children and their families, a program designed to give children a true "Head Start."

I am particularly pleased that many of those who helped launch Head Start could join us today to witness the fruits of their vision and see the faces of those who entered Head Start programs in that first summer of 1965. They represent more than 13 million children and families whose lives have been touched by this great program.

It is with tremendous pride that I help turn the next page in the distinguished history of Head Start by signing S. 2000, legislation that sets forth a bold new agenda for the future of the Head Start program. Over the years, Head Start has been successful in improving the lives of low-income children and their families by providing health and social services and education. These comprehensive services have changed numerous lives and contributed to a stronger future for our Nation.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation, which authorizes a wide array of human services programs, is the product of extraordinary bipartisan cooperation. This effort began last June when Secretary Shalala announced the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Head Start

Quality and Expansion. Its groundbreaking report set forth a blueprint for creating a 21st century Head Start and laid the foundation for the landmark legislation that we celebrate today.

This legislation seeks to re-energize the Head Start program for generations to come. Through this legislation, strong new efforts will be made to improve the quality of Head Start programs, and an important new initiative will be launched to provide Head Start services to families with children under age three. Services will be tailored to meet the needs of today's families, and creative partnerships will be forged with other key programs at the State and local level.

Head Start reminds us that our country cannot afford to waste its young or ignore their families. We must value every child and help every parent succeed. Head Start creates the sense of community that all of us need in our lives. The dedication of thousands of volunteers, staff, and parents helps create the special relationship that defines the Head Start program. Head Start is indeed a celebration of human diversity and creativity.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 18, 1994.

NOTE: S. 2000, approved May 18, was assigned Public Law No. 103–252.

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

May 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 1993 and the Inventory of the Federal Funds Distributed to Public Telecommunications Entities by Federal Departments and Agencies: Fiscal Year 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 18, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities

May 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to present to you the twenty-eighth annual report of National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). In terms of breadth and number of projects funded, this agency is the largest grant-making entity for the humanities in the country. The Endowment supports scholars, teachers, and students in their research and studies, and provides funds for projects such as documentary films and museum exhibitions that reach a large general audience. These humanities activities strengthen the cultural resources of the nation and provide insight into the problems that face our increasingly complex society.

In addition to direct federal support of the humanities, NEH programs have stimulated private contributions, to date almost $1.3 billion in matching gift funds. The Endowment also requires grantees in most programs to commit their own funds for part of the project costs. The NEH support of a project is highly respected and often attracts additional funding from other sources.

The country can be proud of the role the Endowment has played as a catalyst for the support of excellent humanities scholarship and

education in the United States over the past twenty-eight years.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

May 18, 1994.

Statement by the Press Secretary on Draft Registration and the Selective Service System

May 18, 1994

The President has announced that he has approved a National Security Council recommendation to maintain peacetime draft registration and the Selective Service System (SSS).

In letters to the House and Senate, the President stated that ". . . it is essential to our national security to continue draft registration and the Selective Service System. While tangible military requirements alone do not currently make a mass call-up of American young men likely, there are three reasons I believe we should maintain both the SSS and the draft registration requirement."

First, the President stated that the SSS and registration provide ". . . a hedge against unforeseen threats and a relatively low cost 'insurance policy' against our underestimating the maximum level of threat we expect our Armed Forces to face."

Next, ". . . terminating the SSS and draft registration now could send the wrong signal to our potential enemies who are watching for signs of U.S. resolve."

And finally, ". . . as fewer and fewer members of our society have direct military experience, it is increasingly important to maintain the link between the All Volunteer Force and our society at large. The Armed Forces must also know that the general population stands behind them, committed to serve, should the preservation of our national security so require."

The NSC review leading to the President's decision has been conducted since January and consisted of representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the DOD Inspector General, the Joint Staff, the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Selective Service System.

The President urged Congress to support the administration fiscal year 1995 request for $23 million for the Selective Service System.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Military Leaders

May 19, 1994

Representative Dan Rostenkowski

Q. On Rostenkowski, sir, should the public be concerned at all that you and he have the same lawyer?

The President. No.

China

Q. Mr. President, did you send Michael Armacost to China to negotiate some kind of deal?

The President. Well, we've had a number of Americans in China and speaking with the Chinese, and those conversations are ongoing. And I think until they are resolved, one way or the other, I shouldn't say more about them.

Q. It's being reported that you have made a decision to go ahead and renew MFN.

The President. We are still in discussions with the Chinese. I don't know that I should call them negotiations; that's not an accurate characterization. We are having discussions with them about our differences and about the importance of our relationship. And I will have a decision on the matter in a timely fashion. No decision has been reached yet; we're still talking with them.

Q. Is it true that China has—[*inaudible*]—leaders willing to make concessions on human rights——

The President. I don't think I should speak for the Chinese. All I can tell you is there are some things which have been reported which have actually occurred, and we've had discussions about other matters. But I don't think I should discuss them now. We're still in discussions with them.

Q. What's the purpose of this meeting?

The President. What?

Q. What's the purpose of the meeting?

The President. We meet on a regular basis to discuss a number of national security issues. And there are a number of things that the CINC's are going to bring me up to date on. I have some questions to ask them about some of the challenges we face around the world.

North Korea

Q. On North Korea, sir—[*inaudible*]—North Korea divert its spent nuclear fuel? And if so, is it too late to avoid sanctions?

The President. Well, let me say I certainly cannot answer that first question in the affirmative. That's why we have inspectors there now. And they are working hard, and as far as we know, they're—I got a report this morning—they are proceeding with their inspections. They should be in a position to give us a report imminently, in the near future. So I don't think you'll have to wait long for an answer to that. But the inspectors are there and working, and we should know more about it. And I think that the better course of action is for all of us to refrain from any kind of comment until we know what the facts are, because we will have the facts soon.

Q. Sending troops anywhere? [*Laughter*]

The President. To Normandy. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:14 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A reporter referred to Michael Armacost, Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao of India and an Exchange With Reporters

May 19, 1994

The President. Let me say that it's a great honor for me personally and for the United States to welcome Prime Minister Rao and his delegation here.

India is the world's largest democracy, by a long ways, and a very important partner for the United States on many issues, with a very impressive rate of economic growth now and the prospect of a real partnership with our country, spanning not only economic but many other issues. And I'm really looking forward to our discussions. And I'm delighted that he's found the time to come and be here with us.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

Q. Mr. President, how much of a hang-up is the issue of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and India's resistance to signing it? Will that come up? And do you think there's any way of persuading India to sign this treaty?

The President. Well, we'll have a chance to talk about a number of issues. I think that, as you know, we have a broad-based approach. We're supporting the comprehensive test ban. We want to have the fissile materials production ban. We've got a lot of things to discuss, and we'll have a chance to talk about them. But he just got here. I don't want to presume upon the conversation that hasn't yet occurred.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

Q. Mr. President, do you have anything to say to the Kennedys? Do you have any words for the Kennedys? You know, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis is——

The President. Hillary and I have been in touch with Mrs. Onassis in the last several days and are getting regular updates. She's been quite wonderful to my wife and to my daughter and to all of us. And we're thinking about her, praying for her.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

India

The President. I would like to say it's a great honor for me personally and for the United States to welcome Prime Minister Rao and his party here.

India is not only the world's largest democracy, but a very impressive one, having preserved democracy through all manner of difficulties and challenges. We are mindful of the profound importance of our relationship with India, and the many aspects of that relationship. And I am looking forward to establishing a good working relationship with the Prime Minister and to building on that as we go into the future. I'm very hopeful about it.

Q. Mr. President, may I ask you a question? The economic reforms in India and the end of cold war—what kind of an impact do you think these two events have had on the Indo-American relationship?

The President. Well, I think it should—both those things should permit that relationship to grow and to flourish, to deepen, and should permit us to do things that together as leaders in the community of nations, as we work together in the United Nations. And India, for example, has been very constructive in Somalia and Mozambique and other places around the world. So I think we'll have a deeper and better partnership now. and I'm looking forward to building on it, and that's one of the things that I hope to have a chance to discuss with the Prime Minister.

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—said that this trip was a turning point in Indo-U.S. relations. What do you think? Would it prove to be a turning point?

The President. Well, if it's a positive turning point, that would make me very happy because I think it's very important that the United States and India have good relations and strong relations. And so I'm hopeful of that.

Let me remind you, we're going to have a time that the press—at the end of this, where we can both make statements and answer questions. So let's do that after we have a chance to visit.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:40 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao of India

May 19, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. I have just completed a very productive meeting with Prime Minister Rao. It's an honor for me and for the United States to host the leader of the world's largest democracy, a nation of almost 900 million people.

It was a distinct pleasure for me to meet the Prime Minister who has led India through what to me is an absolutely astonishing period of economic transformation. He's kept a steady hand on the helm of Indian democracy through many challenges. India has sustained its commitment to representative government for many decades now. And I expressed my admiration to the Prime Minister for the remarkable achievement of India's people in social, cultural, and scientific areas.

Today we began what I hope will be a very close working relationship as our two countries forge stronger partnership. Our nations share many common values. And speaking as friends, we explored ways to deepen our ties and to expand cooperation.

The Prime Minister and I shared our concerns and our hopes about world events. We talked about the many challenges facing international community and discussed how each of us is working through the United Nations and other organizations to solve those problems. In particular, I expressed my appreciation to the Prime Minister for India's contributions to peacekeeping in Somalia, Cambodia, Mozambique, and elsewhere.

I told the Prime Minister that we heartily support his ambitious program of economic reform that brings India's economy into the global marketplace. This important reform plan will be the engine of growth in our relationships. Our Commerce Department has identified India as one of the 10 biggest emerging markets around the world. We are pleased at the rapid expansion of trade and investment between our two countries. We are now the largest bilateral trading partner and investor with India. We're proud of that, and we want that relationship to grow. We also discussed some of the obstacles to trade, and we pledged that we'd work hard to resolve those.

We talked about security issues that affect India in the post-cold-war era. We discussed common efforts to curb weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We pledged to intensify our efforts to achieve a comprehensive test ban treaty and a verifiable global ban on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. I told the Prime Minister that I hoped that India and Pakistan would continue their constructive dialog on ways to resolve their differences, including their differences over Kashmir.

In our talks today, we also agreed to increase the frequency of high-level visits and exchanges between our two countries. I've asked our Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, to visit India in July to further our talks on renewable energy. And I've asked the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, to go to India in November to continue our important discussions on trade and to promote further growth in trade and investment.

Today's visit was the first between Indian and United States leaders since Rajiv Gandhi came to the White House in 1987. I hope that the promising future in our relations will permit more frequent exchanges. Along with the United States, India is one of the world's great experiments in multicultural democracy. Its people share our love for freedom, entrepreneurship, and self-expression. And they have fought for more than four decades now to keep their democracy alive under the most amazing challenges.

India's freedom was born out of a remarkable struggle led by Mahatma Gandhi and others whose courage and vision still inspires us and people all around the world. The Prime Minister has been part of that struggle and that history from the beginning of his country and since he was a very young man. Today he struck me as a leader of great wisdom and experience. He shared some of that with me today. And under his leadership, India is taking its rightful place as a major world economic power and a partner in world affairs. We look forward to working with India in that way.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Rao. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I am greatly pleased to be here today and to have had an opportunity of meeting you. My fellow citizens of India join me in conveying to you, Mr. President, and to the citizens of this great country our warm greetings and friendship.

As the President has already told you, our talks today were held in an extremely friendly atmosphere. They were constructive, useful, and candid, as discussion between friends should be. We discussed international issues of concern to both sides, as also ways and means of strengthening bilateral ties.

The President and I agreed that we have an unprecedented opportunity to free India-U.S. bilateral relations from the distortions induced by the cold war, to look for areas of converging interest in the changed international situation, and work together for our mutual benefit.

We reviewed the tremendous economic opportunities thrown up by the sweeping economic reforms in India. I thank you, Mr. President, for your administration's strong support to our endeavor. The U.S. is India's largest trading partner. India is one of the big, emerging economies of the world, offering vast opportunities for trade and investment. Corporate America, too, is attracted by the prospects that have opened up in India. We will continue steadily along this path of economic liberalization. There will be no turning back.

The United States has a crucial position in promoting international cooperation. As the first post-cold-war President of the United States, you, Mr. President, have a special role to play in this regard. I'm happy to note in this context that Indo-U.S. cooperation flourishes in many areas, bilateral and multilateral, ranging from cooperation in U.N. peacekeeping and our joint advocacy of nuclear test ban treaty to our rapidly expanding economic ties.

As the growth and size of the Indian economy expands with the stimulus of international linkages and competition, we expect India to be in a position to make increasingly important con-

tributions to the shaping of the world in both its political and economic dimensions. We look forward to working with the U.S. administration on the many areas in which our interests converge.

The United States and India are the world's largest democracies. We share many cherished ideals and values. None are more important than democracy, individual liberty, and rule of law. My discussions with President Clinton have strengthened my conviction that our two nations can work together closely for international peace and development.

Mr. President, I thank you for your gracious invitation and your generous remarks. I shall cherish your warm hospitality, your vision, and our stimulating discussion. I look forward to working with you to further strengthen Indo-U.S. relations. I would also like to take this opportunity of wishing you success in your very important tasks.

And finally, Mr. President, I had the pleasure to invite you to visit India. You graciously accepted it. Please come at the time of your convenience.

Thank you.

The President. Thank you.

Let me say I'd like to alternate questions between the American and the Indian press. So we'll begin with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International] and—Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], are you next? Go ahead, go ahead.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, U.N. inspectors in North Korea say there's evidence that spent fuel rods are being withdrawn from a nuclear reactor, raising these concerns that it's going to be reprocessed into plutonium for a nuclear weapon. How serious is this development? And is it still your position that North Korea must not be allowed to make a nuclear bomb?

The President. Let me tell you, first of all, I have nothing to add to what I said when I met with the Joint Chiefs this morning about that. I want to make sure that I have the facts from the inspectors and that the facts are there. When I know what the facts are, I will then make a statement about them.

I think it would be an error for North Korea to continue to thwart these inspections after they have agreed to comply with them. But I want to know what the facts are. And when I do, then I will make a more definitive statement.

Yes, sir.

India

Q. Mr. President, would you say after your talks with the Prime Minister that some of the problems which have dogged Indo-American relations, there have been no outcome, but in other words, the areas of agreement are so large that you can afford to play down the areas of disagreement or leave them aside for future reference? And also, you mentioned the global partnership, and in that connection I'd like to ask you about the statement made by the new Ambassador—Ambassador-designate—that if India is included in the Security Council, it will undermine cohesion. When you have a strong partner like India, why should it undermine cohesion? And if the largest democracy in the world cannot be a member of the Security Council, then who can be?

I also have a question for the Prime Minister—wait, wait—the question is that in India, people said that President Clinton is going to twist your arm. I want to ask you what is the state of your arm after your talks today? [*Laughter*]

The President. I can answer you the three questions very quickly, or two, and then you had one for the Prime Minister.

First of all, when two nations are friends, it doesn't mean that they agree on everything or that they should. But in the context of their friendly relationships, they are then able to discuss differences, problems, or issues between them. We discussed in a very, I think, open way all the things that you might imagine we discussed today. But I have been disturbed by the apparent either strain or perhaps the better word is limitation on the relationships between the U.S. and India as reported in the press, not only here but in your country.

We have a very great stake, it seems to me, in the end of the cold war in having not only a friendly relationship but a constructive and operating relationship—we, the two great democracies, with a great future together. And we emphasized that positive today, not in any way not dealing with other issues of difficulty, but knowing that it all has to be put in a proper context in the interests of the American people and in the interests of the Indian people.

Secondly, with regard to the Security Council issue, that is an issue that I think the United States should keep an open mind on. We have been on record—I have personally and our administration has—for some considerable amount of time favoring permanent membership for Germany and for Japan, who were our two principal opponents in World War II and who since then have built enormous economic superpowers in the context of peaceful countries, not on the backs of military domination, not even with the development of nuclear weapons but basically because of their enormous ability to develop the capacities of their people.

That does not mean that I think we should have a definitive position prohibiting anybody else from participating in that way. I think that's something we should keep an open mind on.

Prime Minister Rao. I think I owe you an answer. My arm is absolutely intact. The President didn't even touch it. [*Laughter*]

The President. I'm very grateful you said that, Mr. Prime Minister, in more ways than one.

Go ahead, Helen.

Human Rights

Q. You've met with your foreign policy advisers today, and maybe it's misunderstood, but there's a widespread perception that you really don't have a definable, resolute foreign policy, that it's ad hoc, crisis to crisis, village to village. Is that true?

Mr. Prime Minister, there are widespread allegations of Indian human rights violations in Kashmir. Are they true?

Prime Minister Rao. No. They're not true.

The President. No.

Foreign Policy

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. No, the answer is no. Let me—wait—if you want to say that this administration has not waved a magic wand and solved all the problems that I dealt with, that I was given when I came to office, that's one thing. But to say that we don't have a clear policy which says our first priority is the safety and security of the American people; in that context we need to continue the work that we are doing with Russia to denuclearize the other former republics, the republics of the former Soviet Union, and to reduce the nuclear threat—and we are doing that; that we then have a serious issue in terms of maintaining our security commitments in the Asian-Pacific region and dealing with the Korean issue—we are doing that—and we have done it, I think, with remarkable consistency in the face of attempts, rhetorical attempts by others to try to tilt the balance one way or the other; that we have a new national security interest, or a renewed national security interest in promoting economic growth and democracy and partnerships which we have manifested with NAFTA, with GATT, with the APEC meeting, with the Summit of the Americas; that from the beginning of my campaign for President, I said that we should not introduce ground troops into Bosnia but that we should try to do what we can to stop ethnic cleansing and to increase the multinational efforts, led by the Europeans who have primary interests there, to bring an end to the fighting on honorable and decent terms—we have certainly done that. And the initiative taken by the Americans and by my administration led to the actions that NATO has taken, has funded and carried out the longest humanitarian airlift ever in our history, and is in large measure responsible for the progress that has been made there.

Now, the fighting in Bosnia continues; the fighting in Haiti continues. I continue to try to look for new solutions. If we look for new solutions when old solutions don't work, does that mean we don't have a coherent foreign policy? I don't think so. So I dispute that.

I think we have made remarkable progress in the Middle East, another place where our national interests are plainly at stake, where the Secretary of State has plainly done a very good job and has the dialog between Syria and Israel further along than it has ever been, as far as I know. And we have played a very constructive role in the progress that has been made in the agreement between the PLO and Israel with regard to Jericho and Gaza. So I feel good about those things.

Do we still have some problems that we had the day I showed up? Yes, we do, and I guess the day I leave office we'll still have some problems. And if we last another 218 years, we'll still have some problems. But I think we are moving aggressively to address these. So that's still—no is as good an answer as that.

Kashmir

Q. My question is, Mr. President, to you regarding Kashmir, and it is in two parts. Recently a report was released by State Department in

which it said, and I quote, "There were credible reports in 1993 of official Pakistani support to Kashmiri militants, who undertook attacks of terrorism in India-controlled Kashmir," unquote. Last year, the House Republican Task Force on Terrorism branded Pakistan as a terrorist state. My question is, will U.S. now put Pakistan back on the list of states that sponsor terrorism? With all the radical statements made by State Department, what is your stand, Mr. President, on Kashmir now?

The President. Well, since the spring of last year, based on our best evidence, official Pakistani material support to the Kashmiri militants has dropped. The Secretary of State concluded last July and again this past January that the available evidence did not warrant a finding that Pakistan—and I've got the exact language here—has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism. Plainly there is still assistance to the militants by private parties in Pakistan. And all I can tell you is we will have to continue to monitor that situation and deal with it based on the facts as we see them.

The ultimate answer there is for these two great nations to get together and resolve that.

China

Q. This kind of follows the question that Helen raised before. At one point, you made it sound as if giving China most-favored-nation status was going to be a pretty easy decision. Why has it taken so long to come to this decision, and what are some of the factors that are going into your decisionmaking on this right now? And can you tell us about Mr. Armacost's mission a little bit?

The President. First of all, it's the decision of great moment for this country that involves not only the economic interests of the American people and the people of China and the human rights interests of the people of China and the human rights commitments of the American people and our Government but also enormous national security interests and international security considerations for a long time to come across a broad range of areas. So it is a very important issue.

Secondly, the decision is due to be made based on facts as they exist moving up to the deadline of June 3d; so that it would have been inappropriate to make a decision in January, February, or March based on that, based on the Executive order, and also the ongoing contacts we had with China.

Thirdly, I can't comment on the question you asked with regard to Mr. Armacost, because we have had a number of people who have gone to China, who have discussed the issues relating to this matter with the Chinese. And we are continuing to have discussions with the Chinese. That's the final answer to your question. The reason that I have not made my statement yet is that we have not concluded our discussions with the Chinese. And I think anything I say about them until we have concluded them would be inappropriate.

India

Q. How far advanced do you think India's nuclear program is, and how many bombs do you think India possesses?

The President. I think you asked the wrong person that. [*Laughter*] I don't think I can or should comment on that.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, you have said that all options are open with regard to Haiti. Can you tell us if that's correct or what the American interest would be in using military action inherent in that threat and how that differs from Rwanda, say, or Bosnia, where you have specifically ruled out the possibility of using U.S. troops?

The President. In Bosnia, since February of 1993, I have said that the United States should contribute to a multinational NATO effort to enforce a peace agreement, if one is reached.

Q. In a possible combat situation——

The President. The difference is, first of all—again, I say, I think it is a mistake for an American President to discuss hypothetical uses of force. But we plainly have a significant interest in Haiti. First, it's in our backyard. Second, we've got a million Haitian-Americans. Third, we've got several thousand Americans in Haiti. Fourth, we believe drugs are coming through Haiti to the United States. Fifth, we face the possibility, continuous possibility, of a massive outflow of Haitian migrants to the United States; they were free to do so because of conditions in Haiti. So we have a lot of very significant interests there. Sixth, Haiti and Cuba are the only two nondemocracies left in our hemisphere, and unlike Cuba, Haiti at least had an election

and voted overwhelmingly for a democratic government, which has been denied.

India

Q. After this summit, are there differences between India and the U.S.? NPT and human rights, have they narrowed down, or does it stand where it is?

The President. I wouldn't say they have narrowed down, but I think they should be seen in the context of the whole relationship. We both support a comprehensive test ban treaty. We both support an end to the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. If we did both those things, that would dramatically reduce the prospect of nuclear development anywhere in the world if, in fact, those treaties were adhered to by everyone and enforced.

We have some things that we have agreed to continue to discuss with regard to the human rights issue and the proliferation issue, and we will continue to discuss them. But I think what you should say is, the differences remain, but in the context of our common interests and our common values, we believe they can be managed in a very constructive way and still allow this relationship to grow and strengthen.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, if I could ask you a domestic question. Welfare reform, which has been delayed repeatedly over these months—so many of your colleagues, or so many Democrats in Congress say health care reform should have the priority now, that if you do go forward with the welfare reform package, in terms of financing, that that would muddy the waters, make it more difficult to get health care reform. Since welfare reform is dependent, as you often say, on health care reform, why not simply delay welfare reform a little bit longer so you get health care first?

The President. Well, first let me say, Congress, just as it did last year when we had the most productive first year of a Presidency in 40 years, I guess, Congress has a lot to do. They've already passed major education reform, school-to-work, Goals 2000, Head Start expansion. They still have to deal with lobby reform, campaign finance reform, most importantly to me, the crime bill, as well as the health care issue.

But as you have seen with health care or with welfare reform, introducing a piece of legislation starts a process that does not finish in a week or a month. And I think the outlines of the principles that I have embraced on welfare reform are very well known. Indeed, my own views on this are not markedly different from the bill introduced by Mr. McCurdy and others except for the way that I would propose to pay for it.

And so I think that putting out in the late spring—we're a little later than I thought we'd be; I thought we'd have this bill out around the first of May—but putting out the bill so that the Congress can see it and see what I think ought to be done and how I would propose to pay for it and so the Democrats and Republicans alike can evaluate it, is an appropriate thing to do. It might catch fire; the whole thing might catch fire. We might have a bipartisan consensus to move the bill in a hurry and get it this year. I wouldn't write that off. But I don't see that that will undermine health care.

It is, however—the flipside is true. Until you find a way to provide health coverage for all workers, you will never have full welfare reform because you're going to have people staying on welfare because that's the only way their kids can get health care. And you're going to have the anomaly of people getting off welfare, taking low-wage jobs, giving up their health coverage so they can earn taxes to pay for the health care of the people who stayed on welfare. So that is the more important issue for the long run. But I don't believe that my introducing my plan will undermine our ability to achieve health care reform this year.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

Q. Mr. President, Israel is known to possess nuclear arms, but the U.S. doesn't seem to be doing anything about it, while there is a lot of pressure on countries like India. Why this double standard?

The President. Well, first of all, sir, we are trying to deal with the international nuclear problems. But we also believe very strongly that the fewer countries who become nuclear powers, the better off we're all going to be.

And if there is a system in which the security of nations who think they may have to develop nuclear weapons to protect themselves can have their security guaranteed in other ways, we think that that's our job to try to put the system out there, to put those alternatives out there, so that people will see it is not in their long-

term security interest to develop such weapons. That's our position.

What we're trying to do is to keep the number of people in the nuclear club as small as possible and then reduce the nuclear arsenals that they have, including our own. As you know, we've worked hard to reduce our own with the Russians.

So that is our position. But our position further is that no one should be asked to put their own security at risk to achieve that. So any dialog we have with India on this would be in the context of what is pivotal for India's security: How can we enhance your security, not diminish it? It would be wrong for the United States to tell your great nation, or the smallest nation on the face of the Earth, that we recommend a course of action for them that would reduce security. We should be in the business of increasing security.

But I believe you can increase your security and avoid becoming a nuclear power. Japan did it. Germany did it. A lot of other countries have done it. We can do it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 57th news conference began at 2:04 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Armacost, Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University.

Nomination for the United States Information Agency

May 19, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Barry Fulton as Associate Director for the United States Information Agency's new Information Bureau.

"I am pleased to name Barry Fulton to serve as the first Associate Director of this new Bureau," the President said. "He was instrumental in the development of the new Information Bureau and is uniquely qualified to lead USIA's information programs in a changing global environment."

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

Remarks on the Death of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

May 20, 1994

On this sad occasion, Hillary and I join our Nation in mourning the loss of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. Jackie Kennedy Onassis was a model of courage and dignity for all Americans and all the world.

More than any other woman of her time, she captivated our Nation and the world with her intelligence, her elegance, and her grace. Even in the face of impossible tragedy, she carried the grief of her family and our entire Nation with a calm power that somehow reassured all the rest of us.

As First Lady, Mrs. Onassis had an uncommon appreciation of the culture that awakened us to all the beauty of our own heritage. She loved art and music, poetry and books, history and architecture, and all matters that enrich the human spirit. She was equally passionate about improving the human condition. She abhorred discrimination of all kinds. And through small, quiet gestures, she stirred the Nation's conscience. She was the first First Lady to hire a mentally retarded employee here at the White House. And she made certain for the first time that minority children were all welcome in the White House nursery.

She and President Kennedy embodied such vitality, such optimism, such pride in our Nation, they inspired an entire generation of young Americans to see the nobility of helping others and to get involved in public service.

When I became President, I was fortunate enough to get to know Mrs. Onassis better, and to see her and her children as friends as well as important American history models and good citizens. I can say that, as much as anything else today, I am grateful for her incredible generosity to Hillary and to Chelsea, the way she shared her thoughts on everything from how to raise children in the White House to ideas about historic preservation, to her favorite current books.

We hope that Mrs. Onassis' children, John and Caroline, and her grandchildren find solace in the extraordinary contribution she made to our country. Our thoughts and prayers are with her children and grandchildren and her entire family as we grieve over the passing of a cherished friend.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:39 a.m. in the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden at the White House.

Remarks to the Community in San Bernardino, California
May 20, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator Feinstein, for that fine introduction, Senator Boxer, Congressman Brown, and Congressman Lewis. I'm glad to see Supervisor Jerry Eaves; he's already been to see me in Washington. Mayor Minor, it's good to see you. We talked on the phone about law enforcement not very long ago. I was thinking, when I saw Mr. Larson up here talking, he's about a head taller than I am; he could run any airport in the country for me. [*Laughter*] I kind of like that.

And I also want to thank our Secretary of the Air Force, Sheila Widnall, for being here and for the very poignant remarks that she made about the importance of these military bases to our communities and our life here. I would like to say also a special word of appreciation for the intense efforts that the California delegation has made to bring to bear in the Oval Office the needs of the people of California. I know you thought that Senator Feinstein was being somewhat aggressive here on the public forum. That is nothing compared to what I hear in private. [*Laughter*] If you've never been worked on by Feinstein and Boxer at one time, just imagine if somebody took a huge fingernail file and applied it to your head. Sooner or later you just say, "All right, whatever you want, take it and run." [*Laughter*]

I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to George Brown for his brilliant leadership in the fields of science and technology, trying to help us to modernize the economy in ways that can only help. And I want to say a particular word of thanks to Jerry Lewis for his work with me on a number of issues and for his kind comments today and for holding out the prospect that we can still bridge some of the awful partisan divide that still paralyzes Washington too often. I thank him for what he said; I especially thank him for what he said about Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis.

This is a very sad day for my wife and for my daughter and for me because, in addition to being a very important figure in our Nation, she was a personal friend of ours. Last summer on our family vacation, we had one of the most wonderful days I ever spent with Jackie and her daughter, Caroline, and her son-in-law and her brother-in-law and a number of members of her family. She was an astonishing woman who I think did a remarkable thing in raising two very fine children in what could have been the destructive public glare of the spotlight.

I'd like to just echo one thing that Jerry said. When President Kennedy was elected, he inspired a whole generation of Americans, I think, without regard to party, with the promise that public life could be a noble and good thing and that together we could make a difference. The country had grown somewhat weary after the burdens of World War II and then the war in Korea, and he said we ought to get moving again; we ought to get the country moving again. And people felt good about it, even when they disagreed about the specifics. The main reason I ran for President is that I thought we ought to get the country moving again and that we ought to pull the country together again.

I'll never forget the day I came to the Inland Empire and played in that big softball game. Some of you might have been there. It wasn't my best softball game, but it was one of my better days. And I left that crowd thinking, "You know, this is America. We are a very diverse country, but we're at our best when we're pulling together." And out here in the real world where people worry about base closures and their kids' education and whether their streets are safe, most of our problems do not have an answer that pulls us hard to the left or the right or calls for a label of party or philosophy. And most of them can only be solved if we air our differences in a civilized and honest and listening way and then pull together and work together.

I was afraid in 1992 that we weren't doing what we needed to do to go into the 21st century. The deficit was going up when it ought to be going down. Unemployment was going up when it ought to be going down. We weren't adequately preparing our workers and our children. We weren't investing in new technologies. We weren't coming to grips with the demands of change. And nothing made it more clear to me than an experience I had as Governor of my own State dealing with a base closing, when a base closed in a part of my State that already had double-digit unemployment before it closed. And they told me that I could have some of this land for a public park but not to put people back to work. They told me that we'd have to come up with all kinds of money if we wanted to convert the base, and the whole area, as I said, had double-digit unemployment before the base closed.

Well, we've tried to change all that. Our economic plan's got the deficit going down and unemployment going down—3 million new jobs in 16 months. We'll have, if the Congress passes this plan—and I believe they will pass this one on a bipartisan basis—for the first time since Harry Truman was President, the deficit will go down for 3 years in a row. And that's something that America can be proud of.

And we came up with this new strategy to try to help people who had won the cold war for us but were losing the aftermath because of base closings deal with that. You've heard a little bit about it today. The announcement of the DFAS center here and in three other places in California is a symbol of that. But I want you to know how it came about. When I became President, I knew that the Defense Department had plans to collapse over 300 very small data processing centers into some smaller number, perhaps as few as 8, perhaps as many as 13. And I said, "Well, what are the economies of this?" And they had basically opened the bidding process, again, inviting communities to put up as much money as they could in facilities and other things to get these things. And it seemed to me that that was wrong, because this was a defense investment after years and years of defense disinvestment in communities all over the country. And I know how a small investment like this can really jumpstart a whole economy and what it can do to the psychology of a community.

So we decided that we would go back and change the DFAS process, not to pick communities—we didn't know who would win and who wouldn't—but to give special consideration to communities that had suffered from base closings. And we also learned that the economies of this were such that we could do 25 and save about as much money as we could if we just did 10 or 12. So we decided that we would do that.

You were the victor in that process, partly because you had the talent and the resources and because you had a base closing. So you didn't have to win a bazaar; all you had to do was to show that you could do the job, you could do a very fine job, and that you had suffered grievously from the base closing process. That, I think, was the right thing to do.

The second thing we did was to change the rules for how we handled these bases. Under the old rule, we could give away bases free, as I said, for new parks but not for new jobs. Under our plan we give planning grants to communities that put together groups like this; we speed up the environmental cleanup; we cut a lot of the redtape, and we focus on creating new jobs.

As you know, about 1,300 acres, if I remember my briefing right, has already been approved here for your new San Bernardino International Airport. There will be a few other acres approved in the course of this year for good public purposes, dealing with parks and education and other problems that you have. And we are working now on the negotiations for the transfer of the land which will permit economic development of all kinds.

The thing I want to say to you is that normally when a politician comes to a place like this, the emphasis is on what we are giving to you. And what we gave to you here was the DFAS center. Now, I'm proud of that, but you got it because you deserve it. You got it because you lost a base and because you have the capacity to do it.

But over the long run—and I predict 10 years from now you all will look back on this and agree with me—as important as that DFAS center is, the far more important thing we have done is to change the rules by which this base is given back to you because that empowers you to create your own future with a resource that rightfully belongs to you. And you should be very proud of that today.

When I leave here, I'm going over to UCLA to speak at their convocation, and I'll try to remember that the most important thing for young people at graduation time is that the speaker be brief. [*Laughter*] But I'll be thinking about you over there and the spirit of John and Jackie Kennedy and the simple idea that the future is something that none of us can ever take for granted, that we always have to make for ourselves, for our children, and for our grandchildren.

If I could leave that legacy as President, if I could make the American people feel good about embracing the changes that we're confronting, instead of feeling threatened by them, and believe again that by pulling together across all the lines that divide us, we can solve our problems and seize our opportunities, that would be a legacy worth leaving. More important than any specific project, my fellow Americans, we have to believe in our better selves again. We cannot be, we cannot be distracted, divided, diverted, dragged down. This is a time for uplift, for looking to the future, and for pulling together. You have proved that it works. Let us do it for all America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 a.m. at the San Bernardino International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Jerry Eaves, county supervisor and chair of the Reuse Project; Swen Larson, president, International Airport Authority, San Bernardino International Airport; and Mayor Tom Minor of San Bernardino.

Remarks at the University of California in Los Angeles, California
May 20, 1994

Thank you so much for allowing me to be part of this wonderful occasion and for the university medal. You know, for a person like me who is a diehard basketball fan, just walking in Pauley Pavilion is a great honor. I dreamed of being here for many years, but I never thought that it would be on this kind of occasion. [*Laughter*] I'm proud to be here to honor the university's 75th anniversary and to honor your chancellor on his 25th anniversary of service. It is the sort of commitment our country could do with more of, and I honor it, and I know you do, too.

To my good friend Mayor Riordan; President Peltason; Regent Sue Johnson; President Shapiro; to Carol Goldberg-Ambrose, the chair of your Academic Senate; to Kate Anderson and Khosrow Khosravani—we had a great talk over there. I hope we didn't earn any conduct demerits. But the two students told me a lot about UCLA. [*Laughter*] To all of you, I thank you for the chance to be here. The spirit in this room has been truly moving to me today.

This is a sad day for our country and for my family because we mourn the loss of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. She was a remarkable woman of courage and dignity, who loved things that ennobled the human spirit. She and President Kennedy inspired me and an entire generation of Americans to see the nobility of helping others and the good that could come in public service. In later years, and particularly in this last year, it was my family's privilege to get to know her personally and to see that the image which was projected to all the world was more than met by the true person behind the image. Today, as we offer our prayers and best wishes to her family, I think it well to remember that Jackie Kennedy and her husband called us to a time when the world was full of challenges

that we saw in terms of possibilities, not problems. We saw our own lives in terms of promise, not pessimism. We thought our job here on Earth was to build up, not tear down; to unite, not to divide.

I say to the students who are here from this magnificent institution, you now have an education as fine as the world can afford. The question now is, as you go out into the world, what is your attitude about yourselves, each other, your country, and your future.

UCLA, as I watched that slide show it was clear to me again, is an example of America's faith in the future, the thing that's kept us going for 218 years now. Seventy-five years ago, this was just a tiny 2-year teachers college on a dirt road in Hollywood. Now, it's one of the leading research institutions in the world and a bridge to the future for tens of thousands of Americans and people who come from all around the world to be here.

There's no better place to discuss the future than here in California, America's last frontier. For all of your present difficulties, don't ever forget that California is still America's America, the cutting edge for a nation still a symbol of hope and optimism throughout the world.

I want to say that I very much envy those of you who are beginning your future here and now, on the edge of this new century. Many say that this generation of college graduates is filled with pessimism, with a sense of generational despair that our glory days are behind us. Americans of my generation have been bombarded by images on television shows, and even one book, about the so-called Generation X, filled with cynics and slackers. Well, what I have seen today is not a generation of slackers but a generation of seekers, and I am much encouraged.

To be sure, you are beginning your journey in uncertain times. Many of the college graduates of 1994 were born in 1973. That was a watershed year in American life. You see, from the end of World War II until 1973, family income doubled in America, and we lived in an era of prosperity that we almost came to take for granted. The middle class grew ever larger and more secure; our country was stronger. People just took it for granted that they could get jobs they could hold for a lifetime, that they would always do better every year than they did the year before, that they would be able to afford to send their children to college, to have a comfortable retirement, to own their own homes, and to take care of their parents.

Since then, most Americans have worked harder and harder for the same or lower incomes. Our society has suffered unbelievable stresses as broken homes and unwed mothers have become commonplace. In many places devastated by poverty and despair, we have seen the absolute collapse of families and work itself and the sense of community. And in that vacuum have rushed gangs and drugs and violence, the kind of random violence that today often makes neighbors seem like strangers and strangers thought of as enemies.

In the time that many of you went from the first grade through high school graduation, when all this was going on, your National Government was embroiled in a sense of gridlock and paralysis and high rhetoric and low action. The deficit quadrupled, but there were no investments made adequate to the challenges of the future, and many of our tough problems were talked about but not acted on.

Here in this county, you've experienced earthquakes of all kinds, not just the real earthquake of January but social and economic upheavals. The trends that are shaking and remaking our entire society have hit California first and hardest.

Next month many college graduates will move on to their first full-time jobs. And I wonder how many of you have, like me, laughed and almost cried reading that wonderful Doonesbury comic strip—that is, on some days I think it's wonderful; some days I'm not so sure—[*laughter*]—which means I probably feel the same way about Mr. Trudeau that he feels about me—[*laughter*]—you know, the great Doonesbury strip about the students at the college graduation trading stories about their job openings and whether they're going to be selling blue jeans or flipping hamburgers. [*Laughter*] Well, it's funny, but it's not quite accurate. The truth is that education still makes a huge difference in what you can do with your lives and your future. It is still the key, indeed, more the key today than ever before.

The truth also is that your destiny will be filled with great chances and great choices. As with every new generation in this country, you will make your mark by exploring new frontiers. Once the challenge was settling a new continent. Now it is preparing for a new century. And you face the next American frontier, which you

can see here at UCLA all around you, living with people who may seem different, working with technologies that may seem difficult, pursuing markets and opportunities that may seem distant.

For the rest of your lives you will face this choice. In the face of bewildering, intense, sometimes overpowering change, you can recoil. You can hope to do as well as you can for as long as you can simply by trying to hold the future at arm's length. Or you can act in the spirit of America or the State or this great university of which you are a part, the spirit of the families who sacrificed so much to bring you here. You can embrace the future with all of its changes and engage in what the late Oliver Wendell Holmes called "the action and passion of your time." The choice you make as individuals and as a generation will make all the difference.

Three times in this century alone our Nation has found itself a victor in global conflicts, World War I, World War II, and the cold war. Three times America has faced the fundamental question of which direction we would take, embracing or rejecting the future. Seventy-five years ago, when this university was founded, we faced one of those pivotal moments. At that time, just after the end of World War I, there was also wrenching change and enormous anxiety. The Nation's hottest new novelist was a man named F. Scott Fitzgerald. He described the so-called lost generation, the first that would graduate from UCLA. He said that they grew up, and I quote, "to find all gods dead, all wars fought, all faiths in man shaken." America withdrew from the world, seeking security in isolationism and protectionism. An ugly withdrawal occurred here at home as well, a retreat into the trenches of racial prejudice and religious prejudice, of class bigotry and easy convenience, and a simple refusal to prepare our people to live in the world as it was.

Ten years later, just 10 years later in 1929, that decade of neglect produced the Great Depression. And soon we learned we could not withdraw from a world menaced by dictators, and we found ourselves again in a world war.

At the end of the Second World War, we made a very different choice as a people. We decided to reach out to the future together, together here at home and together with nations around the world. As Franklin Roosevelt said of the generation of my parents and the graduates' grandparents, they believed history was, I quote, "a highway on which your fellow men and women are advancing with you." Abroad, we lifted former allies and former enemies from the ashes. At home, investment in the future began with the returning warriors. The GI bill helped millions of Americans to get an education, to buy homes, to build the great American middle class. We made a solemn covenant: We would help those who would help themselves.

The wise decisions of that time built four decades of robust economic growth and expanding opportunity and laid the foundation for us to be able to win the cold war. Now, we stand at our third pivotal moment in this century. And you are designed to play the leading role. The cold war is over. It is up to all of us to keep the American dream alive here at home, even as it advances abroad. But this miracle of renewal must begin with personal decisions.

I sought the Presidency in large measure because I thought my generation had not yet done its job for America. I did not want my daughter to grow up to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. As we were becoming more wonderfully diverse, I did not want her to live in a country that was coming apart when it ought to be coming together. I wanted to forge the two great sources of strength that our Nation has: the power of our representative Government, as manifested in the Presidency, to address the challenges of every age and time and the far, far greater power of the American people themselves to transform themselves, their families, and their communities, to seize the future and make it theirs.

My generation's responsibility to you is heavy, indeed. We are working in Washington to meet it, working to turn around the economic difficulties. And we have made a good beginning: 3 million new jobs in 15 months; 3 years of deficit reduction, 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President; at the end of this budget cycle, the smallest Federal Government in 30 years, since John Kennedy was President, with all the savings going back to you to make America safer with more police officers on the street and programs to help our children stay out of crime and have a better future. We are investing in the technologies of tomorrow, from defense conversion to environmental protection to the information

superhighway; with new attacks on our profoundest problems, from AIDS to women's health problems, to homelessness, to the deed to have enterprise development among the poor in cities and rural areas, to the terrible difficulties of our health care system. We are building education for a lifetime, from dramatic expansions in Head Start to permanent retraining programs for displaced adults. We are looking for new markets for our products and services with new trade agreements and new opportunities to sell our best efforts here around the world.

My fellow Americans, this country is on the move, and California is coming back. But the real problem I believe we have today is the problem I came to talk to you about: What will the attitude of your generation be, and how will you approach the future that is before you?

Jackie Kennedy and her husband made us believe that citizenship was a wonderful thing, that we all had the capacity to be better people and to work together, and that the things we could do together would make a very great difference indeed. If President Kennedy were alive today, he would be absolutely shocked at the pessimism, the negativism, the division, the destructive tone of public discourse in America today.

We know we can do better. But if we are to do better, you will have to lead us by looking around at all this diversity you have celebrated today, by this devotion to community you have exhausted, and bringing it out of us.

Just before I came here, I stopped briefly at Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino, which, as you know, was one of the bases closed, to announce the progress we are making at rebuilding that community with a new computer center there, with turning over the land to a new airport and for other public purposes and eventually for economic development. And it's the first one of these bases in the country that the Government has finally said, let's help people build their economy instead of dragging this out til kingdom come. And it was a celebration that knew no party lines, knew no philosophical lines, knew no racial lines. Nobody was out there talking about left and right and liberal and conservative and Republican and Democrat. They were talking about how we could deal with the real problems and opportunities of those people, to pull that community together and push it forward into the future. That is what we must do as a people. And that is what your generation must do in order for America to fulfill its promise.

Now, to do that in a great democracy, where there are a myriad of complex problems and legitimate differences of opinion, we must learn to do something as a people that we often take for granted in the university. We have to learn to talk to each other and to listen to each other, not to talk past each other and to scream at one another.

We have been caught up in what the Georgetown professor Deborah Tannen calls a culture of critique. One sure way to get instant public standing in our popular culture is to slam somebody else. If you work on bringing people together and you talk about it, you're likely to elicit a yawn. But if you bad-mouth people, you can get yourself a talk show.

This country was not built by bad-mouthing. Go back and look at the history of the Constitutional Convention. Go back and look at how people got together wildly different points of view and argued heatedly but always with a common love of this country and the values of freedom and mutual respect. We have to find a way in this age and time to restore that kind of discourse and that kind of respect. We cannot afford to engage in the citizenship of division and distraction and destruction. We have a future to build, and you must lead the way. You know you can do it, because of the way you have been educated here and the people from whom you have learned and with whom you've learned. And you can lead the way for the whole future of this country.

It was because I believe that so strongly that I put at the center of what symbolizes our administration the national service corps, what we call AmeriCorps, the opportunity for tens of thousands of young people to work where they live or where they go to school, solving the problems of America at the grassroots, learning from each other, reaching across lines that divide them, and earning money for their educations at the same time. Rebuild America and educate a new generation—it's sort of a domestic GI bill and a domestic Peace Corps all rolled into one. It was inspired by efforts that I saw all over America over the last few years, efforts like the California Campus Compact, which your chancellor helped to found, which now commits more than 50 colleges and universities in this State to helping students serve their communities. At UCLA alone some 4,000 of you are

working in more than 40 service programs, and I honor you for that.

This summer 7,000 young Americans will work in a summer of safety, helping their communities to be less violent. Last summer in our first summer of service, thousands of people all over the country, including here in Los Angeles, taught young people everything from how to stay away from drugs to how to stay safe in an earthquake.

Service creates heroes. I was interested in the three people acknowledged there by Chancellor Young, and I appreciate what he said. Let me say that there's one project I'd like to mention in particular which one of the young students is involved in, Saru Jayaraman, along with another student, Desiree DeSurra. They helped to found the Women In Support of Each Other, acronym WISE. This program, WISE, helped high school girls to make wise decisions to pursue their education and not to become single mothers. Desiree was one of three students selected to win this year's Chancellor's Humanitarian Award.

Now, let me tell you what that means to me. That is America at its best, people helping people, telling people, "Look, maybe the President should do something, maybe the chancellor of the university should do something, maybe the mayor should do something, but in the end, you also have to take responsibility for your own lives. You have to make good decisions in order to be part of a good future."

Thousands of young people just here on this campus alone have made a decision to make a difference. Beginning this September, AmeriCorps will enable tens of thousands of more to do that. I hope I live long enough to see hundreds of thousands of people in this program every year, earning their way to a better education by rebuilding America every day at the grassroots level.

The point of all that I have said is this: The future is not an inheritance, it is an opportunity and an obligation. It is something you have to make in every generation, and it will be your achievement, not only for yourselves individually but for your generation, for your community, and for the larger community that is America.

If you look around you at this incredible campus where minorities make up a majority, something that will be true for whole States in the not too distant future, you see the future. LA County with over 150 different racial and ethnic groups, thousands of people in this county celebrating this month as Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month because of the number of people who live here; a few days ago in America we celebrated the Cinco de Mayo celebration, Mexican Independence Day, and it is now as big a celebration in America as it is in Mexico because of our diversity. Will it be a source of our strength in the global village, or will we permit it to divide us? I believe I know the answer. And I think you do, too.

There's no reason to be cynical about the future, no matter how difficult our problems are. Look what's just happened in the last 4 or 5 years since many of you came to the university here: the end of the cold war; the fall of the Berlin Wall. Just in the last year, Russia and the United States agree not to point nuclear weapons at each other anymore; Rabin and Arafat agree to self-government for the Palestinians in Jericho and the Gaza; the jailer and the jailed, de Klerk and Mandela, agree that South Africa free, united is more important than anything else.

In just a few days from now, I will go to represent you at the 50th anniversary of the D-Day invasion. Just a few days ago, I was able to speak on the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education.* It is very important for a great country to remember those moments. But remember this, my fellow Americans: When our memories exceed our dreams, we have begun to grow old. And it is the destiny of America to remain forever young.

So I ask you this, young graduates, especially: When you see in a few days the glories of D-Day recounted, one of the most masterful mobilization of people to achieve a common objective, one of the most stunning examples of personal courage in all of human history, remember that it was the work of citizen soldiers who were mostly between the ages of 18 and 25, people who had grown up in the false prosperity of the twenties and the bitter realities of the thirties, people who read books and movies that portrayed them as slackers and the future as dark and cynical. But they rallied that day to a cause larger than themselves. And when they had done the job they were sent to do—to save their country, to save freedom, to save a civilization—they came home and got on with the business of making lives for themselves, their children, and their children's children.

Thanks to them and to God Almighty, you will probably never have to face that kind of challenge in your life but, instead, to face the challenges unique to your generation, the challenges of a new and wide-open world, the challenges of breakdown here at home that we must reverse.

I believe you are ready for that test and that you will meet it. You have the educational tools to meet it. You must now make sure that deep down inside you have the spirit, the drive, the courage, the vision. We are all depending on you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:24 p.m. in Pauley Pavilion at the 75th anniversary convocation. In his remarks, he referred to Charles E. Young, chancellor, University of California-Los Angeles; Mayor Richard Riordan of Los Angeles; Jack W. Peltason, president, and Sue Johnson, board of regents vice chairperson, University of California; Harold T. Shapiro, president, Princeton University; Kate Anderson, president, UCLA Undergraduate Student Association; and Khosrow Khosravani, external vice president, UCLA Graduate Student Association.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Army Force Sufficiency

May 20, 1994

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

As required in section 403 of the 1994 National Defense Authorization Act, I am hereby certifying that the Army is capable of providing sufficient forces (excluding forces engaged in peacekeeping operations and other operations other than war) to carry out two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously, in accordance with the National Military Strategy.

Moreover, the attached report specifies the active Army units anticipated to deploy within the first 75 days in response to a major regional conflict that are currently engaged in peacekeeping operations and other operations other than war. The report also specifies my estimate of the time required to redeploy and retrain those forces.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Statement on Cuban Independence Day

May 20, 1994

On this May 20th, Cuban Independence Day, I wish to convey to the Cuban-American community the best wishes of the American people. We fully share your hopes and aspirations for a future when the people of Cuba can enjoy freedom and democracy. For over three decades, Cuba has suffered under an inhumane dictatorship. It's my deep and committed desire that the Cuban people will live in liberty.

The centerpiece of my administration's foreign policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean has been a commitment to democracy, human rights, and accountable government. A welcome tide of democratic government has swept throughout the hemisphere. The will of the people is being expressed through democratic elections and the strengthening of the rule of law.

Only two countries in the entire hemisphere remain outside this democratic community of nations, Cuba and Haiti. And we are working hard for the restoration of the freely and fairly elected constitutional government of President Aristide in Haiti. Cuba's time has also come.

We wish for the people of Cuba what we wish for all people of the Americas: freedom

of the press and speech, protection from arbitrary arrest and respect for due process, and the rule of law. We wish for the people of Cuba what we strive for for ourselves: prosperity, an environment where our basic needs are met and where our children can grow and develop spiritually and in safety. We wish, on this historic anniversary, for a prosperous, vibrant, flourishing democracy that frees the creativity of the people of Cuba.

Let me be clear. We maintain the trade embargo against the Castro regime because the United States does not want to do anything that could strengthen the dictatorship. As the same time, the Cuban Democracy Act allows humanitarian assistance and the free flow of communications and ideas that can help to alleviate the suffering and isolation of the Cuban people. It is for this reason that I will continue to support Radio and TV Marti; they are an important window to the world.

The United States has no quarrel with the Cuban people. There is a long history of mutual cooperation and admiration between our two peoples. Only the dictatorship stands between our two nations. The United States will continue to encourage the dream of a free and democratic Cuba. As Jose Marti, hero of Cuba and of the Americas said, "We love liberty, because in it we see the truth." The whole world has now seen the truth of the failure of dictatorship. I pray that soon the Cuban people will enjoy the freedoms, the rights, the privileges that they deserve as human beings and that democracy so vigorously guarantees.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Senator Dianne Feinstein in Beverly Hills, California

May 20, 1994

Thank you very much to my friend Willie Brown and to Sally Field for those wonderful comments, to Ron and Jan Burkle for inviting us here to their beautiful place, to Dick Blum and all the other supporters of Senator Feinstein's campaign.

There are two remarkable things about this evening for me. The first is, this is the third time I have been here, and every time I come, when I go back to the White House, I feel like I'm in reasonably nice public housing. [*Laughter*] The second thing is that I want Dianne Feinstein to be reelected so badly that I have spoken at two of her fundraisers, but this is the first one where she's showed up. [*Laughter*] It's a humbling job I've got. [*Laughter*]

You know, Hollywood discovers stars all the time, and now America is beginning to discover Dianne Feinstein. [*Applause*] You can clap for that. She's sort of replacing Tommy Lasorda as the person people think of when they think of California. [*Laughter*] You know, before I started running for President, that's what I thought of in California. I'd see Tommy Lasorda getting smaller and smaller and smaller on television, saying he'd shrunk himself with that Slim-Fast. That's what we're trying to pour into the Federal budget. [*Laughter*] Now the deficit is down; the Dodgers are in first place. I've asked Lasorda to take over the lobbying for health care reform. [*Laughter*]

I don't know—before we get to Dianne's main event we'll have to watch this primary with Bill Dannemeyer and Michael Huffington, who spent $5½ million of his own money in the last election. And now he's spent $2 million to go on television to review Bill Bennett's book. I don't know how she can hope to meet and defeat a person who is foursquare for virtue. But I want to say a little more about that in a moment. I think Dianne Feinstein works for virtue and embodies virtue, and I hope she will be returned on that basis.

I want to say something serious, if I might. This is a, actually, kind of tough day for me to give a speech. I had the opportunity, as Senator Feinstein said, to go with her and Senator Boxer and others to the Inland Empire today to talk about how we could revitalize San Bernardino after the Norton Air Force Base closure and what is being done there, which is truly astonishing, and then to go to UCLA and speak to some wonderful young people at their

convocation. But this is a sad day for Hillary and for me because Jackie Kennedy Onassis passed away last night, and she was not only a great symbol of courage and grace and dignity for our country, but she was a real friend of ours and a special friend of my wife and very kind to our wonderful daughter. And like many of you, when I heard last night that she had lost her fight, my mind began to race over the last 30 years, back to how it was then, back to how it is now, back and forth, what happened in between.

One thing that Jackie and John Kennedy surely did was to make us all believe that somehow together we could make a difference, that what we did mattered, that our role as citizens was important, and that if we gave ourselves to public service, that was the sign of good judgment and compassion. It was a fine thing to do. In other words, we lived in a time then when there was much less cynicism and pessimism and skepticism and in which public discourse was a thing of honor, not a shouting match bent on destruction and division and distraction.

I honestly believe that our ability to bring this country into the 21st century as strong as it needs to be and as united as it needs to be depends perhaps more than anything else on our uncommon strength of purpose which we have mustered in times past, this time to muster on our own state of mind, to fight against all the forces that seek to drag us down and pit us against one another, and to somehow elevate our sense of common purpose.

It isn't easy, and there are lots of folks who hope it won't happen for all kinds of reasons. But if you think about this race in which Dianne Feinstein is involved, it is an example of what we plainly have to do. I'll never forget last fall when she was fighting for the assault weapons ban. And she called and she said, "Now, you said you were for this, Mr. President, and I want you to help me." And I said, "Well, Dianne, we're probably not going to win, but I'll work like crazy for it." So, she gave me my list to call, and call I did. [*Laughter*] And then, that incredibly sensitive Senator on the other side of the issue said that—[*laughter*]—she needed to become a little more familiar with firearms and their deadly characteristics. You all remember what she said in return. She recalled how she became the mayor of San Francisco, how she tried to find the pulse of her slain colleague, how she had been trained in the shooting of a firearm when she had terrorist attacks, with a bomb in her house when her husband was dying, when her windows were shot out.

Well, I don't know if that other guy's made a speech on the floor of the Senate since then. [*Laughter*] But I do know that speech had something to do not only with the passage of the assault weapons ban but with changing the tone and tenor of the debate in the United States Senate over an issue of immense national importance.

When we were trying to get the assault weapons bill passed in the House—same song, second verse—Charles Schumer, a wonderful Congressman from Brooklyn, had carried this bill and had been defeated by 70 votes in 1991. Some significant changes were made in the bill; it was clarified and tightened up a bit. And we even did something that had never been done before, we listed several hundred purely hunting and sporting weapons that were protected under this law. And Senator Feinstein went to work and Chuck Schumer went to work. And so Chuck called me, and he said, "Well, Mr. President, we really need your help. We're probably 40 votes behind and we can't get there, but we ought to try." And I said, "I'd be happy to lose in this cause, but don't be too sure that we can't make it."

Well, you all know what happened. But I wish I could tell you all the stories that produced that 216-to-214 vote victory. One of the clearer reasons was that a conservative Republican from Illinois who is very much respected among his party members, Henry Hyde, was undecided when Dianne Feinstein sent him a big, fat briefing book which included a list of the assault weapons shootings in Illinois since 1991. Henry Hyde stunned the entire Congress by announcing that he had changed his position, he was going to vote for the ban. And he credited Dianne Feinstein for providing him with convincing information.

When that happened, then other things started to happen. First one, then another person would announce for the bill. A Congressman from Michigan in a hunting area, who had never in 20 years in Congress, never cast one vote against the NRA, changed his position. Two Democrats from difficult constituencies, one of whom was an ex-police officer, changed their vote walking down the aisle to cast their ballot, people knowing they were putting their careers

at risk because they grew weary of the shouting and pushing and the division and the rhetoric and they wished something to happen. And in doing that, they ennobled the whole public enterprise again. They made us all believe that, yes, we can, together, make a difference.

I ran for President, as I told those young people at UCLA today, because I thought my generation did not finish its work for America, because I did not want to see my daughter grow up to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents in a country that was coming apart when it ought to be coming together, because I always felt that we could restore the purpose of America and the promise of America if we committed ourselves together to create opportunity, to insist upon responsibility from our citizens, and to reestablish the common bonds of community in this country.

That's what I think Dianne Feinstein is doing. You know, she's been criticized lately on the television for voting for our economic plan last year. Let me tell you why that was such a tough vote. It was such a tough vote because in Washington for so long we had heard nothing but hot air rhetoric instead of reality about what it took to get the deficit down.

My fellow Americans, there are only three ways to get the deficit down. One is to raise taxes; the other is to cut spending; the third is to grow the economy. We did all three with that economic program. And it was the right thing to do. In the first 15 months of this administration there have been 3 million new jobs, one million alone in the first 4 months of this year. We will have, when the Congress passes this year's budget, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States of America. At the end of 5 years, we will have reduced the size of the Federal Government to a point where it is below 2 million people for the first time since John Kennedy was President. And all the savings will be put into a trust fund to pay for the crime bill to make our streets safer. That is what we have been doing in Washington.

Yes, Senator Feinstein voted for the bill, and so did Senator Boxer. And I guess you could say if either one of them hadn't, we wouldn't have had it. Then we would have had what we've been having for 12 years: a lot of rhetoric, no reduction in the deficit, no reduction in interest rates, no growth in the economy. But people would still be able to make speeches. You have to decide whether you want real progress and tough decisions made or more of what you had before. It wasn't very good for the California economy, and we're beginning to turn that around.

You know, one of the things we have to decide is what standard we are going to require in our public discourse. I know when I see an advertisement running against a Senator like Dianne Feinstein, saying that this program was just a tax bill—well, let me tell you, 300,000 people or a little more than 2 percent of your taxpayers, including nearly everybody in this room—[*laughter*]—paid more.

You need to know that 100 percent of that money, 100 percent of it, went to bringing the deficit down. You also need to know that 2 million of your fellow citizens actually got an income tax cut, 15 percent of the Californians. Why? Because they're low-wage workers with children who are hovering just above the poverty line, and we want to encourage them to stay in the work force instead of going on welfare. I think most Americans think that's a good investment.

Ninety percent of the small businesses in this country qualified for tax cuts under the bill. California was helped by the capital gains tax for investments in new enterprises, by the research and experimentation tax credit, by—now because your college costs have gone up—the availability of lower cost college loans with longer repayment terms. That's what was in that economic program that Dianne Feinstein voted for that had the most deficit reduction in history. I don't think it's fair to characterize it as a tax bill, and I don't think it furthers the public debate. All it does is further the present state of high rhetoric and division.

I made a remark a few moments ago about the publicity about Bill Bennett's book. Some of you probably haven't read it, but it basically quotes other people on virtues. You can't run a democracy without an addiction to truth and to fairness. What Dianne Feinstein deserves is truth and fairness. If she gets it, she'll be overwhelmingly reelected.

Senator Feinstein talked a little about breaking gridlock. That's one of the things I was hired to do. It took 7 years to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act, 7 years to pass the Brady bill, 5 years to get a crime bill. That's

how long it takes to get things done in Washington. It's taken us about a year to 15 months to get a lot of these things done. We are turning these things around.

I'd also like to say that Dianne Feinstein is one of the most effective lobbyists of anybody in Congress. I said today—lobbying the President, that is—[*laughter*]—I said today when she and Barbara Boxer come after me at the same time, it's sort of like Mutt and Jeff, you know. [*Laughter*] And it's like—I feel almost as if they've got this gigantic fingernail file that they're putting on my head and rubbing it, you know. And if I will just say yes, they will stop. [*Laughter*] I mean, "Just Say Yes," that's what they want me to do. This is a serious issue. You don't know how I've suffered from this. [*Laughter*] It is literally true that no Member of the Senate has called me more persuasively, more frequently for projects that would create jobs, deal with the crime problem, or deal with the immigration problem in a responsible way than Dianne Feinstein, nobody in the Congress. She's helped me to change the whole approach of the national bureaucracy on defense conversion and base closings so that we can turn closed bases into economic oases for the 21st century.

She has helped me to pass a crime bill that has not just this assault weapons ban but a bill to provide 100,000 more police officers for our streets, not only to catch criminals but to keep crime from happening by working with the children and the neighbors and the people in the community; that has not only tougher punishment with the "three strikes and you're out" law but also more prevention to give our kids something to say yes to and a chance to turn away from a life of violence and to turn away from resolving their differences in a destructive way toward finding constructive ways of dealing with problems and frustrations and anger. This is a very important piece of legislation.

You heard Sally talk about the California Desert Protection Act. That also has been bottled up for 7 years. And after she came to the Senate, it passed 69 to 29. You wonder what it was doing for the last 7 years.

On this immigration issue, you're going to hear a lot about it during this campaign, and you'll probably hear the incumbent Governor putting a lot of pressure on me to do more. I don't mind that. I don't think the States have been treated fairly who have had large immigration problems, not just California, but Florida and New York and New Jersey and other States. They have not been treated fairly or adequately. But I'll tell you this, in the last year we got more money for California in education, health care, and border patrol officers dealing with the cost of immigration than had been the case in the previous 4 years. We are doing better. We are moving in the right direction, thanks to the fact that Dianne Feinstein has taken a responsible, constructive approach, not just a rhetorical, pressure-oriented approach. She is doing something that makes sense, that will actually make a dent in this problem. And she ought to be rewarded for it.

So I say to you, this Senator, in a remarkably short period of time, has established herself as a national leader on the economy, on crime, on the environment, on immigration. That's an amazing record in no more time than she's been there. And she's had the courage to challenge her colleagues and her President to produce, to lower our guards, to trust each other, to talk through these problems.

One of the things that I felt very strongly, having been a Governor, was something I know Dianne felt, having been a mayor, and that is that most of our problems that we face now as a country and as a people, do not fall easily within the past labels of partisanship.

You know, I'll just tell you a story that just tore my heart out. Last week I was on my way to what I thought would be a wonderful day in Indianapolis to dedicate a site for a statue honoring Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy on the site where Robert Kennedy spoke in Indianapolis on April 4, 1968, the night Martin Luther King was killed. And some of you may remember that magnificent speech which calmed the crowds in Indianapolis and made it one of the major cities in America where there was not a riot after Dr. King's assassination. And I was so excited. And Ethel Kennedy went with me, and two of Martin Luther King's sons went with me. And they had just come back from South Africa. And they were ebullient, and we were all so happy. And it's a wonderful thing, this statue's going to be made out of metal melted down from guns turned in by gun buy-back programs sponsored by the Indiana Pacers. It's very exciting. And I picked up my notes and read yet another story of another human tragedy. A 13-year-old boy in Greenbelt, Maryland, right outside Washington, had just won a scholarship to a prestigious school, stand-

ing on a street corner waiting for a bus, shot dead when he got caught in the crossfire between two groups of warring youngsters, neither of whom knew him or gave a rip about him. He just happened to be in the way.

Now, when I hear that story, or when I get yet another letter from somebody telling me they can never change jobs because they've got a child with a terrible illness and their preexisting condition won't allow any other employer to give them health insurance, or when somebody talks to me like they did in San Bernardino today about whether there are going to be enough jobs for their children there after the base closings, it just seems to me that those are the things that our public discourse ought to be concentrated on. When I looked at those kids at UCLA today, that's what I thought.

You know, in this country today—it's going to be a great test for Willie Brown with his new talk show—most people—I'm serious, I'm serious—he's a delightful man with a wonderful personality, he'll pull it off. But the truth is that most people who talk sense and try to bring out the best in folks today are not great commercial successes. If you want to immediately become a popular culture figure, just bad-mouth somebody; they'll give you a talk show. You think about it. We have to fight against that.

I want to end where I began. If you think about what the Kennedys meant to us a generation ago, they were able to do that because we had inside a willingness, a willing heart, a listening ear, a willingness to be summoned to higher purposes, a willingness to believe that we could come together, a willingness to believe that we could make a difference. You all still have that here. You can feel it here tonight. Those kids at UCLA—62 percent of the student body now minority students, they're in the majority, just as they will be in many States within a very few years—you could feel it there. What we owe to our country is to change the heart of the country. We just simply cannot be, with all these challenges before us, all of which, by the way, can be met with sufficient effort and thought and constancy, we cannot afford to be divided, diverted, distracted. We cannot.

We have to have our hearts and our ears and our eyes open. We have to stop shouting at each other and start talking with each other. And we surely have to make a beginning by retaining in public life those people who have devoted themselves to actually doing something that makes a difference.

You will rarely find anybody who has served in the United States Senate for 6 or 12 years who has been involved in so many things that make a difference as has Dianne Feinstein in her very short tenure there. I hope you will renew it and extend it. The Nation needs it, and it will be good for the spirit of California and the feeling that we have to bring back to our whole country.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:20 p.m. at the Green Acres Estate. In his remarks, he referred to Willie Brown, California State Assembly speaker; actress Sally Field; Ron and Jan Burkle, fundraiser hosts; Richard Blum, Senator Feinstein's husband; Tommy Lasorda, manager, Los Angeles Dodgers baseball team; Bill Dannemeyer and Michael Huffington, candidates for the Republican senatorial nomination; and William Bennett, former Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The President's Radio Address
May 21, 1994

Good morning. Hillary and I join our Nation in mourning the loss of former First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. She inspired all of us with her grace and courage. She loved art and culture, all the things that express the better angels of our nature. She and President Kennedy made people believe that change for the better is possible, that public service is a noble calling, and that we ought to be about the business of building our country up, not tearing it down or pulling it apart.

This is a time of considerably more cynicism and pessimism, when harsh rhetoric of division and distraction and outright destruction some-

times dominates discussion of public issues. But it is well today to remember the examples of President and Mrs. Kennedy. They changed our lives for the better because they helped us to believe we could change for the better. That is still true. It is ultimately pointless and self-defeating to believe any other way.

Today I want to talk about two things we can all do to change our future for the better: improving our economy and solving the health care crisis in America. Although we're still in the dawn of our economic recovery, we've clearly begun to turn the economy around, to set the stage for long-term and sustainable economic growth. The deficit is down. Inflation and unemployment are down. Growth, the stock market, jobs, and consumer confidence are all up. In the first 15 months of our administration nearly 3 million jobs were created, over 90 percent of them in the private sector, more than in the previous 4 years combined.

When Congress passes our budget this year we'll have 3 years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was President. With our effort to reinvent the Government to do more with less, we're reducing the size of the Federal payroll by over 250,000 people. And when it's done, we'll have the smallest Federal Government in over 30 years, since Kennedy was President. And all the savings will go in to pay for the crime bill for safer streets, for more punishment, 100,000 more police officers on our street, and an aggressive prevention strategy to give our young people something to say yes to, to turn away from a life of violence. We're investing in new technologies and in new trade opportunities for all the things Americans make.

What's most important to me is that inside these statistics there's good news about real people: an entrepreneur hanging out a shingle for the first time, a worker getting a raise for the first time in years, a person finding a new job after having been out of work for months and months, a parent finally able to buy toys for a baby. Economic security is our first major battle, one we're still fighting in places like California where too many communities have not yet tasted the fruits of recovery.

But the economic battle will never be fully won until we face our second great crisis, reforming a health care system that costs too much and does too little. Health care now is the only part of our Federal budget that is really contributing to the deficit. And still millions are trapped in a system that offers them no coverage or because of previous illnesses, costs them too much or means that they can never change jobs.

After 60 years of fits and starts, of roadblocks and dead-ends, we're finally making real progress toward comprehensive health care reform. This week, for the first time ever, the relevant committees of Congress in both Houses have begun to review and modify our proposal to guarantee all Americans private health insurance, to give small businesses, farmers, and self-employed people the ability to buy insurance like big business and Government can today.

Their action follows more than a year and a half of debate and discussion in town hall meetings, in doctors' offices, hospitals, and around kitchen tables. There have been twists and turns along the way. There are no doubt more ahead. But steadily our country is moving closer to a goal, passing major health care reform legislation this year. And as with the economy, the victory of passing health care reform will be a victory for America's families.

As I've traveled our country, I've heard firsthand from some of the more than one million people who have written to Hillary and to me describing their problems with the current health care system. Each of these letters is a little different, but the message is always the same: Do something and do it soon. Some people say we should wait awhile and study the issue further. To them I say, we've studied it quite a lot already. Many Members of Congress have studied it for years. And you ought to come to the White House and read these letters if you want to wait, read the letter from the mother who was forced to sell her home and go on welfare just to provide medical benefits to a sick son; the letter from a nurse who had to leave the bedside of a cancer patient to attend a meeting on how to fill out even new insurance forms; the one from a little boy who was afraid to tell his parents he felt sick because he knew they couldn't afford a visit to the doctor; the thousands of letters about people who have been sick or had someone in their family sick, so they can't get insurance or they have to pay more than they can afford or they can never change jobs; and the hundreds of letters from small business people who are paying 35 percent to 40 percent more than they ought to be paying for coverage that's inadequate.

Now, for 60 years Presidents of both parties have tried to do something to fix this health care system, to solve its problems without hurting what's best about our health care system. We don't need to wait any longer. The committees in Congress are well on the way to passing a bill that will make the health care nightmares detailed in these letters a thing of the past.

Of course, there will be obstacles ahead. There are genuine disagreements. It's a complicated subject. But we can surmount these obstacles. We know there are models today that are like what we're trying to do, models of managed competition in places like Minnesota, where 91 percent of the people have coverage, it's of high quality, and the cost increases are much lower than they are in the rest of the country or models like the new small business cooperative in California, where over 2,300 small businesses, representing 40,000 employees, have joined together to buy health insurance that's lower in cost for the same or better coverage for everyone.

In 1935, Congress passed Social Security after much of the same debate we read about today in the press, people saying that it would wreck the economy, that it would be terrible, that it was not the right thing to do. But from that day forward, older Americans knew they could face retirement in old age with dignity.

In 1965, Congress passed Medicare, guaranteeing that people over 65 would never again be bankrupted by medical bills they couldn't pay. Again, there were those who said it would just be a terrible thing for the country. Now we're all proud of the fact that older Americans are less poor than the rest of us and don't have to worry about their health care.

We're closer than ever before to making 1994 the year that Congress makes history once again by guaranteeing Americans private health insurance that can never be taken away. Let's work together now to tone down the divisive rhetoric, to stop the shouting, to starting talking with each other, listening to each other, and working with our sleeves rolled up and our heads and hearts engaged in the job.

We can get this done this year. We will get it done this year with your help. Tell the Congress to move, and move now. We can do it. America needs it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 3:25 p.m. on May 20 in the Costas Sports Center at the University of California-Los Angeles for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 21.

Remarks to the Community in Sacramento, California

May 21, 1994

Thank you very, very much, Congressman Fazio, for those fine words and for your leadership. Thank you, Congressman Matsui, for your fine words and for your leadership, especially on areas of global trade and other things designed to help the people of northern California. I'd also like to recognize over here to my right the presence of another Member of your congressional delegation, Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey. I'm glad to see you here, and thank you for coming. Senator Feinstein, thank you once again for making it clear that you have no ambivalence on the question of McClellan Air Force Base and its future. I'm glad to be here with Mayor Serna and to be working with him, and I appreciate his statements about our partnership. I appreciate the leadership that Secretary Widnall has shown in the Air Force, and I'm glad to be here with General Phillips and General Thompson. I thank them for welcoming me here for a second time to McClellan Air Force Base. I'd also like to recognize in the audience a good friend of mine and your State insurance commissioner, John Garamendi and Mrs. Garamendi. I'm glad to see them over there.

Ladies and gentlemen, I had a wonderful trip to McClellan Air Force Base the first time I came to celebrate the work that you are doing not only to defend our Nation but to help us to convert to a post-cold-war era in which many of the fruits of defense progress and defense technology can be used to benefit a growing commercial economy in America. Today I come

to celebrate the spirit of Sacramento and the spirit of McClellan as we honor the men and women who wear the uniforms of the American Armed Forces.

In just 2 weeks it will be my proud duty to travel to Europe to represent our Nation as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Rome and the landing of the Allied forces in France on D-Day. Sacrifice, planning, determination, and sheer bravery carried the day then, and it still counts today. We deeply appreciate what our forces did in the cause of freedom in World War II. Were it not for them and their efforts, we would, none of us, be here today. But I want to say we also appreciate very much what those of you who wear our Nation's uniforms do to keep us free and strong and to promote the cause of freedom around the world today. We honor your patriotism, your service, and your sacrifice. And we all recognize that that sacrifice often extends to your families as well, who have to endure long periods of separation and sometimes, still, the loss of life. Every day, all across our land and all around the world, people who wear the uniform of this country put their lives at risk. As we have seen in the last year and as we see every year, the simple work of maintaining preparedness and the training involved in it, often itself is life threatening.

I'm especially glad to be here at McClellan to sign the proclamation for Armed Forces Day today because of the special role that McClellan is playing in America at the end of the cold war, the special role in helping us downsize our defense forces without becoming weaker, the special role in helping us convert so many of our resources from defense to domestic economic purposes.

Beyond the building and maintenance of military equipment, McClellan has been a pioneer in high-tech fields from microelectronics to hydraulics. This is the only place in the United States where aircraft can be thoroughly inspected without dismantling, thanks to the nondestructive facility here.

This base has also led the way in promoting partnerships with the private sector in technology transfer and what we now call dual-use of technology. These help with concerns like the environment, and they create jobs for our people. The work to develop a new low-emission metal casting process, for example, will help automakers comply with the Clean Air Act, making us all healthier and creating more jobs. I thank you for that.

I think we all know that the important work of rebuilding our economy is also part of our national security. On that I can report to you confidently that our Nation is moving in the right direction.

In the last 15 months our economy has produced 3 million new jobs. The deficit is going down. Interest rates are stable. The stock market is up. Consumer confidence is up. When the Congress passes the budget that I have presented before them, we'll have 3 years of declining deficits in the Federal budget for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States of America.

Still the Congress is working with me to find ways to increase investments in areas where we need more investment, even as we eliminate over 100 Government programs and cut a couple of hundred others, building a system of lifetime education from the expansion of Head Start to lifetime learning to opportunities for young people who don't go on to 4-year colleges, to lower interest rates for college loans and better repayments terms, to national service payments for young people who want to pay their way through college by solving the problems of the country here at home.

The Congress has provided more funds for technology reinvestment projects, like the ones you're participating in here. One-fourth of them have gone to the State of California to try to help those people who won the cold war for us not be left out in the cold as we enjoy the peace.

When this budget is fully enacted over the next 5 years, the size of the civilian work force for the Federal Government will be the smallest it has been in over 30 years, and all the savings will be used to go into a trust fund to help make our streets safer, to pay for tougher punishment for violent criminals, prevention opportunities for young people to keep them out of trouble, and 100,000 more police officers on the streets of the cities of this country to help protect our young people.

We are trying to adapt to the changes in this changing world. But let me say on this Armed Forces Day, while the size of our military must be adjusted, we must not adjust our attitude about quality or readiness. We must remain the world's best prepared, best trained, best equipped, highest morale fighting force. I

say that because as we enter the next few weeks of budget negotiations, Congress must work to get our deficit down while keeping our guard up.

I have to say, too, to you my friends, since it has been mentioned by others, that the biggest long-term threat to deficit reduction is also perhaps the biggest long-term threat to defense readiness, that is the soaring cost of health care. Because while your Federal spending is going down in defense and down in domestic spending for the first time since 1969, the cost of Federal health care programs are going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And still there are 37 million Americans without any health insurance.

We spend, as a nation, 40 percent more of our income on health care than any other nation, and we don't cover everyone. We have small business people, hundreds of thousands of them, who don't provide any coverage or provide some coverage and wish they could do more. But they must pay rates 35 to 40 percent higher than those of us who are in Government or are insured by big businesses do. We have 81 million Americans out of a nation of 255 million who live in families where someone has been sick, and so they're insured with what are called preexisting conditions, which is a fine way of saying they pay too much for their insurance or they can't get insurance or they can never change jobs because if they try to change, their future employers won't be able to insure them.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, this is unacceptable. It is a threat to the deficit, it is a threat to the defense, it is a threat to the national security of the United States to leave our people in this fix.

I do not pretend that this is an easy issue. If it were it would have been solved a long time ago. I do ask the Congress to act and to act now, this year, to guarantee private health insurance to all Americans; to provide a choice of doctors and plans to American citizens; to allow, as California is now doing, small business people, farmers, and self-employed people to join in big co-ops and to buy insurance on the same competitive basis that big business and Government folks can do so that they can afford to purchase health care without going broke.

I thank the California Medical Association for their endorsement of these principles as well as the notion that we should not discriminate against people because someone in their family has been sick.

These are things that we ought to do. We can do it without interfering with Medicare for the elderly. We can do it while phasing in prescription drug and long-term care benefits to the elderly and disabled, but we must act this year. I believe that you hire people to serve in the Presidency and in the Congress to make the same tough decisions that our military leaders have to make when called upon to do it. There are not always easy answers, but usually there are answers to problems when they have to be faced. There are answers to this problem, and we owe it to you to face it. In the future our deficit reduction depends on it, our defense readiness depends on it, the health and strength of our Nation depends on it, and we should act this year.

Finally, let me say one special word. Behind me sits what I have been told is the only fully restored and flyable B–24 Liberator in use today. It had a storied career of service since it rolled off the assembly line in Fort Worth, Texas, in August of 1944. It's 2 years older than I am. [*Laughter*] It was part of the massive homefront production during World War II. The *All-American,* as she's known, is named in honor of the 15th Air Force B–24 that set a record for downing 14 enemy fighters in a single raid over Germany on July 25th, 1944. But her name also signifies the all-American builders who produced the plane, the flyers who manned the missions, the crews that kept them in the air. This plan stands for the all-American team to help to win the war that we will honor when I go to the D-Day celebration.

This is a time when every American of every generation should pause to remember and honor the sacrifices of the airmen, soldiers, and sailors of D-Day, who through their individual acts of glory and valor and their common efforts changed the course of history.

One aircraft of World War II stands behind me today, but we should be mindful that exactly 50 years ago the largest air attack ever staged was being readied to support the allied landings on Normandy. Over one million American airmen were stationed in England during World War II. On D-Day the allies sent 3,467 heavy bombers, 1,645 medium bombers, 5,409 fighters into the skies above the English Channel and the coast of France. They gave General Eisenhower and the planners of Operation Overlord

virtual allied supremacy for the landings. On that day, 113 aircraft did not make it back.

Two weeks from today at the American cemetery outside Cambridge, England, I will stand with crew members of other B–24's and B–26's, B–17's, P–38's and P–47's, the veteran airmen of D-Day. Thirty-nine hundred and twelve Americans, many of them aviators, are buried there in Cambridge, their graves aligned in a gentle arc on a sloping English pasture. They rest in peace far from home, as do thousands of other Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice during World War II, buried in American soil overseas with names like Nettuno and Colleville. But in every city, in every neighborhood, in every living room where we cherish the fruits of freedom and democracy, they are with us still.

They would be very proud of the men and women who wear our uniforms today. They would be proud that nuclear weapons in Russia and the United States are no longer pointed at each other for the first time since the advent of the nuclear age. They would be proud of the contributions of Americans to peace in the Middle East and democracy in South Africa. They would be proud that the power of our example has helped to encourage people in Central and Latin America, all over the hemisphere, to embrace democracy. Now all but two nations to our south, all but two, are today governed by democratically elected leaders.

So I say to you, my fellow Americans, today as we cherish the memories of those who fought in World War II and as we salute today's men and women of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the sentinels of our peace and freedom, let us cherish our memory but also remember our mission: to meet the challenges of today at home and abroad, to keep America forever strong and forever young.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:40 p.m. at McClellan Air Force Base. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Joe Serna of Sacramento; Secretary of the Air Force Sheila Widnall; Maj. Gen. John Phillips, commander, McClellan Air Force Base; and Lt. Gen. Dale W. Thompson, Jr., vice commander, Air Force Materiel Command, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH. The Armed Forces Day proclamation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message on the Observance of Armed Forces Day, 1994

May 21, 1994

Greetings to the men and women of the Armed Forces stationed around the world as we celebrate Armed Forces Day, 1994. On behalf of the American people, I am proud to extend heartfelt appreciation for your tremendous service to our country.

Each of you who wears our nation's uniform makes an invaluable contribution to the safety, security, and well-being of the United States and of the entire world. Some of you serve here at home, while others are posted the world over, but all of you work to guard our precious freedom and to further the goals of peace and democracy. In addition to these traditional military roles, you have set a new standard of excellence for international humanitarian efforts—bringing food, shelter, and medical relief to people in desperate need.

On this important day, I am honored to salute the hard-working individuals serving in the Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard. American owes you a debt of gratitude for all that you have done for our Nation and for all that you continue to do to protect the blessings of liberty we cherish.

BILL CLINTON

Message to the Congress on Additional Economic Sanctions Against Haiti
May 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1703 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 on October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 on October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c), I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 of June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 of June 16, 1993.

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 of October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. On May 7, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority and issued Executive Order No. 12914 of May 7, 1994, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 that were effective immediately under that Resolution.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 contains several provisions required to become effective no later than May 21, 1994, to further tighten the embargo against Haiti. These include, *inter alia,* a requirement that Member States prohibit importation of Haitian-origin products into their territories exported from Haiti after May 21, 1994, activities that promote importation or transshipment of such products, and dealings by their nationals, flag vessels, or aircraft in such products. In addition, the Resolution requires Member States to prevent the sale or supply of products to Haiti by their nationals or from their territories or using their flag vessels or aircraft, and activities that promote such sale or supply, with certain exceptions for humanitarian needs and trade in informational materials.

This new Executive order:

—bans importation into the United States of goods or services of Haitian origin exported after May 21, 1994, or activities that promote or are intended to promote such importation, except for informational materials;

—prohibits activities by U.S. persons or from the United States that promote exportation or transshipment of goods of Haitian origin exported after May 21, 1994, except for informational materials;

—prohibits dealings by U.S. persons or in the United States or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft in goods of Haitian origin exported after May 21, 1994, except for informational materials;

—prohibits the sale, supply, or exportation by U.S. persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of any goods to Haiti or in connection with Haitian businesses, or activities by U.S. persons or in the United States that promote such sale, supply, or exportation, except for informational materials, certain foodstuffs, and medicines and medical supplies;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State,

to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to implement certain provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 of May 6, 1994, which take effect no later than May 21, 1994, and require additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti with the goal of the restoration of democracy in that nation and the prompt return of the legitimately elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, under the framework of the Governors Island Agreement.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 21, 1994.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at the Presentation Ceremony for the Congressional Medal of Honor

May 23, 1994

To the distinguished leaders of the military and the Congress who are here, family and friends of the two men on whom we will confer the Nation's highest military award, the Medal of Honor, Master Sergeant Gary Gordon and Sergeant First Class Randall Shughart were real American heroes.

During the military operation in Mogadishu on October 3d, two American helicopters were downed by hostile fire. Although United States Army Rangers established a defensive perimeter around the first downed helicopter, they could not reach the second one quickly by land. In the wreckage of this helicopter lay four injured Army crewmen.

Another helicopter with Sergeants Gordon and Shughart on board was dispatched to provide cover from above. But they came under withering fire, and the two sergeants instinctively understood that if the downed crew was to stand a chance of survival someone would have to get them on the ground. Immediately Sergeants Gordon and Shughart volunteered to go. They were told, no, it's too dangerous. They volunteered again. Again, they were told no. They volunteered a third time, and permission finally was granted.

Sergeants Gordon and Shughart knew their own chances of survival were extremely bleak. The pilot of their helicopter said that anyone in their right mind would never have gone in. But they insisted on it because they were comrades in danger, because they believed passionately in the creed that says, "I will not fail those with whom I serve." And so they asked their pilot to hover just above the ground, and they jumped into the ferocious firefight.

The citations that will be read shortly describe the extraordinary courage that Sergeants Gordon and Shughart demonstrated in the battle that followed. Gary Gordon and Randall Shughart died in the most courageous and selfless way any human being can act. They risked their lives without hesitation. They gave their lives to save others. Their actions were clearly above and beyond the call of duty.

Today, on behalf of the United States Congress, I award them both the Medal of Honor. They join a roll of heroes that includes soldiers like Sergeant York, Audie Murphy, Jimmie Doolittle, Teddy Roosevelt, Jr., Senator Kerrey, and only some 3,000 others across more than two centuries of our Nation's history.

We will remember Sergeants Gordon and Shughart not only as heroes who fell in battle but as good men who loved their families. Randall Shughart was raised on a dairy farm. He loved the outdoors. He and his wife, Stephanie, planned to build a log cabin in Montana for their retirement. Gary Gordon was a gentle father who filled notebooks with stories for his two young children. He dreamed of starting a furniture-making shop with his wife, Carmen.

Both were men whose dreams and generous hearts we can never adequately portray. Both were quiet men whose steadiness gave strength

to all who knew them. Both would probably feel a bit uncomfortable about being the center of so much attention. We were just doing our job, they would probably say, a job they loved and a job they had plainly mastered.

Of course, there is little we can do to ease the pain, the sense of loss that their loved ones feel. We know they will live in the memories of those whose lives they touched. We pray that their families will find strength in their faiths during this time and in the times to come. But we can also draw comfort from the words of the pilot they saved, Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant. "Without a doubt," he says, "I owe my life to these two men and their bravery."

Sergeants Gordon and Shughart died on October 3d for a noble and important cause, to give Durant and others a chance to live. They were part of a larger mission, a difficult one, that saved hundreds of thousands of innocent Somalis from starvation and gave that nation a chance to build its own future.

Only America could assume and accomplish such a mission. It is a part of who we are as a people, what we are as a nation, why we are trusted and respected around the globe. And that, too, is a part of our national security. As I said when I welcomed home members of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, if there are any debates still to be had about our mission in Somalia, let people have those debates where they belong, with the President and the policymakers. But let there be no debate about the professionalism and the valor of those who served there and the valor of those who died there. We are proud of what they did. We honor them. We thank them.

On the wall of the Special Forces Memorial Court at Ft. Bragg, the words of the prophet Isaiah are etched in stone: "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?'" Master Sergeant Gary Gordon and Sergeant First Class Randall Shughart answered that call.

Today, we inscribe their lives and their deeds in the distinguished and valorous history of this country's men and women in uniform. We pray that God will embrace their souls. And may their service and sacrifice inspire generations to come.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:07 a.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Abdou Diouf of Senegal and an Exchange With Reporters

May 23, 1994

The President. Let me say, it's a great honor for me to have the President of Senegal here and to thank him publicly for the leadership that his country has shown in promoting democracy and economic market reforms and many activities of the United Nations designed to save lives. I am very grateful for that, and I look forward to this meeting. We've never had an opportunity to talk before, but our two nations have had very close and good relationships, and I think we'll continue them.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us something about your remarks this afternoon?

The President. Well, I'll just do the best I can to try to speak on behalf of the Nation a word of gratitude and appreciation and farewell and perhaps a few personal remarks as well.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:31 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at the Gravesite Service for Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis in Arlington, Virginia
May 23, 1994

We are joined here today at the site of the Eternal Flame, lit by Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis 31 years ago, to bid farewell to this remarkable woman whose life will forever glow in the lives of her fellow Americans.

Whether she was soothing a nation grieving for a former President or raising children with the care and the privacy they deserve or simply being a good friend, she seemed always to do the right thing in the right way. She taught us by example about the beauty of art, the meaning of culture, the lessons of history, the power of personal courage, the nobility of public service, and most of all, the sanctity of family.

God gave her very great gifts and imposed upon her great burdens. She bore them all with dignity and grace and uncommon common sense. In the end, she cared most about being a good mother to her children. And the lives of Caroline and John leave no doubt that she was that, and more.

Hillary and I are especially grateful that she took so much time to talk about the importance of raising children away from the public eye. And we will always remember the wonderful, happy times we shared together last summer.

With admiration, love, and gratitude for the inspiration and the dreams she gave to all of us, we say goodbye to Jackie today. May the flame she lit so long ago burn ever brighter here and always brighter in our hearts.

God bless you, friend, and farewell.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:05 p.m. at Arlington National Cemetery.

Memorandum on the Amendment to the United Kingdom-United States Atomic Energy Agreement
May 23, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy

Subject: Proposed Amendment to the United States/United Kingdom Agreement for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes

I have reviewed and concur in the positions taken in your joint letter to me of May 14, 1994, recommending approval of a proposed amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes. I note from your joint recommendation and concur with your view that the United Kingdom is participating with the United States pursuant to an international agreement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security. The proposed Amendment will permit cooperation that will further improve our mutual defense posture and support our interests under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I hereby:

—approve the proposed Amendment to the 1958 Agreement;

—determine that performance under the proposed Amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security;

—approve the program outlined in this Amendment and determine that such program will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

—authorize the execution of the proposed Amendment for the Government of the United States in a manner specified by the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Amendment to the United Kingdom-United States Atomic Energy Agreement

May 23, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to section 123d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the text of an amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958, as amended, and my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement. The joint unclassified letter submitted to me by the Secretaries of Energy and Defense that provide a summary position on the Amendment is also enclosed.

The Amendment extends for 10 years (until December 31, 2004) provisions which permit the transfer of nonnuclear parts, source, byproduct, special nuclear materials, and other material and technology for nuclear weapons and military reactors, and revises text, principally in the Security Annex, to be consistent with current policies and practices relating to personnel and physical security. Additionally, certain activities related to naval nuclear reactor plant technology have been completed and those provisions have been deleted from the Supplemental Technical Annex.

In my judgment, the proposed Amendment meets all statutory requirements. The United Kingdom intends to continue to maintain viable nuclear forces. In light of our previous close cooperation and the fact that the United Kingdom has committed its nuclear forces to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have concluded that it is in our interest to continue to assist them in maintaining a credible nuclear force.

I have approved the Amendment, authorized its execution, and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 23, 1994.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Chemical and Biological Weapons Proliferation

May 23, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 16, 1990, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12735, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701, *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice of its continuation. On November 12, 1993, I extended the national emergency on the basis that the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act contain periodic reporting requirements regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to an emergency declaration. The following report is made pursuant to those provisions. Additional information on chemical and biological weapons proliferation is contained in the report to the Congress provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

The three export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative are fully in force and continue to be used to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons (CBW) or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

During the last 6 months, the United States has continued to address actively in its international diplomatic efforts the problem of the proliferation and use of CBW.

More than 150 nations have signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and a number have already ratified it. On November 23, 1993, I submitted the CWC to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. I have urged all nations, including the United States, to ratify the Convention quickly so that it can enter into force at the earliest possible date of January 13, 1995. We also have continued to urge those countries that have not signed the Convention to do so. The United States plays a leading role in the work of the CWC Preparatory Commission headquartered in The Hague, to elaborate the technical and administrative procedures for implementing the Convention.

The United States participated actively in the Ad Hoc Group of Government Experts convened by the Third Biological Weapons Review Conference to identify and examine potential verification measures. The consensus final report of the experts group will be considered at a Special Conference of States Parties, to be held September 19–30, 1994. The United States supports the holding of a Special Conference and will promote new transparency measures to help strengthen the Convention.

The membership of the Australia Group (AG) of countries cooperating against CBW proliferation stands at 25. At the December 1993 meeting of the AG, members reiterated their commitment to comprehensive and global chemical and biological disarmament, which can only be achieved by the early entry into force and effective and universal implementation of the CWC and full compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention. In this context, members stressed the importance of encouraging the widest possible adherence to the CWC.

Experts at the December AG meeting also discussed ways of implementing CBW export controls more effectively. The Group considered streamlining licensing procedures applicable to mixtures and small quantities of precursor chemicals, with a view to facilitating legitimate trade without increasing the risk of contributing to potential weapons production. It also took steps to enhance cooperation in enforcement of existing controls.

The United States Government determined that three commercial entities in Thailand had engaged in chemical weapons proliferation activities that required the imposition of trade sanctions against the entities, effective on February 8, 1994. Additional information on this determination is contained in a classified report to the Congress provided pursuant to the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991.

Progress also was made in the steps taken by countries outside the AG to extend chemical weapons-related export controls. For example, the Royal Thai Government adopted regulations to prevent the export of Thai laborers to programs of CBW concern. Poland enacted legislation to implement controls on CBW-related items.

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, I report that there were no additional expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 23, 1994.

Remarks at a Reception Commemorating National Park Week

May 23, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Attorney General Reno, Mr. Frampton, Mr. Kennedy, Congressman Vento, ladies and gentlemen. I sure have had a good time this afternoon.

You know, this is a wonderful occasion for all of us as Americans. And in many ways it's a very personal occasion. Hillary and I were up here whispering to each other; I said, now, didn't we go to the Dinosaur National Park in Utah and to the Buffalo, and then I started reeling them off. She said, "Bill, forget it. You will never remember all the parks we have visited." [*Laughter*] And we can't. We can't begin to remember all the ones we have visited and all the things that have happened to us from Florida to northern California and all points in between.

I do want to say that I am personally very grateful to the people who have been recognized this year. Ambassador Lane, thank you, sir, for your many contributions. Steve Coleman and Josephine Butler and the other people from Meridian Hill—we were there on Earth Day. And I want you to know that—not that I didn't trust you—but the other day I was in the neighborhood, and I had my car sort of drive by the park again just to make sure there was no false advertising. [*Laughter*] And sure enough, it was just like it was on Earth Day. And I thank you for that urban miracle of nature. I congratulate the Dade County Public Schools. And Phyllis Cohen, thank you for coming here and for teaching our young people about the importance of our natural resources. The children of Florida have a great burden as they grow up now to reconcile our responsibility to the remarkable ecostructure of that State and the explosion of growth that's going on there. Richard Gale, congratulations to you, sir, and thank you for your career.

You know, we were talking here a moment ago. I'll bet you that more American citizens have met employees of the Park Service than any other department of the Federal Government. They may have thought more about employees of the IRS—[*laughter*]—but they have actually met more employees of the Park Service. And I'll bet you—you think about it—I bet each and every one of you here can remember park rangers you met at Carlsbad or Yellowstone or Yosemite or you name it. And that's a very important thing. At a time when people have such negative impressions of Government, this is our Government at its best.

And I appreciate what Secretary Babbitt said about the budget. Just so you'll know exactly how hard that was, this budget recommends the outright elimination of over 100 Government programs, slashing over 200 more. If adopted, it'll be the first time in anybody's memory that the Congress and the President have actually worked together to pass an executive budget for 2 years in a row and will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President. But we still spent more on the Park Service, because that's where a lot of America's heart is and where a lot of America's future is. And the California bill will be an astonishing achievement if we can get it through. And we're working hard on that.

Thank you, Elizabeth Barlow Rogers, for your work in Central Park. For all of us who have ever been to the zoo or the carousel or jogged around the reservoir with bated breath, we thank you for what you have done to give that great park a new lease on life.

Most important, I'd like to thank Secretary Babbitt. We've been friends a long time. We've talked about these things a long time. He grew up near the Grand Canyon. I grew up in Hot Springs, which actually is, I think, the only city in America, perhaps except this one, that actually has a whole national park within the city limits. And it was the first reservation set aside by Congress for a national reservation in 1932, in recognition of the fact that in the 16th century, Hernando DeSoto came there and found the Indians bathing in the hot sulfur springs. He was looking for the fountain of youth. I grew up there and lost it. [*Laughter*] But Bruce and I have been through these things for so many years. And when we served as Governors, I don't know how many times I heard the Western Governors who cared about the environment say that there had to be some way that Interior could push this country toward sustainable development, push this country toward maintaining its resources and still not feel that we were violating the culture and the way of life of the people, especially in the West where the Interior Department owns so much land. I think he has managed the tension between traditional culture and change better than any other person in the entire United States could have done it, in the only department that really still literally affects the lives of more than half the people in many communities in this country. So I am very grateful to him. I thank him for what he's done. And I know all of you will join me in expressing your appreciation for his brilliant leadership.

Now I have to say just a parochial word about where I live now. I live on National Park Service

Reservation number one. [*Laughter*] And I want you all to take note of that the next time you hear somebody say the President's off the reservation. [*Laughter*] I'm actually here with Hillary and Chelsea on part of the original design of Washington laid out by George Washington and Pierre L'Enfant. Like other families who've lived here, we've had the honor of planting several trees on these grounds, a willow oak, a leaf linden, an American elm. We love this place that is maintained by our Park Service.

I want to recognize two special contributors and say I enjoyed having my picture taken with the White House staff, who do so much to maintain the house and the grounds, just a moment ago. I want to thank our Head Usher, Gary Walters, who does a great job for us on so many events here. Where's Gary? There's Gary back there. And I'd like to ask Irv Williams, the Executive Grounds Superintendent—for nearly 40 years he's been here. Where are you, Irv? Stand up. Thank you so much. Three decades ago, Mr. Williams helped Jacqueline Kennedy redesign the First Lady's Garden. It was later renamed the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden. It is just opposite the Rose Garden in the back of the White House. It's another of the wonderful legacies that this fine lady left our country with the help of Irv Williams, who's given his life to this work, and we thank you, sir.

Wallace Stegner said, "The National Parks are the best idea we ever had. Absolutely democratic, absolutely American, they reflect us at our best rather than our worst." I could say it no better. Let us try to live by the mottoes of the National Parks. Let us try to lift our spirits on a daily basis as we are all uplifted when we visit them. And let us for the rest of our lives rededicate ourselves to preserving and enhancing them. They are the legacy of every generation. They're our hope for the future, our tie to the past, our connection to the land. They're bigger than any of us, and they make us all better. And we thank you all for your contribution to that end.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to George T. Frampton, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks; Roger Kennedy, Director, National Park Service; Laurence W. Lane, Jr., former Ambassador to Australia and Japan; Steven W. Coleman, founder and president, and Josephine Butler, vice chair, Friends of Meridian Hill; Phyllis Cohen, deputy superintendent, Dade County Public School District; Richard Gale, director, National Fire Center, Boise, ID; and Elizabeth Barlow Rogers, administrator, New York City Central Park. The National Park Week proclamation of April 14 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Guntis Ulmanis of Latvia and an Exchange With Reporters

May 24, 1994

President Clinton. Since we're not going to do a press availability—it's late in the afternoon—I'd like to make a brief statement about the purpose of this meeting and then ask President Ulmanis to say a few words.

First, I want to welcome him to the United States and express my appreciation for the close working relationship we have had with him during my tenure and his, which have overlapped.

Our administration has worked very hard to support the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltics in general and from Latvia in particular. We have been very involved in trying to help resolve the dispute between Russia and Latvia over the facility at Skrunda, and we have been very pleased at the resolution of that. And we have supported the resettlement of Russian soldiers and the housing program for them when they leave the Baltics and go back home. And so we look forward to the completion of that effort this summer. And we are very, very pleased about it. It's an important part of our overall objectives and our long-term relationships with all the nations in the Baltics area

and the CIS, and particular with Russia. So I'm very pleased about that.

I'm glad to have President Ulmanis here. And he perhaps has a word or two he'd like to say.

President Ulmanis. I'm honored about the progress that has been made since I have met with the American President. At that time we talked about very difficult problems, and I'm happy to say that some of those problems have been resolved.

An issue that's very important to the Baltic area is the whole question of troop patrols, and that will occur after a few months. We have legally established a basis for the Skrunda facility, and we have ensured that this will not be turned into a Russian military base.

This is a great achievement also for the United States, since we worked together on this issue and were able to resolve it together. And today I have come here to talk about the way we can work together in the future.

I want to ensure that in the future the Baltic area is not a victim of any kind of aggression, that we establish a good—[*inaudible*]—stimulating the area and that we begin to develop that area economically.

When I was speaking with the Pope recently, we talked about the fact that the Baltic area could be a key to peace in that area. Now we can talk about various kinds of development in the area of agriculture and social fields, in economic area. But most importantly, we need to talk about how we can help former Russian army personnel leave the Baltic area voluntarily.

Thank you.

Russia and the Baltic Countries

Q. You're sure they will pull out? And does that mean out of the entire Balkans area, out of Estonia, Lithuania, wherever they are?

[*President Ulmanis' response was translated by an interpreter as follows.*]

President Ulmanis. He's convinced that that will be the case, and that's why he's here.

President Clinton. Our preliminary—I say it's not preliminary with regard to Lithuania and Latvia—but we think by the summer that all the negotiations will be concluded. The Yeltsin government and President Yeltsin himself have been personally—he's been personally involved in this. I have been personally involved in it. We discussed these matters in enormous detail when I was in Russia. I think it's going in the right direction.

And the leadership of President Ulmanis and the leaders of all the Baltic States, I think, has been quite key to this. So I feel good about it. I think it's going in the right direction. And it clearly will be a force for stability and democracy in the years ahead in that part of the world.

China and Japan

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Secretary Christopher has been consulting with Congress today. Have you got a better idea on what you plan to do about MFN for China and where that's going, and could you share that with us?

President Clinton. Yes, I have an idea of where it's going. No, I'm not prepared to share it with you, because we still have not only ongoing negotiations with Congress but with others as well, and there are a number of things that still have to be resolved. We're working through it as quickly as we can. We will resolve it as quickly as we can.

I do want to say that the United States announced some very good news today. Late last night we reached agreement with the Japanese on returning to our trade talks with them. They are an important part of our long-term strategy for peace and stability and democracy in Asia. And I think that will support what we hope will be a long-term, positive relationship with China and our desire to advance the cause of human rights within the country. I think Japanese—the break there with the negotiations is a big plus. And we've been working hard on it. I talked to Prime Minister Hata today. I'm very encouraged about that. And we'll have the Chinese decision as quickly as we can work through it.

Q. Before you go to Normandy? Before you go to Normandy?

Q. Is there going to be a Cabinet shakeup?

President Clinton. Sometimes I'm the last to know, but as far as I know there isn't. [*Laughter*] Unless you know something I don't, the answer is no.

Well, the deadline's June 3d. And I don't expect to announce it in Europe.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:16 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. President Ulmanis spoke in Latvian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Nomination for the United States Court of Appeals
May 24, 1994

The President today nominated Judge José A. Cabranes to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

"Judge Cabranes has an outstanding record of achievement in the legal profession, in academia, and in public service," the President said today. "I am confident that he will continue to serve with excellence and distinction on the appellate bench."

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

Remarks at the United States Naval Academy Commencement Ceremony in Annapolis, Maryland
May 25, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Dalton, for those fine remarks. Admiral Lynch, thank you for your comments and your leadership here at the Academy. Admiral Owens, Admiral Boorda, General Mundy, proud parents and family members, faculty and staff of the Academy, brigade of the midshipmen: It's a great honor for me to join you at this moment of celebration. I'm delighted to be back here on the eve of the Academy's 150th year.

Since 1845, the U.S. Naval Academy has provided superb leadership for our Navy, for our Marine Corps, and for our entire Nation. And I cannot imagine a more valuable contribution.

The last time I was here, I joined some of you for lunch at King Hall. And ever since then, whenever people have asked me what I liked best about my visit to the Naval Academy I try to think of elevated things to say, but part of my answer is always pan pizza and chicken tenders. [*Laughter*] In memory of that luxurious meal—[*laughter*]—I have today a small graduation present. In keeping with longstanding tradition I hereby grant amnesty to all midshipmen who received demerits for minor conduct offenses. [*Laughter*] See, today the interest group is in the stands, not on the field. [*Laughter*]

Next week I will have the proud responsibility to represent our Nation in Europe in the ceremonies marking the 50th anniversary of D-Day, the invasion of Italy, and World War II. That war marked the turning point of our century when we joined with our allies to stem a dark tide of dictatorship, aggression, and terror and to start a flow of democracy and freedom that continues to sweep the world down to the present day.

That war also marked an era of sacrifice almost unequaled in our entire history. Some 400,000 of our fellow countrymen and women lost their lives. Over half a million more were wounded. Today we have among us many who took part at Normandy and the other great battles of World War II, such as retired Commander Alfred McKowan, Academy class of 1942, who served aboard the U.S.S. *Quincy* off Utah Beach on D-Day. They're a great reminder of what our armed services have done for America. And I would ask all the veterans of that war to stand now so that the rest of us might honor them. [*Applause*]

To the members of the class of 1994, my parents' generation and your grandparents' generation did not end their work with the liberation of Europe and victory in the Pacific. They came back to work wonders at home. They created the GI bill so that freedom's heroes could reenter civilian life and succeed and build strong families and strong communities. They built our Interstate Highway System. They turned our economy into a global wonder. They forged the tools of international security and trade that helped to rebuild our former allies and our former enemies so that we could ultimately win the cold war. It brought us decades of peace and prosperity.

Today we have come to celebrate your graduation from this Academy and your commission as officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps. As we do, the question which hangs over

your head is the question of what your generation will accomplish, as the generation of World War II accomplished so much.

Lately, there have been a number of books written, not about you, of course, but about your generation that says that so many people your age are afflicted with a sense of fatalism and cynicism, a sort of Generation X that believes America's greatest days are behind us and there are no great deeds left to be done. Well, this class, this very class is a rebuke to those cynics of any age.

Look at the extraordinary effort you have made to become leaders in service to America: formation at dawn, classes at 8 a.m., rigorous mandatory PT, parading on Worden Field, summers spent aboard ship or down at Quantico. Most college students never go through anything like it. It's a routine that turns young men and women into officers and that has taken your basketball team to the NCAA Tournament.

I deeply respect your decision to serve our Nation. Your service may take many forms in the years ahead: commanding ships in combat, training aviators for flight, running a business, perhaps one day even sitting in the Oval Office. Your career, regardless of its past, will require sacrifices, time away from loved ones, and potentially, service in the face of danger. But regardless of where your careers take you, you clearly understand the imperative of civic duty. There's no brighter badge of citizenship than the path you have chosen and the oath you are about to take.

You just heard Secretary Dalton speak of President Kennedy's wonderful speech here at the Naval Academy when he was here. I read that speech carefully before I came here. And among other things, President Kennedy said, along the lines that Secretary Dalton quoted, that if someone asked you what you did with your life, there's not a better answer than to say, "I served as an officer in the United States Navy."

The challenge for your generation is to remember the deeds of those who have served before you and now to build on their work in a new and very different world. The world wars are over; the cold war has been won. Now it is our job to win the peace.

For the first time in history, we have the chance to expand the reach of a democracy and economic progress across the whole of Europe and to the far reaches of the world. The first step on the mission is to keep our own Nation secure. And your very graduation today helps ensure that. Today the American people have 874 new leaders, 874 new plates of battle armor on our ship of state, 874 reasons to sleep better at night.

The past 4 years have been a time of challenge and exertion for each of you, a time of challenge and exertion, too, for the U.S. Navy and for this Academy. The Navy has had to confront the difficulty of the Tailhook scandal. And this year the Academy had to confront improper conduct regarding an academic examination. These are troubling events, to be sure, because our military rests on honor and leadership. But ultimately, the test of leadership is not constant flawlessness. Rather it is marked by a commitment to continue always to strive for the highest standards, to learn honesty when one falls short, and to do the right thing when it happens.

I came here today because I want America to know there remains no finer Navy in the world than the United States Navy and no finer training ground for naval leadership then the United States Naval Academy. You have my confidence. You have America's confidence.

These are challenging times to be in the Navy because it's a new era in world affairs. When this class entered the Academy in June of 1990, think of this, Israel and the PLO were sworn enemies; South Africa lived under apartheid; Moscow, Kiev, and Riga all were still part of the Soviet Union; and the United States and the Soviet Union still pointed their nuclear weapons in massive numbers at each other. But now Nelson Mandela is the President of his nation. There is genuine progress toward peace in the Middle East between Israel and the PLO and the other parties. Where the Kremlin once imposed its will, a score of new free states now grapple with the burden of freedom. And the United States and Russia at least no longer aim their nuclear weapons at each other.

These amazing transformations make our Nation more secure. They also enable us to devote more resources to the profound challenges we face here at home, from providing jobs for our people to advancing education and training for all of them, to making our streets safer, to ensuring health care for all of our citizens, and in the end building an economy that can compete and win well into the 21st century.

But the world's changes also can create uncertainty for those who have committed their careers to military service. Indeed, they create uncertainty for the United States. And in this time of uncertainty they tempt some to cut our defenses too far.

At the end of the cold war it was right to reduce our defense spending. But let us not forget that this new era has many dangers. We have replaced a cold war threat of a world of nuclear gridlock with a new world threatened with instability, even abject chaos, rooted in the economic dislocations that are inherent in the change from communism to market economics, rooted in religious and ethnic battles long covered over by authoritarian regimes now gone, rooted in tribal slaughters, aggravated by environmental disasters, by abject hunger, by mass migration across tenuous national borders. And with three of the Soviet Union's successor states now becoming nonnuclear and the tension between the U.S. and Russia over nuclear matters declining, we still must not forget that the threat of weapons of mass destruction remain in the continuing disputes we have over North Korea and elsewhere with countries who seek either to develop or to sell or to buy such weapons. So we must, we must do better. For this generation to expand freedom's reach, we must always keep America out of danger's reach.

Last year I ordered a sweeping review—we called it the bottom-up review—to ensure that in this new era we have a right-sized Navy, Marine Corps, Army, and Air Force for the post-cold-war era. That is especially important for our naval forces. For even with all the changes in the world, some basic facts endure: We are a maritime nation; over 60 percent of our border is seacoast. Over 70 percent of the world is covered by water, and over 90 percent of the human race lives within our Navy's reach from the sea. Now, as long as these facts remain true, we need naval forces that can dominate the sea, project our power, and protect our interests.

We've known that lesson for over 200 years now, since the time Admiral John Paul Jones proclaimed, "Without a respectable Navy, alas, America." The right-size defense costs less but still costs quite a bit. That is why this year I have resisted attempts to impose further cuts on our defense budget.

I want you to understand this clearly. It is important for your generation and your children to bring down this terrible debt we accumulated in recent years. And I have asked the Congress to eliminate outright over 100 programs, to cut over 200 others. We've presented a budget that cuts discretionary domestic spending for the first time since 1969. That will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States right after World War II. But we should not cut defense further. And I thank the Congress this week for resisting the calls to do so. That enables us to answer John Paul Jones' cry.

Today you can see the importance of our naval forces all around the world. Right now, at this very moment as you sit here, the U.S.S. *Saratoga* and her battle group are steaming in the Adriatic to help enforce the no-fly zone and to protect the safe havens in Bosnia. At this very moment, the U.S.S. *Carl Vinson* is in the Persian Gulf to help enforce sanctions on Iraq. Right now, the U.S.S. *Independence* is patrolling the waters of Northeast Asia to protect our allies and interests in Japan, Korea, and throughout the Asian-Pacific region.

As we adjust our forces to a new era, our motto should still be: "Reduce where we should, but strengthen as we must." That's why we're investing in new weapons such as the next carrier, CVN–76; our new Sea Wolf attack submarine; new AEGIS ships, like the DDG–51; new air capabilities like F–18 upgrades and the Joint Advanced Strike Technology. It's why we're improving our weapons systems and making the technology that won Operation Desert Storm even better: Tomahawk missiles with increased accuracy and target area and better night-fighting capabilities for our Harrier jump jets and other aircraft, so we can not only own the night today but dominate the night tomorrow.

We have been able to afford a right-sized military at lower cost, but this year we must continue to fight any deeper cuts to defense. I want to emphasize how important it is that the House of Representatives and the Senate do that. I want to thank Congressman Gilchrest, who is here, and Congressman Machtley from Rhode Island, a graduate of the Naval Academy, also here, and their colleagues for their support for the C–17 vote and for their continuing support for an adequate military. This is a bipartisan issue; it knows no party. We have done all we should do, and we now must support an adequate defense.

We are working to safeguard the quality of the most important defense asset of all, you and the more than one million other men and women in uniform, who stand sentry over our security. Today our Armed Forces are clearly and without dispute the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared, and the best motivated military on the face of the Earth. As long as I am President, that will continue to be the truth.

The question of our security in this era still ultimately depends upon our decisions about where to bring our military power to bear. That is what makes it possible for our enormous economic strength to assert itself at home and around the world. And there is no decision any President takes more seriously than the decision to send Americans into harm's way.

History teaches us that there is no magic formula, nor should a President ever try to draw the line so carefully that we would completely rule out the use of our military in circumstances where it might later become important. After all, the mere possibility of American force is itself a potent weapon all around the world. But this is clear: We must be willing to fight to defend our land and our people, first and foremost. That's why we responded forcefully when we discovered an Iraqi plot to assassinate former President Bush. And the Tomahawks we fired that day were fired by the Navy.

We must be willing to fight to protect our vital interests. And that's why we've adopted a defense strategy for winning any two major regional conflicts nearly simultaneously. We must be willing to fight to protect our allies. That's why we deployed Patriot missiles to South Korea, and working with others—working with others—we must be willing to use force when other American interests are threatened. And that's why we sought a stronger role for NATO in Bosnia.

The hardest cases involve the many ethnic and religious conflicts that have erupted in our era. The end of the superpower standoff lifted the lid from a cauldron of long-simmering hatreds. Now the entire global terrain is bloody with such conflicts, from Rwanda to Georgia. We cannot solve every such outburst of civil strife or militant nationalism simply by sending in our forces. We cannot turn away from them, but our interests are not sufficiently at stake in so many of them to justify a commitment of our folks. Nonetheless, as the world's greatest power, we have an obligation to lead and, at times when our interests and our values are sufficiently at stake, to act.

Look at the example of the former Yugoslavia. For centuries, that land marked a tense and often violent fault line between empires and religions. The end of the cold war and the dissolution of that country into so many new republics surfaced all those ancient tensions again, triggering Serb aggression, ethnic cleansing, and the most brutal European conflict since the Second World War.

Whether we get involved in any of the world's ethnic conflicts in the end must depend on the cumulative weight of the American interests at stake. Now, in Bosnia, we clearly have an interest in preventing the spread of the fighting into a broader European war, in providing that NATO can still be a credible force for peace in the post-cold-war era in this first-ever involvement of NATO outside a NATO country, in stemming the incredibly destabilizing flow of refugees from the conflict and in helping to stop the slaughter of innocents.

These interests do not warrant our unilateral involvement, but they do demand that we help to lead a way to a workable peace agreement if one can be achieved, and that if one can be achieved, we help to enforce it. Our administration is committed to help achieve such a resolution, working with others such as NATO, the United Nations, and Russia.

Those efforts have not been easy or smooth, but we have produced results. By securing NATO enforcement of the no-fly zone over Bosnia, we kept the war from escalating into the air. We initiated humanitarian air drops and have now participated in the longest humanitarian airlift in history. We secured NATO enforcement of the exclusion zones around Sarajevo and Gorazde, and as a result, the people of Sarajevo have experienced over 3 months of relative calm, and Gorazde is no longer being shelled. And by stepping up diplomatic engagement, we have worked with others to foster a breakthrough agreement between the Croats and the Bosnians, signed here in Washington, which I believe eventually will lead to a broader settlement.

One of the dreams of World War II was that after the war, through the United Nations and in other ways, the United States might be able to cooperate with others to help resolve the most difficult problems of our age, not al-

ways to have its own way, not always to be able to prescribe every move, but in order to help resolve the problems of the world without having to commit the lives of our own soldiers where they should not be committed and still being able to play a positive role. That is what we are attempting to work out in Bosnia. And if it can be done—if it can be done—we'll be on the way to managing some of this incredible chaos that has threatened to engulf the world in which you will raise your children.

Today I want to acknowledge the outstanding contributions of Admiral Mike Boorda which were made to our efforts in Bosnia. His stunning leadership there, his clarity of thought, and resolve of purpose is one of the key reasons I named him to be our new Chief of Naval Operations. Thank you, Admiral Boorda.

At every turn, we have worked to move the parties there toward a workable political solution. This is one of those conflicts that can only end at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. They can fight for another 100 years and not resolve it there. At every turn we have rejected the easy-out of simplistic ideas that sound good on bumper stickers but that would have tragic consequences. The newest of these is that we should simply unilaterally break the United Nations arms embargo on Bosnia and the other former Yugoslav states.

I do not support that arms embargo, and I never have. We worked with our allies and tried to persuade all of them that we should end it. Now some say we should simply violate the embargo on our own because it was a bad idea to impose it in the first place. Well, if we did that, it would kill the peace process; it would sour our relationships with our European allies in NATO and in the U.N.; it would undermine the partnership we are trying to build with Russia across a whole broad range of areas; it would undermine our efforts to enforce U.N. embargoes that we like, such as those against Sadaam Hussein, Colonel Qadhafi, and General Cedras in Haiti.

We simply must not opt for options and action that sound simple and painless and good but which will not work in this era of interdependence where it is important that we leverage American influence and leadership by proving that we can work with others, especially when others have greater and more immediate stakes and are willing to put their soldiers in harm's way.

Our administration will not walk away from this Bosnian conflict. But we will not embrace solutions that are wrong. We plan to continue the course we have chosen, raising the price on those who pursue aggression, helping to provide relief to the suffering, and working with our partners in Europe to move the parties to a workable agreement. It is not quick. It is not neat. It is not comfortable. But I am convinced in a world of interdependence, where we must lead by working with others, it is the right path. It is the one that preserves our leadership, preserves our treasure, and commits our forces in the proper way.

The world's most tearing conflicts in Bosnia and elsewhere are not made in a day. And one of the most frustrating things that you may have to live with throughout your life is that many of these conflicts will rarely submit to instant solutions. But remember this, it took years after D-Day to not only end the war but to build a lasting peace. It took decades of patience and strength and resolve to prevail in the cold war.

And as with generations going before, we must often be willing to pay the price of time, sometimes the most painful price of all. There is no better source of the courage and constancy of our Nation that we will lead in this era than this Academy and our Armed Forces. This Academy has prepared you to lead those Armed Forces. As you take your place in the Navy and the Marine Corps, always bear in mind the heroism, the sacrifice, the leadership of those who have served before you.

I think, in particular, of one of the stories that comes out of D-Day, June 6th, 1944. On that gray dawn, as U.S. Rangers approached Pointe du Hoc, they were raked by German fire from the cliff above. One landing craft was sunk; others were endangered. But then, an American destroyer, the U.S.S. *Satterlee,* along with a British destroyer, came to the rescue. They came in perilously close to the shore, and opened fire with all their guns at the Germans who were raining fire down on the Rangers. By its actions, the *Satterlee* saved American lives and enabled the Rangers to carry out their now-famous mission. Forty-eight years later, a Ranger Platoon leader said, "Someday I'd love to meet up with somebody from *Satterlee* so I can shake his hand and thank him."

The valor of those who proceeded you is the stuff of inspiration. A great country must always remember the sacrifices of those who went be-

fore and made our freedom possible. But even greater accomplishments lie ahead if you can make them happen. For remember this: When our memories exceed our dreams, we have begun to grow old. It is the destiny of America to remain forever young.

As the guardians of your generation's freedom and our future, may you never know directly whose lives you have saved—you may not—whose future you have improved. You may never hear their thanks or get to shake their hands. But they'll be out there. We'll all be out there, aware of your courage, impressed by your dedication, grateful for your service to God and country. You can keep America forever young.

Good luck, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:28 a.m. at the Navy/Marine Corps Memorial Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Rear Adm. Thomas C. Lynch, USN, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; Adm. William A. Owens, USN, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Gen. Carl E. Mundy, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Message to the Congress on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

May 25, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is to continue in effect beyond May 30, 1994, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on May 30, 1992, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) continues to support groups seizing and attempting to seize territory in the Republics of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence. The actions and policies of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, vital foreign policy interests, and the economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to reduce its ability to support the continuing civil strife in the former Yugoslavia.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
May 25, 1994.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks on Signing the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994

May 26, 1994

Thank you very much, General Reno, for your leadership on this issue. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. Senator Kennedy, Chairman Brooks, Congressman Schumer, Congresswoman Schroeder, Congresswoman Morella, thank you all for your leadership. I thank the Republicans as well as the Democrats in the Congress. I think it is important to point out that this bill had bipar-

tisan support. I'd also like to acknowledge the presence here today among us of David and Wendy Gunn, the children of Dr. David Gunn from Florida. Thank you for coming, and you're welcome here today.

Enacting this bill to provide freedom of access to clinics has been a priority because protecting the freedoms of our citizens is surely chief among the responsibilities of the President of the United States. This bill is designed to eliminate violence and coercion. It is not a strike against the first amendment. Far from it, it ensures that all citizens have the opportunity to exercise all their constitutional rights, including their privacy rights under the Constitution.

Our people have genuine and deeply felt differences on the subject of abortion, even if abortion is safe, legal, and rare. But we must all agree that as a nation we must remain committed to the rule of law. It is what keeps us civilized. It is what enables us to live together. It protects our liberties as individuals and as a nation. It gives us the freedom at election time to try to elect those who agree with us and defeat those who don't. It gives us a way to carry on as one nation from many people with many different views.

We simply cannot, we must not continue to allow the attacks, the incidents of arson, the campaigns of intimidation upon law-abiding citizens that has given rise to this law. No person seeking medical care, no physician providing that care should have to endure harassments or threats or obstruction or intimidation or even murder from vigilantes who take the law into their own hands because they think they know what the law ought to be.

What happened to the father of Wendy and David Gunn should not have happened. The shooting attack that wounded Dr. George Tiller in Wichita, Kansas, should not have happened. Now with this legislation we will have a law with teeth to deal with those who take part in unlawful activities, who put themselves above and beyond the law. Because of the violence it will curb, the lives and property it will protect, and the constitutional rights of women it will uphold, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act becomes law today.

Let me say again that the awful circumstances which gave rise to this law are the most extreme example of a trend running in this country that I think is very bad for us as a democracy. I treasure and would fight and indeed die to protect the rights of people to express their views on this issue, no matter how different they may be from mine. I believe deeply that our country is strengthened by people whose religious convictions on this issue may be different from mine or from yours. But the implication that people who differ about what rights should be accorded to women in our society are somehow enthusiastic about abortion is just downright wrong.

There is so much we have to talk about, so much we could be doing together to diffuse the intense anger and animosity and to listen to one another, to help the lives of children who have been born, to get them into good adoptive homes more quickly, more readily, often across racial lines—things that aren't available today. A lot of this could be done.

But it will never be done if people who think they have a right to take the law in their own hands, to misrepresent the positions of their opponents, and to wreak violence in this country and verbal extremism, and to distort the tenor of public debate have their day. It is time for us to turn away from that. All the people in this country without regard to their position on abortion, I think, would say that parents have fundamental responsibilities to raise their children. The people who gave rise to this act denied Dr. David Gunn the right to be a parent throughout his lifetime. That was not a pro-life position.

Let us take the opportunity in signing this not only to speak out against the extremism and the vigilante conduct which gave right to this law but to ask the American people once again to reach across these awful barriers and start listening to each other again and talking with each other again and trying to honestly deal with these problems again.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. David Gunn, who was killed outside a Pensacola, FL, clinic on March 10, 1993, and Dr. George R. Tiller, who was wounded outside a Wichita, KS, clinic on August 19, 1993. S. 636, approved May 26, was assigned Public Law No. 103–259.

The President's News Conference
May 26, 1994

China

The President. Good afternoon. Today I would like to announce a series of important decisions regarding United States policy toward China.

Our relationship with China is important to all Americans. We have significant interests in what happens there and what happens between us. China has an atomic arsenal and a vote and a veto in the U.N. Security Council. It is a major factor in Asian and global security. We share important interests, such as in a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula and in sustaining the global environment. China is also the world's fastest growing economy. Over $8 billion of United States exports to China last year supported over 150,000 American jobs.

I have received Secretary Christopher's letter recommending—as required by last year's Executive order, reporting to me on the conditions in that Executive order. He has reached a conclusion with which I agree, that the Chinese did not achieve overall significant progress in all the areas outlined in the Executive order relating to human rights, even though clearly there was progress made in important areas including the resolution of all emigration cases, the establishment of a memorandum of understanding with regard to how prison labor issues would be resolved, the adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other issues. Nevertheless, serious human rights abuses continue in China, including the arrest and detention of those who peacefully voice their opinions and the repression of Tibet's religious and cultural traditions.

The question for us now is, given the fact that there has been some progress but that not all the requirements of the Executive order were met, how can we best advance the cause of human rights and the other profound interests the United States has in our relationship with China?

I have decided that the United States should renew most-favored-nation trading status toward China. This decision, I believe, offers us the best opportunity to lay the basis for long-term sustainable progress in human rights and for the advancement of our other interests with China. Extending MFN will avoid isolating China and instead will permit us to engage the Chinese with not only economic contacts but with cultural, educational, and other contacts and with a continuing aggressive effort in human rights, an approach that I believe will make it more likely that China will play a responsible role, both at home and abroad.

I am moving, therefore, to delink human rights from the annual extension of most-favored-nation trading status for China. That linkage has been constructive during the past year. But I believe, based on our aggressive contacts with the Chinese in the past several months, that we have reached the end of the usefulness of that policy and it is time to take a new path toward the achievement of our constant objectives. We need to place our relationship into a larger and more productive framework.

In view of the continuing human rights abuses, I am extending the sanctions imposed by the United States as a result of the events in Tiananmen Square, and I am also banning the import of munitions, principally guns and ammunition from China. I am also pursuing a new and vigorous American program to support those in China working to advance the cause of human rights and democracy. This program will include increased broadcasts for Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America, increased support for nongovernmental organizations working on human rights in China, and the development with American business leaders of a voluntary set of principles for business activity in China.

I don't want to be misunderstood about this: China continues to commit very serious human rights abuses. Even as we engage the Chinese on military, political, and economic issues, we intend to stay engaged with those in China who suffer from human rights abuses. The United States must remain a champion of their liberties.

I believe the question, therefore, is not whether we continue to support human rights in China but how we can best support human rights in China and advance our other very significant issues and interests. I believe we can do it by engaging the Chinese. I believe the course I have chosen gives us the best chance of success on all fronts. We will have more contacts. We will have more trade. We will have

more international cooperation. We will have more intense and constant dialog on human rights issues. We will have that in an atmosphere which gives us the chance to see China evolve as a responsible power, ever growing not only economically but growing in political maturity so that human rights can be observed.

To those who argue that in view of China's human rights abuses we should revoke MFN status, let me ask you the same question that I have asked myself over and over these last few weeks, as I have studied this issue and consulted people of both parties who have had experience with China over many decades: Will we do more to advance the cause of human rights if China is isolated or if our nations are engaged in a growing web of political and economic cooperation and contacts? I am persuaded that the best path for advancing freedom in China is for the United State to intensify and broaden its engagement with that nation.

I think we have to see our relations with China within the broader context of our policies in the Asian-Pacific region, a region that, after all, includes our own Nation. This week, we've seen encouraging developments, progress on resolving trade frictions with the Japanese and possible progress towards stopping North Korea's nuclear program. I am determined to see that we maintain an active role in this region in both its dynamic economic growth and in its security.

In three decades and three wars during this century, Americans have fought and died in the Asian-Pacific to advance our ideals and our security. Our destiny demands that we continue to play an active role in this region. The actions I have taken today to advance our security, to advance our prosperity, to advance our ideals I believe are the important and appropriate ones. I believe, in other words, this is in the strategic, economic, and political interests of both the United States and China, and I am confident that over the long run this decision will prove to be the correct one.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, most of the conditions, the aspects of this problem were prevalent last year when you made very strong threats of a cutoff of human rights. Aren't you really bowing to big business and backing off of human rights in terms of the world perception?

The President. No. No, I don't think so. And if you've seen the statements of recent days by many others—Senator Bradley and many other Members of the Senate, other members of the American political community who have also evolved in their view, I think most people believe, number one, that conditions have changed.

I think it's very important to say that under the terms of this agreement some progress has been made. Some important political dissidents have been released. We've gotten information on Tibetan prisoners for the first time. We have a process now with operable deadlines for looking into these disputes over prison labor matters. We have at least an adherence, an explicit adherence by the Chinese to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We have an ongoing set of negotiations now on how to deal with the jamming we've suffered on our Voice of America broadcast. So there have been some changes.

And interestingly enough, many of the most vocal human rights advocates have argued that—not that we should lift MFN status but that instead we should have some intermediate sanctions which cover a bigger section of the economy. But things have changed to the point, both in terms of what has gone on in China and in terms of the other strategic issues—the situation in Korea, for example, I think everyone would admit is somewhat different than it was a year ago—that I believe, that everybody believes we should do something differently.

The question is, should we delink, or should we continue to do this on an annual basis? I believe the answer to that is no. And I believe the answer to what we should do is to pursue a broader strategy of engagement. I think that is where we are now. And I think that it is far more likely to produce advances in human rights as well as to support our strategic and economic interests.

Q. Mr. President, how do you answer those who say you are—using your own words now—coddling tyrants? And with the leverage of linkage now moved away, what incentive is there for China to improve human rights?

The President. Well, let me turn it on its head, first of all. China is a very great and important nation. What gave rise to this MFN in the first place, this issue? Why did anyone believe human rights should be tied to MFN in China as opposed to other nations in the

world? The MFN law basically is tied to emigration, and we have—I haven't said that, I don't think, today—we have successfully resolved all outstanding emigration cases with the Chinese. Why was it extended to involve human rights here? Because of the frustration in the Congress that the previous administration had reestablished relationships too quickly after Tiananmen Square, and there seemed to be no other aggressive human rights strategy.

The United States has pursued the cause of human rights around the world in many, many ways without tying it to MFN with those countries. I have had, for example, several conversations on this subject with one of our Nation's most dedicated human rights advocates, President Carter, who strongly believes that the decision I have taken today is the right one and more likely to produce human rights progress. Because, let me answer your question precisely, every nation, every great nation makes some decisions and perhaps most decisions based on what is in the interest of the nation at that moment in time internally. But no nation likes to feel that every decision it makes for the good, to do something that's right, that makes progress, is being made not because it's the right thing to do but only because of external pressure from someone else.

And I believe, based on my—and this is the root of this judgment, and all of you and all of the American people will have to draw your own conclusions about whether I'm right or wrong, but I'm prepared to fight for my position in the Congress and elsewhere, because I believe it's right. I believe, based on intensive efforts over the last few weeks, that we are far more likely to have human rights advances when it is not under the cloud of the annual question of review of MFN. That is what I believe.

That is not to say that there will not continue to be human rights abuses in China, that there won't be ups and downs in this. But I believe that over the long run we're more likely to make advances if there's more contact with the Chinese, not less; if there's more economic growth, not less—we saw that in Taiwan and Korea—and if we are free to explicitly and aggressively pursue our human rights agenda, as we would with any other country. That is the conclusion I have drawn. I think it's the correct one.

Q. On the first question, aren't you coddling tyrants just as you accuse——

The President. No, because I do believe what happened—what has happened since then? Has there been any progress? There's been so much progress that even the people who have supported these strong resolutions, the legislation in the past are now arguing for a different course. I'm not the only person arguing that the time has come to take a different path; it's that they will say, well, I should have done something else. But virtually everyone says the time has come to move out of the framework now.

We obviously have something going on in this relationship now. We obviously have a broader and deeper relationship, and we obviously are going to see some changes here. So I think everybody acknowledges that there is some dynamism in this relationship now which warrants a change. The question is what tactical path should we take. And I expect that many people who criticize my decision will say, "Well, he should have put stiffer tariffs on something or another or should have had a bigger section of the economy affected or gone after the military enterprises or something like that." But I think nearly everybody recognizes that there has been some real change in this and that we have the chance to move it to a different and better plane. And I think what I'm doing is the right thing to do.

White House Staff Misuse of Helicopters

Q. Mr. President, on another topic, do you have anything to say about some of your staffers who apparently used a Government helicopter for a golf outing?

The President. Yes, I do. First of all, I knew nothing about it until sometime during the business day. As you know, I've been working on this for the last couple of days. I asked Mr. McLarty to look into it, and I can tell you that, number one, I was very upset about it when I heard about it. Mr. Watkins has resigned, and the taxpayers will be fully reimbursed. That's the most important thing to me. The Treasury will not be out one red cent for whatever happened there. Now, I don't think there's anything else for me to say about it.

Q. Will he pay that himself, or will you be paying that money from——

The President. Well, I haven't resolved that yet. Like I said, I didn't even know about it. All I can tell you is when I found out about it, I asked Mr. McLarty to look into it. Some-

body else can give you more facts and more background. I've been working on this all day. I just know that Mr. Watkins offered his resignation and I insisted that the taxpayers be reimbursed. Some way or another they will be, and we'll tell you how when we do it.

Q. Can I follow on that? Do you expect that there will be resignations from the two other individuals involved? Is that up to the Pentagon since they are in the military?

The President. No, I don't know enough about the facts. I just haven't had time. I've been working on this China issue all day. I'm just telling you what I know; the taxpayers will be made whole. There is a resignation, more facts to follow.

China

Q. May I ask you a question about China, sir? Senator Bradley and others wanted you to do nothing that would restrict trade. Do you expect now that there will be some retaliation from China because of the ban on weapons imports or some other lack of cooperation in our efforts to restrain the North Koreans, for instance?

The President. I would hope not. I think this was an appropriate thing to do because it was discreet, it recognizes that there has not been complete compliance, it is plainly enforceable in ways that many of the other suggestions may not be. And I think that there are corollary benefits to the United States in this which I think should be well understood by the Chinese.

Many people have said and I noticed it was reported in a news article in the Wall Street Journal this morning that many of the manufacturers believe that a lot of these guns have come in below cost, anyway, in ways that almost simulate high-tech Saturday Night Special phenomenon.

So I think it is the right thing to do. I do not expect that to occur. I am plainly offering to build the basis of a long-term, strategic relationship with the Chinese. We can work together when our interests demand it, and if there is progress on the human rights front, we can actually develop the kind of friendship that our relationship has seemed to promise at various times since the opening of China over a century ago. But that remains to be seen.

I want to make it clear to you, I do not do this with rose-colored glasses on. I know there will be—no matter which approach we take, if we had taken another approach, there would have been continuing human rights problems. A great society, so large and with such built-in habits does not change overnight. Just as I hope I can dramatically reduce the climate of crime and violence in this country I know it won't happen overnight. So there will be problems regardless. I simply think this is the best way to approach it.

Q. Mr. President, in revoking and delinking human rights with trade, can you do that on your own given the fact there is a law, the Jackson-Vanik law, that does this? Will this require congressional action?

The President. Well, the Jackson—no, it will permit congressional action. That is, if the Congress chooses to disagree with me, of course, they can offer an alternative path. And then we will—or some in Congress can—then we will debate it. There are many good people who disagree with me.

Q. But you won't have to——

The President. No, I can do what I have done today under the Jackson-Vanik law because the Jackson-Vanik law, which was a product of the cold war, says basically that countries with controlled economies have to meet certain criteria in order for annual renewal of MFN. We will have to continue to certify that they meet those criteria, but they relate to emigration. So that's different from trade and different from the broader human rights questions that we seek. In other words, the trade could be linked to emigration. If the Chinese violate the Jackson-Vanik law, well, that's something they're still subject to. I can't repeal the law.

Q. So barring action by Nancy Pelosi or George Mitchell or someone else in Congress, next year at this time you will not have to certify that China has met these basic human rights conditions in order to go forward with MFN?

The President. That is correct. But next year at this time we'll still be discussing this, and you will see that we have a very aggressive and, I think, more successful approach. That is not about forgetting about human rights. This is about which is the better way to pursue the human rights agenda.

Q. What is your analysis of why the Chinese leadership is going slower in [*inaudible*]—on human rights than you would like them to? And the foreseeable future, what kind of timetable and standards will you use to decide whether

any change in policy is necessary if they're not making, in your view, sufficient progress?

The President. I think there are three factors involved in why are they going slower. First of all, I think that this is a time of considerable political tension in China, that is, tension between the center and the provinces, tension because of the inevitable transformations of leadership that the passage of time will bring about in the—not, at least, in the foreseeable future. And in times of a transition like that, it tends to be more difficult to effect change of any kind. I think that's the first thing.

The second thing, I think, is that we see in the culture of China, and in many other Asian societies, a desire to preserve order in the interest of the group, often at the expense of the individual. We saw a variant of that in the discussion that I had, you know, with the Government of Singapore over the case of the Fay caning. And many believe that in a world that is tumultuous like ours is, you have to have more order, even at the expense of individual rights. My answer to that, obviously, is that what we asked them to do was not to become like us but to honor universally recognized standards of human rights. But you asked me the question.

The third thing, I think, is that a country with 1.2 billion people and the third largest economy in the world, conscious of all the cross currents of change in the difficulties it is facing, is going to have, inevitably, an reluctance to take steps which are right if it looks like every step that is taken, is taken under the pressure of the United States, some outside power making them do it.

And the fourth thing I would say is that this was something, a step we took not in cooperation with the international community. No other nation agreed with us. So it wasn't like there was a big multinational coalition; it's not like sanctions on Iraq, for example.

Now, I think one of the most important things is the third point I made. Every one of you should put yourselves in that position. Would you move forward if you thought no matter what you did and how good it was, every time you did it, it would be interpreted that you were doing it because someone from outside your country were pressuring you to do it?

But I don't want to minimize the fact that there are still serious human rights problems there. We are going to continue to work on them, but I believe doing this in the context of our national security interests, our economic interests, and the opening of China, both economically and in many other ways, and being able to have an explicit and open human rights agenda not hobbled by timetables which may be artificial, is the right way to go. I predict that it will be successful, more successful on human rights than the alternative would have been, and it is my judgment—I am absolutely convinced that's the right thing, that it's in the interest of the United States, and I have done it for that reason.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 58th news conference began at 5:10 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Fay, U.S. citizen convicted of vandalism in Singapore and sentenced to caning.

Statement on the Death of Timothy West

May 26, 1994

Hillary and I were heartbroken when we learned that Timothy West, the 4-year-old boy with leukemia who hugged me so close when I visited him, died this morning in Houston. This precious boy carried the burdens of his illness with courage and a sense of warmth that touched me deeply. Our prayers are with Timothy's parents, Chris and Lisa West, and we especially want to thank the doctors, nurses, and staff of the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center for pouring so much of themselves into Timothy's treatment and care. On such a sorrowful day, I hope they will feel healed by Timothy's strength and the knowledge that he is now with God.

Interview With Gavin Esler of the British Broadcasting Corporation
May 27, 1994

Foreign Policy

Mr. Esler. Mr. President, you are going to Europe to celebrate this great anniversary, the 50-year anniversary of the grand alliance against fascism and tyranny. But it's said that the present generation of leaders, yourself included, have somehow not got the vision of the Churchills and the Roosevelts to lead us into the next century. How do you respond with some ideas about your own vision?

The President. Well, first, I don't think that's accurate or a fair judgment. I think we're all deeply grateful to the generation of D-Day and the Second War for what they did and the freedom they bought us. I think we're also grateful to those who fought and won the cold war. And what we have to do now is to work out how we're going to face the challenges of the post-cold-war era and what our responsibilities are. The United States is still prepared to lead in a world in which our concerns are clear—security, prosperity, democracy, and human rights—and in which we know there is an interdependence, a level of cooperation required, because we want to maintain a discipline that was not there before the Second World War, a discipline that was not there before World War II, a discipline that will permit us to work on these problems, contain those we can't control, and prevent the whole world from becoming engulfed again.

And that is what we are attempting to do in working with the British, the French, and others in Bosnia, what we are attempting to do in leading NATO to take action out of area for the first time and trying to support the attempt to secure peace in Bosnia. That's what we're trying to do with the Partnership For Peace. Eighteen nations have now signed up to cooperate with NATO in a way that gives us the opportunity, for the first time since nation states came across the European continent, to unify Europe rather than have it divided.

So, I'm quite encouraged, actually, about the way things are going. We're engaging Russia; we're engaging the other republics of the former Soviet Union. We are working hard there. In Asia, the United States is engaging Japan, is engaging China, is engaging a whole lot of other Pacific powers in an attempt to preserve the peace there. In our own hemisphere now, 33 of the 35 nations in Central and Latin America are now governed by democracies. And we are working together as never before. So, I think that we are trying to forge this newer world. I admit there are ragged edges and uncertainties, but that was the case after the Second World War for a few years as well.

Bosnia

Mr. Esler. Well, one of those ragged edges is Bosnia itself. You're going to a Europe which, for the first time in 50 years, is at war with itself. You're the Commander in Chief of 1.6 million men and women under arms. Why is it so difficult to do what Roosevelt did, to send some of those men to put the fire out in Europe?

The President. Well, first of all, Roosevelt sent those people after Pearl Harbor, after there was an attack and after Germany declared war on the United States, when the whole future of Europe was at stake.

What has happened here is that European nations under the U.N. mandate have gone into Bosnia not for the purpose of ending the war but for the purpose of preserving the U.N. mission of preserving some limitation on the fighting and some humanitarian aid. We have acted in support of that in several ways. We have provided through our air power the longest humanitarian airlift in history, now longer than the Berlin airlift. We have worked hard to get our NATO allies to agree to use not only the threat but the reality of air power to stop the war in Bosnia from spreading to the air. We have shot down planes in aid of that objective to protect Sarajevo and other safe areas. And we are aggressively involved with our European allies in trying to get a peace agreement.

I do not think it is an appropriate thing for the United States to send ground troops to Bosnia to become involved in the conflict itself. Now, if we reach an agreement in which NATO has a responsibility to enforce the agreement along lines agreed to by the parties, that's a different matter altogether. The United States still has troops in the Middle East enforcing the agreement reached by Israel and Egypt at

the Camp David accord. I think that is a different thing.

If we're talking about limiting the conflict, we have troops now in Macedonia, in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, designed to limit the conflict. I think that that is the appropriate thing for us. I think the Europeans have done the right thing in putting their troops in in the U.N. mandate to try to limit the fighting. But in the end, these parties are going to have to make an agreement. Otherwise, there's a risk that they'll collapse the U.N. mission. They're going to have to decide that they cannot win, either side, by fighting and make an agreement. They reached an agreement tentatively before the terrible problems in Gorazde. And we need to get them back to the negotiating table.

Mr. Esler. Your critics say that you've been inconsistent in your Bosnia policy. Some Western diplomats have said to me that on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of April you seem to have had three different Bosnian policies. You raised the possibility of discussing lifting the trade embargo on the Serbs. You talked about lifting the arms embargo on the Muslims. In any event, you didn't do any of those things. Can you see why your friends are perplexed by this because you seemed to have changed your mind?

The President. A lot of times people have said things in this Bosnian thing, not only about me but about others, as a way of shifting to others the responsibility they have for their own frustrations. Let's just be frank about this. I did not raise the prospect of any kind of unilateral lifting in the embargo on Serbia. I said that any discussion of that, any discussion of that, could not proceed until there was some sort of cessation of hostilities and that I personally would not favor changing the position of the United States, which is that that embargo should not be lifted until (a) there is a peace agreement in force in Bosnia and (b) some other changes have occurred in Serbia. I have not changed our position.

With regard to lifting the arms embargo, I have always thought that the arms embargo was unfair to the Bosnian Government, always. That has been my position from day one. I have also always thought that the United States should not unilaterally lift it, from day one. Our European allies have not favored lifting it for good reasons. They have soldiers on the ground there. There are British soldiers in Bosnia; they do not want them subject to attack, to capture because the arm's embargo has been lifted. Therefore, I do not think the global community will vote to lift the arms embargo unless the U.N. mission collapses.

What I said about the arms embargo was quite simple, and that is that I think it is a possibility if the U.N. mission does not succeed. I said what I did in hopes that we could spur the Serbs to understand that they are going to have to make a reasonable agreement or fight a very long war. I don't think any of that is inconsistent with the position I have taken. The problem is—let's face it, the problem is everybody is so frustrated about Bosnia that it's easy in our frustrations to point our fingers at each other. I don't think that's very helpful. I believe that we have a common policy. I believe that we are working very closely with our friends in Europe and, by the way, with the Russians, who have been quite constructive in this. And my position is that as long as the Europeans are willing to be part of the U.N. mission and as long as the Russians are willing to follow a responsible course in their relationship with the Serbs, we ought to try to make a decent peace.

Northern Ireland

Mr. Esler. Could we turn to Ireland now, Mr. President; that's been a bone of contention with Britain. Was your decision to allow Gerry Adams in here, in retrospect, a mistake because the IRA have still failed to endorse the Downing Street declaration on the peace process?

The President. I don't think we can know yet. The decision to let him come was plainly taking a risk for peace. I think that Sinn Fein ought to renounce violence and ought to join the peace process. I'm very frankly pleased that at long last they issued their questions and the British Government provided answers and all that's been published. And I'm hoping that after the June 12 elections, that we'll see some real progress there. But I don't think we can know yet whether the decision was or was not a mistake in terms of what will happen over the long run. I think plainly it was designed to further the debate, and I hope it did that.

Media Criticism

Mr. Esler. Finally, Mr. President, you go to Europe at a time when you're facing the kind of criticism, sleazy criticism, at home and in the British papers that no President has ever

had to face before. How distracting is it for you that people are raking up financial dealings and personal affairs going back years?

The President. Well, unfortunately that's become part of the daily fare of American public life now because of certain extremist groups and because now it's part of our media life, like unfortunately it's a part of your media life. But I know that the charges are bogus and that they'll ultimately be disproved or they'll die of their own weight. And they don't take up a lot of our time and attention here.

My job is to lead this country in its own path of internal revival and engaging with our friends and allies. And I can't really afford to be distracted by it. I just get up here every day and think about what an incredible historic opportunity and what an obligation it is, and I do my best to fulfill the obligation.

I will say this, I'm ecstatic about going back to Britain again after some years of absence and having a chance to go back to Oxford again after the D-Day ceremonies are complete. The United States has no closer ally than Great Britain. And even though we may have some differences from time to time, we mustn't let those differences get in our way. We have too much at stake. We have too much work to do in building this new world. As you point out, there are still a lot of problems out there, but we're going to deal with them, and we're going to do fine.

Mr. Esler. Mr. President, thank you very much for talking to me. And I hope you enjoy your visit to Britain.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 2:40 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Fein.

Interview With the Italian Media

May 27, 1994

Giuseppe Lugato. Mr. President, I want to thank you, first of all, for this great opportunity. I want to remember that this is the first time that a President of the United States gives an interview to two Italian journalists only. So thank you, and our first question, sir.

Italian Government

Silvia Kramar. My first question to you, Mr. President, is about Italy. There has been great many political changes in the last few months. We have a brand new government, and we actually call it the beginning of the second republic. My question to you is what do you think about this new government? What is your impression? And also, what do you think will be the future of the relationships between the United States and Italy?

The President. Well, first let me say a word about the outgoing government. I think Prime Minister Ciampi did a fine job of bridging the period of transition and giving a sense of stability and security and confidence to the rest of us about Italy and what was going on. We all followed the elections with great interest. As you know, your system is quite a bit different from ours, so here in America we were very interested to see how the election would come out and then how a government would be formed.

I haven't met with your new Prime Minister, but I am looking forward to it. The Italian Foreign Minister was here just a few days ago to assure the United States of the continuing commitment of Italy to the sort of partnership we have had. The Italian-American relationship is extremely important for our ability to work for peace in Bosnia, for our ability to maintain a stability in the entire region, and for our long-term economic partnerships as well. So I am looking forward to it, and I am basically quite optimistic. I'm hopeful.

Mr. Lugato. Sir, you were just quoting the new Prime Minister. Can I ask you what is the perception that you have of Mr. Berlusconi? That at the same time he is a successful businessman, number one Italian TV tycoon, and Prime Minister. Now, many in Italy, they think that's too much, and they think that in the United States this couldn't happen.

The President. Couldn't happen?

Mr. Lugato. That's what I'm saying.

The President. Well, you know, as I said, we've never met so I have no direct perception. But I think that we live in a world in which the media is very dominant. I mean, our perceptions are so shaped by what we see and what we hear that it is not surprising that in certain nations people who have made their careers and fortunes in the media would rise to the top of the political system.

I think the question is, then once you have the job, what do you do with it? And I think I have the impression that in the campaign he projected strength, he projected a sense of where Italy should go and a willingness to make sure that certain changes would be made to make the system function and to provide a measure of stable progress. And that, of course, is the challenge that we all face.

So I am sort of like, I think the Italian citizens—I say that the man has been elected; give him a chance. Let's see if he can do his job. Give him a chance, and give him a little support.

Ms. Kramar. Talking about the new government, Berlusconi also has a coalition with a different party called Aliancia Nacionale, which has always been a right-wing party. And five of our new ministers belong to that party. Of course, you must have read all the newspapers here and the columns saying that Italy is going back to a new Fascist era. What do you think about that?

The President. I think it's a little premature to make that sort of extreme judgment, for several reasons. I mean a lot of the political parties in multiparty democracies have their roots in the past and certain ideas and images and policies of the past, which may not be a valid way of judging them today. In Poland, for example, they had an election and the, if you will, the children, the descendants of the former Communist Party, won a big portion of the election. Does that mean they are going to go back to communism? Not necessarily. In Argentina, one of my favorite examples, President Menem won as the heir of Juan Peron's party, but he privatized the economy. He grew it. He stabilized inflation.

In Italy, when I was last in Italy in 1987, I was staying in Florence and traveling around to Bologna and to Siena and to many other cities, and I was noticing all these governments governed by people who said they were members of the Communist Party. But they were pro-NATO, anti-Soviet Union, pro-United States, pro-free enterprise. I think we must judge people by what they do, not by the labels behind them. So let's give them a chance to govern and see what they do.

Administration Goals

Mr. Lugato. Mr. President, what is the America that you would like to see? And do you think you are on the right track to build it?

The President. Yes, I think we're going in the right direction. I want America to be able to do the following things: One, I want America to rebuild itself. I want a strong American economy, and I want this incredibly diverse country of ours to be coming together with a stronger sense of community. I want us to have a mature and accurate idea of what the relationship between the Government and the people should be. What can the Government do, what must the people do for themselves from the grassroots up in their families, their communities, their workplaces? I want an America that is moving outward into the 21st century, reaching out to other countries and leading a world in which we do not dominate but in which we must lead, where we cooperate with our friends and allies to provide for security against the proliferation of weapons, against terrorism, against aggression, against all the pressures to dissolve in all these countries and where we try to advance the cause of prosperity, democracy, and human rights, and where we try to limit chaos and misery, doing what we can in a cooperative way as we did in Somalia or as we work together to try to help the African countries deal with the tragedy of Rwanda and Burundi, and et cetera, et cetera. Those are the things I think we should be doing.

Foreign Policy

Mr. Lugato. So, Mr. President, you have a vision also for the world. Now, how do you explain that your foreign policy—I know that you don't deserve that, but—has been so criticized, has been unfocused, uncertain? How do you explain that?

The President. Well, I think that there are, if you will, three parts of it, and one part of it has been criticized. No one has criticized what we have done to protect the security of Americans, that is, working with the Russians to make Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus nonnuclear states, reducing our nuclear arsenals. We don't point our nuclear weapons at each other any more.

We are working in partnership. That's been very successful.

The second thing we have done is to try to advance international trade and to promote freedom and openness through that in our own hemisphere with the North American Free Trade Agreement, with our leadership to get the GATT agreement worldwide, with our continuing efforts to engage China and Japan and other Asian countries. We are working in ways that—in our country, we have seen more progress than in a generation in reaching out to the world economically.

The third area is the most difficult: To what extent can America influence adverse events in other parts of the world? And particularly, they mention Bosnia and, in our backyard here, Haiti. The real issue there, it seems to me, is that there is a lot of confusion about exactly how much our country should do.

We have interests and values at stake in Bosnia. Should we be on the ground there with troops? I don't think so. Should we lift the arms embargo, as maybe a majority of my Congress wants to do? I don't think so. I don't agree with the arms embargo. I think it was a mistake in the first place. But we are now involved in a cooperative venture in Bosnia with our allies in NATO and the United Nations and principally with Europe to try to help to bring that awful conflict to an end and, in the meanwhile, to make sure it does not spread. In that environment where we are working to push toward a solution, we cannot impose our will, and we have to be flexible and listening. That is the frustration people have. People say, "Well, President Clinton doesn't favor the arms embargo, but he won't lift it." That's right. Because if I lift the arms embargo all by myself, then why should Italy observe the embargo on Saddam Hussein, or any other country?

We have done the following things constantly. I have always said I would not send troops into Bosnia while the war was going on because that would complicate the U.N. mission and because I did not think that was the right thing to do. I would, however, support the troops there with air support, with the airplanes for the humanitarian airlift, and then I'll work to get NATO to agree to an out-of-area mission to use air power there to keep the Bosnian war from spreading into the air and to try to protect Sarajevo and these other areas. That is my policy. If we can reach an agreement on clear dividing lines for peace, then I would be prepared to have the United States participate in that peace effort. I think that shows leadership, I think it shows a respect for the European powers, and I don't think it shows vacillation. But it is frustrating because people say, "Well, the U.S. is the only superpower in the world, and Europe is very strong and rich. Why can't we just fix this?" We forget the history of Bosnia. It can't be fixed easily.

Ms. Kramar. Mr. President, on a more personal level, you are an idealist. You always wanted to be President of the United States, ever since you were a child. Now you are in the position of being probably the most powerful man in the world, and yet you wake up in the morning, you read the papers, and you see that there is violence in Rwanda, there is violence in Bosnia, there is violence in Haiti and in the streets of America. How does it feel to be not able to change this?

The President. Well, one of my great predecessors, Harry Truman, who was President, as you know, right after World War II, said that he discovered after he became President that his job largely consisted of trying to talk other people into doing what they ought to do anyway. Sometimes I feel that way, that I don't have as much power as I thought I would have.

On the other hand, this is a place with some power. As anyone who has ever exercised power will tell you, there is always the tug of the mind and the heart, of the interests and the values. And what you have to do is to decide how much you can do and do that and do it as well as you can and then try to marshal the energies and ideas and values of other people to help.

So that is what I am trying to do. I am trying to construct a framework in which Italy and France and Germany and England and the South American powers and the Asian powers and the African powers can cooperate to try to deal with horrible problems in which the United States leads but does not attempt to do something it cannot do. And every day I think about it. I am doing my best to live out my ideals, understanding that I have to have everyone else's help in order to do it. But I am, frankly, more optimistic than I was about the future of the world than when I took office.

Mr. Lugato. Mr. President, we thank you very much. And really be welcome in my country, and have a great time in Italy.

The President. I can't wait to come. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 3:10 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. The interviewers were Giuseppe Lugato, RAI Television, and Silvia Kramar, RTI Television.

Letter Accepting the Resignation of David Watkins as Assistant to the President for Management and Administration

May 27, 1994

Dear David:

I write to accept your resignation and to say that I understand your reasons for submitting it.

At the same time, it should be stated that you undertook your assignment as Assistant to the President for Management and Administration with great vigor and effectiveness. During your tenure, we changed and upgraded the technology upon which this White House depends and future White Houses will depend; from telephones to computers, you brought us into the modern age. Moreover, you opened this house—the people's house—literally to thousands more visitors than had ever been welcomed here in White House history. For these, and many other accomplishments large and small, you deserve great credit.

Hillary and I will never forget the loyal friendship you and Ileene have given to us over the years.

Sincerely,

BILL

NOTE: A letter of resignation from David Watkins to the President and a letter from Chief of Staff Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty to Mr. Watkins were also made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Statement on the Whale Sanctuary Agreement

May 27, 1994

We are pleased that we were able to get so many other countries to agree to a sanctuary. The United States will continue to exercise leadership in seeking international agreement on the conservation of whales.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on the International Whaling Commission agreement to create a sanctuary for whales.

The President's Radio Address

May 28, 1994

Good morning. Next week, many millions of Americans, indeed people all across the world, will focus on the beaches of Normandy, France, for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of D-Day. I'll be leaving for Europe in the next few days to represent our people at the ceremonies honoring the sacrifices of those who fought in World War II. D-Day, June 6, 1944, saw the single greatest mobilization of any fighting force in human history. It was the turning point of World War II and in many respects a turning point of the 20th century. It was the beginning of the end of Nazi tyranny and a

downpayment on all the years of freedom the rest of us have enjoyed ever since.

Memorial Day, on Monday, reminds Americans everywhere that the ultimate price of freedom is never fully paid. This past week, I presented the Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest award for valor, to the widows and families of Sergeants Gary Gordon and Randall Shughart, who served nobly, fought bravely, and died while saving the life of a comrade in Somalia last October.

It was the first time this medal had been earned in over 20 years. Sergeants Gordon and Shughart served above and beyond the call of duty and died in the most courageous and selfless way any human being can act. They risked their safety without hesitation and gave their lives to save a comrade. Because of their heroism and that of others on October 3d, America was able to complete its mission in Somalia without any further casualties, turn over its responsibilities to the United Nations, to their soldiers from other lands, and to come home knowing that our efforts saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of people and gave Somalia at least a chance to become a stable land. These soldiers and others will live in the memories of those whose lives they touched.

From the American Revolution to the Civil War, down through all the conflicts of our own century, the lives of all Americans have been moved by every patriot who ever fought and died for the freedoms we all share. To honor the sacrifices of those who have gone before, we must build on their service in a very different and challenging world. The World Wars are over. The cold war has been won. Now, it is our job to secure the peace. For the first time in history, there is a chance that democracy and economic progress can reach across all Europe and to the far corners of the world. It is an exciting and promising challenge. But if we are to expand freedom's reach, we must first and foremost stand ready to protect America from danger's reach.

No era is ever free of dangers; none ever will be. And ours is no exception. The cold war world, which was bound up in a nuclear standoff, has been traded for a new world yearning for stability and facing unimaginable chaos. Nations once burdened by the smothering grip of communism faced economic insecurities as they moved toward market economies. The heavy lid of authoritarian regimes has been lifted to reveal the smoldering embers of ethnic and religious hatreds. Millions are dying from hunger rooted in environmental and economic devastation and uncontrolled migration. Millions more hunger to be free. And all of us on this Earth still face serious threats from the spread of nuclear weapons technology and the spread of other weapons of mass destruction around the world.

In this new era we cannot dispatch our troops to solve every problem where our values are offended by human misery, and we should not. But we are prepared to defend ourselves and our fundamental interests when they are threatened. We'll do so on our own whenever necessary, and we'll act with others whenever that's possible and prudent. In all cases, as the great power of this era, we have a responsibility to lead, because millions around the world look to us for strength, for ideals, for the power of example.

Today more than any time in human history, we live in an interdependent world where the fortunes of all nations are tied together. Through two World Wars, we learned that the security of our freedom here at home depends on the survival of freedom overseas. That's why we still have troops in Europe and in Korea. Now more than ever before, the strength of our economy here at home also is joined to the strength of economies abroad.

In an age of increasing interdependence, our mission is to provide for our own security, fighting terrorism, fighting proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, fighting conventional threats; then to help other nations achieve economic reforms and prosperity and become more democratic. A world of free and stable trading partners is not only good for our economic security, it's important for our national security.

That's why we've worked so hard for the North American Free Trade Agreement, for the worldwide GATT trade agreement, to reach out to the countries of the Asian-Pacific region and Latin America, to involve South Africa in the world's growing trade, and now to try to engage the Chinese to support not only human rights in that country but the continuing evolution of economic integration.

To be sure, there is more danger and uncertainty ahead, but there also awaits a world of promise. As we go forward, we should learn from the brave veterans who stormed the shores of Normandy and fought in Italy 50 years ago.

They had no guarantee of survival when they approached their beachhead. Many now say that even with 50 years gone by, they remember expecting that they would not survive. They had no guarantees, but they went on against gunfire, under shelling, over land mines. Against all, they plowed ahead. And they knew that unless they prevailed, our very way of life might be lost.

The sacrifices of their yesterdays have given us the promise of freedom in our tomorrows. A grateful nation must never forget that. It is our obligation to make a world in which no D-Day will ever be necessary again. Working together, with American leadership, we can do that. We can resist tyranny. We can combat terrorism and contain chaos. We can work for peace, for progress, for human rights. The sacrifices of those who went before us demand no less. Like the soldiers who fought on D-Day and in Italy, our great Nation must always push onward to see our freedom endure. For when our memories exceed our dreams, we have begun to grow old. And it is the destiny and the obligation of America to remain forever young.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: This address was recorded at 4:41 p.m. on May 27 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on May 28.

Remarks at a Memorial Day Breakfast

May 30, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Hershel, for that kind of introduction and for the good work that you do for our veterans every day. Secretary Perry, Postmaster General Runyon, General Shalikashvili and the chiefs of our military services, General Gordon at the Military District here in Washington, to the other distinguished guests who are here. Let me welcome you here for another happy and honorable Memorial Day.

I'd like to begin, if I might, by asking one person here to stand and be acknowledged. I want to say a special word of thanks to General Mick Kicklighter and the World War II Commemoration Committee for the remarkable work they have done in organizing this commemoration and what we are about to do in the coming week. General, please stand up. [*Applause*] Thank you.

In just a few moments, I will sign two proclamations, one a prayer for peace on Memorial Day and the other the declaration of D-Day National Remembrance Day. Before I do that and before Postmaster General Runyon unveils this year's additions to the World War II commemorative stamps, I'd like to say just a word about this occasion.

Fifty years ago, our Nation and our allies were engaged in a monumental struggle, the outcome of which was far from clear for quite a long while. Americans from all walks of life were called far from their homes and their families. Franklin Roosevelt spoke of their mission on the morning of the 6th of June, D-Day: "Our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization and to set free a suffering humanity. . . . They fight not for the lust of conquest, they fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise and tolerance and good will among all God's people."

Today, we enjoy the fruits of that toil. We owe our liberty and our prosperity to the strength and the valor of those who fought in that great struggle. But we also inherit the responsibility of defending that gift. We must be the guardians of the freedom that was delivered to us today by what we do here at home to keep freedom alive and to enhance its meaning.

And around the world our men and women in uniform stand guard, guaranteeing and defending that freedom. I think the veterans of D-Day and World War II who are here must take a great deal of pride in knowing that today's men and women in uniform are the finest, most well-motivated Armed Forces our Nation or any nation has ever known. Our highest commitment must be to ensure that they remain so, best trained, best equipped, best prepared. If they must be in harm's way, they must have the support they need and deserve.

As we observe the 50th anniversary of World War II, we must also pause to remember and to pay tribute to those who did not come home, to honor them for the ultimate sacrifice, to honor their families, their friends, those who love them. Also, we must honor those who are here and those they represent who did come home after service in World War II and all those who have guarded our security since. Our Nation is in your debt. We will never forget your valor, your sacrifices, the daily lives that you have made possible.

Let me say, too, a special word of appreciation to those of you who came through the line today who told me that you, too, were going back to Europe this week to be part of that celebration. I hope when you go back, you will feel the immense pride and gratitude that all Americans feel for the sacrifice you made, the commitment you made, and for all the days you made possible in the 50 years since. And I hope everyone else who is here being honored today will also share in some of that pride. We sometimes forget that no democracy in human history has ever lasted as long as the United States of America. It is easy to forget that. It is easy to forget it, but if you measure against all the recorded history of civilization, every day we have is a miracle, a miracle that you made possible, and we thank you for it.

I'm going to sign the proclamations, and then Mr. Gober and Mr. Runyon are in charge of the rest of the program.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:30 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs Hershel Gober. The proclamations are listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Memorial Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia
May 30, 1994

Thank you very much, Mrs. McIntosh, for your fine introduction and for your service to our Nation in Asia during the Second World War. To you and your husband, Professor Shriner, who sang so well—I could imagine him at the age of 24 singing again; to Katy Daley; all the others here; and General Gordon; the distinguished leaders of our Armed Forces, the Congress, and the administration; to the leaders of the veterans' organizations present here; to all of you who are veterans and your families; my fellow Americans.

This morning we join, as we always do on this day, to honor the sacrifices that have made our Nation free and strong. All across our Nation, small towns are holding quiet Memorial Day ceremonies. Proud veterans are pinning on their medals. Children are laying wreaths. Men and women in uniform everywhere stand a little bit taller today as they salute the colors.

Here at Arlington, row after row of headstones, aligned in silent formation, reminds us of the high cost of our freedom. Almost a quarter of a million Americans rest here alone, from every war since the Revolution. Among them are many names we know: General Pershing, Audie Murphy, General Marshall, and so many others. But far more numerous are the Americans whose names are not famous, whose lives were not legend but whose deeds were the backbone that secured our Nation's liberty. Today we honor them. We honor them all as heroes, those who are buried here and those who are buried all around the Nation and the world.

If you look at the headstones, they don't tell you whether the people buried there are poor or rich. They make no distinction of race or of age or of condition. They simply stand, each of them, for one American. Each reminds us that we are descendants, whatever our differences, of a common creed, unbeatable when we are united: one nation under God.

Fifty years ago, the world learned just what Americans are capable of when we joined in common cause in World War II. Later this week it will be my great honor to represent our Nation in Europe at the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the World War II campaigns at Normandy and in Italy.

World War II was an era of sacrifice unequalled in our own history. Over 400,000

Americans died in the service of our Nation. At D-Day alone, over 5,200 were killed or wounded in Normandy. But the battle that was fought there was not just between two armies; it was, as clearly as any conflict in all of human history, a battle between two ways of life.

The totalitarians whose tanks had overrun so much of the earth honestly believed democracies were too undisciplined to survive. Hitler believed a free people would never muster the unity of purpose to win the Second World War. But in the chaos of battle, it was the independence and the can-do confidence of the sons and daughters of America and the other democracies that won the day. And all across our Nation, in factories and farms and hospitals and blood banks, it was the energies of free people who turned the tide. General Eisenhower called it then "the fury of an aroused democracy," the self-reliant fury that took Omaha Beach and liberated much of the Continent and, within a year, brought the war in Europe to an end.

Today, too many of our youngest Americans know too little about what the heroes of that war did. The children and grandchildren of that generation have not been taught enough about the meaning of Normandy or Anzio or Guadalcanal or Midway. And that's why the commemorative ceremonies this year are so very important to all of us: To honor, we must remember.

Today somewhere in America, a curious child rummaging through an attic will stumble upon his grandfather's insignia patches, a pocket guide to France, a metal cricket, a black-and-white photo of a smiling young man in uniform. But learning about those times and those deeds must be more than accidental.

Fortunately, many of our fellow Americans understand that. Gail Thomas of Brentwood, Missouri, was one of them. Her parents both served in World War II. She's a librarian at the Mark Twain Elementary School in her community, and every year she brings in veterans of D-Day and other battles to speak to the students. She says the kids can't believe what those gray-haired men did when they were young. Then they understand that America is the way it is today because of what people gave up 50 years ago. That is the lesson we must all remember, not only for the veterans of World War II but for all our veterans on Memorial Day, on Veterans Day, and every day.

The American veterans of World War II, though they fought in a terribly destructive conflict, at heart were builders. When they came home, they laid down the ribbons of interstate highways across this land. And through the GI bill, those who had fought and won the war were educated so they could win the fruits of victory in peaceful cooperation. In countries ravaged by war, they helped to lift cities from rubble to renewal. They created the international institutions that have undergirded our security for a half a century.

Now our generation honors them for what they did 50 years ago, knowing full well that the greatest honor we can give is to build for the future ourselves at home and abroad: revitalizing our economy so that our people can live to their fullest capacities; strengthening the fabric of our communities and our families; putting our children first and giving them the values they need to do well in a difficult world; making our Government work for all the people, for it took all the people to win the Second World War and to keep this country going forward.

In this uncertain world, we must also remain vigilant against new threats. Today American men and women in uniform stand sentry all around the globe, in Europe, in the Adriatic, in Korea, and on bases here at home. They are the finest, best trained, best motivated fighting force the world has ever known. And our highest commitment must be to ensure that they remain exactly that. If they must be sent in harm's way, we owe them the support they need and deserve.

On this day, we honor those who died for our country. But let us also hold a special place for all of our living American veterans. We owe them a lasting debt of gratitude, and their well-being must be always the cause of our common concern. And let us recognize again our solemn obligation to find answers for those whose loved ones served but were never accounted for.

A year ago today, just before I came to this hallowed place, I spoke at the Vietnam Memorial to honor those who died in that war. I was proud to be joined there by a remarkable man who became a friend of mine, Lewis Puller, Jr. This year, as virtually all of you must know, he rests here on this holy place. This morning when I got up I thought of Lew Puller and the countless heroes he has joined and the terrible sacrifices men and women had been willing to make for this great land.

Every one of them, no matter what war they served in or what battlefield they died on, every

one helped to build a nation we love. Let us remember them. Let us pray for their souls and those of their families and resolve to carry on the never-finished work of freedom.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. at Arlington National Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to World War II veteran Elizabeth P. McIntosh and master of ceremonies Katy Daley.

Remarks at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Members of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports

May 31, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Shalala and Mr. Vice President, Florence Griffith Joyner and Tom McMillen. Glad to see others here in the audience, our Surgeon General, Dr. Elders; Assistant Secretary of HHS Phil Lee; and so many others who are here.

Let me say that I was once asked if I wanted Al Gore to be Vice President because he could run faster than me, and then I would get my times down. [*Laughter*] That was not the primary reason that I asked him to join the ticket in 1992, but I did think it was important, and I do believe it is important that all of us exemplify by what we do a commitment to the work we are about to celebrate when we swear in the President's Council today.

Let me explain why I think this is important. This morning before I came out here, I had about 10 minutes, and I sat down and I made these little notes here, to try to see if I could get across to you and, perhaps through you, to the American people why this day is really a big deal to me.

Before I ran for President, I devoted a lot of time, very private time, to reflecting on the nature of public service, the nature of government, what the role of government in our life is, and what things government cannot do. And I thought a lot about what the American people have to do for themselves in order for this country to work right.

So consider the following: Our Government and our administration has worked hard here at home to get the economy up and going and the deficit down, to pass the most sweeping education and training legislation for workers and young people trying to compete in a global economy in 30 years, to expand trade more in 15 months than in the previous generation. Abroad, in the last couple of days, we have celebrated something that's good for our health: for the first time since the dawn of the atomic age, the United States and Russia no longer have nuclear missiles pointed at each other.

An enormous amount of what we do involves the health of our people. In the area of the environment, we're working hard on a new clean air act and a safe drinking water act. In the area of crime, we passed an assault weapons ban and the Brady bill and more police officers and more prevention, more opportunities for our young people to stay out of trouble, in the area of strengthening the family, something that directly relates to the health of American families, the Family and Medical Leave Act, which permits families to take time off when their children or their parents are ill. Our FDA is taking on a pretty tough fight with the tobacco industry and now looking into the whole issue of the narcotic or addictive effects and whether they can be varied based on certain production techniques. In the area of health care, the First Lady and the Department of Health and Human Services and others have worked on immunization, on more primary and preventive care in our health care proposal, on trying to provide prescription medicines to elderly people.

Now, in the course of doing this, we've made quite a few enemies. We've made the NRA mad, the cigarette industry mad, certain business interests that don't agree with either the economic program or the environmental initiatives or other things, many of but not all of the health insurance companies, and some particularly extremist groups who disapprove even of what we've done to expand the frontiers of medical research. It has all been worth it. It is part of what we are supposed to do.

Now, having said all that, when I picked up the briefing for this event and I realized that

43 percent of the adults in this country don't exercise, that 5 years ago the Council sponsored a poll that said 42 percent of the American people who were adults were actively interested in pursuing a healthier lifestyle which would mean more exercise and a better diet and it's dropped now to 30 percent; when I see the number of children who live in our cities and are vulnerable to gangs and violence and drugs, and I realize that there are no public swimming pools in many of our cities available to them, that the basketball courts don't work anymore, that there are no longer baseball leagues for kids to play in in the summertime; when I look at large employers who spend fabulous amounts of money on health care but very little on the wellness of their employees, I say to myself, I like fighting these fights. I don't mind making these enemies. But unless the American people do something to seize control of their own personal health care destiny and that of their families and that of their friends and neighbors and the kids who live in their cities and communities, we are not going to become what we ought to become. That is why this day is important to me and to the American people.

So I say to the members of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, thank you. We will support you in every way we can. We hope your message will be heard loud and clear.

I say to my fellow Americans, ask yourselves what you can do to improve your own health, the health of your communities, and the availability of sporting and teamwork activities to kids. When you play sports, you don't have time to do other things. When you're involved in teamwork, you learn how to deal with the disappointment of defeat and frustration. You even learn how to manage unfairness. These are important things, lessons in life that have to be learned. A Government program cannot provide them.

So we'll keep doing our job. Let's help them do their job.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:21 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Florence Griffith Joyner and Tom McMillen, Cochairs of the Council.

Statement on Representative Dan Rostenkowski

May 31, 1994

Like all Americans, Chairman Rostenkowski has the right to contest the charges made against him and to have his day in court. Chairman Rostenkowski and others have helped create real momentum for health care reform, and I am confident that legislation will pass this year.

Statement on the Death of Ezra Taft Benson

May 31, 1994

It was with sadness that I learned today of the passing of Ezra Taft Benson, who served our country and his church with ceaseless dedication over a long life productively lived.

It is no accident that one of Mr. Benson's most famous books emphasized in its words and thoughts the three values his life best represented—church, God, and country. He was a leader of his church for five decades, he preached with passion for unity, solidarity, and responsibility within the family, and he served ably in the Eisenhower administration as Agriculture Secretary.

As we celebrate D-Day and the liberation of Europe, it is important to remember that Mr. Benson was the first representative of his church to reenter post-war Europe, where he distributed aid and lifted the spirits of thousands of survivors.

His friends and fellow believers remind us tonight that Ezra Taft Benson was a lifelong scouter, a strong defender of the Constitution, the creator of the soil bank, a religious man who expanded the membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and someone who believed and preached the idea that families come first.

We rejoice in his service, we remember his life, and we extend our heartfelt sympathies to his family, his church, and his admirers worldwide.

Remarks Honoring the 1st Infantry Division

June 1, 1994

Thank you so much, Colonel Nechey, for your introduction, for your comments, for your heroic devotion to your country. General Sullivan, General Talbott, Mr. Stanton, we stand here today in the shadow of Winged Victory, the statue atop the monument to the 1st Infantry Division, the Big Red 1. The motto says it all, "No mission too difficult, no sacrifice too great, beauty first." The number "1" tells us not only your division's name but the faith your country has placed in you for quite a long while now. You have been first in battle for as long as you have existed: the first in Paris in World War I, the first on the Normandy beaches, the first Army division in Vietnam, the first to breach Iraqi defenses in Desert Storm.

In a few moments I will leave to begin this historic trip to Europe to commemorate the 50th anniversary of D-Day and the other crucial battles of World War II. I want to take a moment here briefly to thank the Department of Defense and the World War II Commemorative Committee for all their hard work in organizing these observances. In Europe we will be remembering the sacrifices of the generation that fought that great war. They have given us 50 years of freedom and strong nationhood. They have nurtured generations of young Americans and given us a chance to work with the rest of the world to bring the cold war to an end and to build toward the 21st century.

Before we leave to honor those who fought and died in the Second World War, I think we should also say a word here on American soil about those who were here at home during that war and who, themselves, were also heroes. They made a contribution, whether they were women who built aircraft or rolled bandages, farmers who grew food for troops, men who in my State and many others worked as much as 16 hours in coal mines breathing coal dust and wrecking their bodies to keep our engine of production going, or children who collected scrap metal and rubber for our production. Worried about loved ones overseas, the homefront army of democracy kept the faith to build the wartime output that made D-Day and victory possible.

With the strong leadership of President Roosevelt, they awakened the slumbering genius and giant of American industry. In 1940, our Navy had no landing craft. By 1944 there were over 25,000. In 1940, the United States produced fewer than 500 airplanes a month. In 1941, F.D.R. called for 4,000 a month and everyone thought he was a little crazy. But by D-Day, Rosie the Riveter and her coworkers were rolling out planes at twice the pace Roosevelt asked for.

After the war that same generation turned their energies to building a new prosperity. They built schools and highways and a sense of common purpose that put the country back on track, through the GI bill and housing initiatives and other things that built the strongest middle class in all of human history.

On D-Day Americans gathered around the radio to join President Roosevelt in prayer. "Success," he said, "may not come with rushing speed. But we shall return again and again. And we know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause our sons will triumph."

Today we face new challenges at home and abroad. We know, too, as then, our successes will not come with rushing speed. But we must see our battles through to the end. As it was on D-Day, America will be at work next Monday, June 6th. For one moment on that Monday you might pause and reflect, 50 years ago on this day, at this hour, the men and women of

America saved democracy in Europe and changed the course of history for the world.

Wherever you are then, I hope you will have some time to look at the ceremonies. I hope you will think about how we can honor their legacy by carrying it on. That is the greatest honor of all.

One of the greatest privileges I have as President is to represent all of our country in honoring those who won World War II. This week let us all, from the President to every other citizen, do our best to say a simple thank you. Thank you for what you did. Thank you for the years you have given us. Thank you for the example you have set through sacrifice and courage and determination.

It is fitting that we should begin here, in the shadow of this great monument to the 1st Army Division. Let us all, all of us Americans, spend this next week in gratitude, in reflection, and with resolve.

God bless you all, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:22 a.m. at the 1st Division Monument. In his remarks, he referred to Col. Walter F. Nechey, USA (Ret.), 1st Infantry Division D-Day veteran; Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, USA, Chief of Staff, Army; Lt. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, USA (Ret.), president, Society of the 1st Infantry Division; and Robert Stanton, regional director, National Park Service.

Remarks to American Seminarians in Vatican City

June 2, 1994

Thank you very much, Cardinal, Mr. Ambassador. After that political comment he made he has another good reason to go to confession now. [*Laughter*] Cardinal Baum, Cardinal Szoka, to all of you here, and especially to the American seminarians who are here, let me say it is a profound honor for me and for Hillary and for our entire American party to be here in the Vatican today and for me to have had the meeting that I just had with His Holiness.

We had a wonderful discussion about a large number of things. I'm always amazed to find him so vigorously involved in the affairs of the world. We talked about the difficulties in Bosnia, as you might imagine. We talked a lot about Poland and Eastern Europe. We talked at some length about Russia and our emerging relationships there.

We talked for quite a long while about Asia, about the need to protect religious freedoms in Asian countries and to promote that. And I pledged to the Pope my best efforts to work with other nations, especially nations in Asia, in the cause of religious freedom. We talked about the challenges presented at the moment by the dispute we're having with North Korea.

We talked at great length about the role of the Islamic states in the future of the world, not only in the Middle East but elsewhere. We talked a lot about the Middle East, and I thanked His Holiness for the recognition that the Holy See has given to Israel and the support to the peace process.

We talked about the upcoming conference in Cairo on world population problems, about where we agreed and where we didn't and how we could come together on a policy that would promote responsible growth of the world's population and still reaffirm our common commitment for the central role of the family in every society.

It was for me, as it was last year in Denver, an awe-inspiring experience. But I hope it was also an important experience for the people whom we represent and the progress we are trying to make.

For those of you who are American seminarians here, I would like to say a special word of appreciation for the role of the Catholic Church in our country. There are 20,000 parishes, 9,000 Catholic elementary and high schools, over 200 Catholic colleges and universities, one of which gave me a degree a long time ago. The thing I have always revered about the Catholic Church was the sense of constancy and commitment of the Church in our national life, the sense of putting one's life, one's money, one's time where one's stated ideas are. The Catholic Church has brought together faith and action, word and deed, bringing together people

across the lines of rich and poor, of racial lines and other lines perhaps better than any other institution in our society. And I am convinced that it's been able to do that because people like you, those of you who are here as seminarians, have been willing to make the ultimate commitment of your entire lives in the service of that in which you believe.

In all secular societies, it is recognized that very few people have the capacity to make a commitment of that depth and constancy. And yet all of us know that, ultimately, the meaning of our lives depends upon the constant effort to achieve a level of integrity between what we feel and what we think and what we do. And I stand here today to tell you that as an American President I am immensely proud of the commitment you have made.

Hillary and I have a friend whom we treasure greatly, who is a Jesuit priest whom I met over 30 years ago, who went to law school with us later and who continues to labor to fulfill his vows. And one of my most treasured possessions that I ever received from a personal friend was a letter that he wrote to us after he had been a priest for 20 years, explaining without being at all self-righteous what it had meant to him to have kept his vows for two decades and why he thought in a way he had lived a selfish life because he had achieved a measure of peace and comfort and energy that he could have found in no other way.

It is that feeling that I think ultimately we want for all the people of our Nation and all the people of the world. And for your example in taking us in that direction, I thank you very much.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 1:05 p.m. in the Sala Clementina at the Vatican. In his remarks, he referred to Raymond L. Flynn, U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See; William Cardinal Baum, major penitentiary, Apostolic Penitentiary; and Edmund Cardinal Szoka, president, Prefecture for the Economic Affairs of the Holy See.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy in Rome

June 2, 1994

Q. Mr. President, North Korea's being very threatening—making more statements about—the talks that you've undertaken—talks of tough sanctions. What do you say to that?

The President. We're going to have a question period, I think, afterward. The Prime Minister and I will make statements and then answer questions. I'd rather answer questions then.

Q. Any general impressions so far—just about how things are going?

The President. It's been a very good trip so far. I've been very impressed, pleased with the reception, pleased with the support for the United States.

NOTE: The exchange began at 3:34 p.m. in Room 123, Piano Primo at the Palazzo Chigi. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy in Rome

June 2, 1994

Prime Minister Berlusconi. I wish to begin by first and foremost thanking the American President for having chosen to begin his stay in Europe or his tour of Europe with our country, to commemorate the liberation that the Al-

lies brought to us, the liberation from Nazi totalitarianism and fascism.

We had a very interesting meeting during which I was able to explain directly to the President the current scenario in Italy, the reason having determined the change in government, as of the majority voting law or electoral law, to the political situation that had come into being and the program of the new government and the willingness on behalf of the government to continue the alliance policy, following a tradition that Italy has always wanted to pursue in a climate of good neighborhood relations vis-a-vis international organizations and especially the United States of America.

After that point, we went on to analyze international policy issues. We would be very honored to have President Clinton as our guest in Naples for the G–7 summit coming up. The main issues during that time that are going to be debated in that forum are going to be of an economic nature, especially the employment issue. It's a very difficult problem I think to be conjugated with economic development, and it's a problem that's afflicting our Western countries, I should say.

We then went on to discuss the international scenario and the need for international organizations to intervene more promptly and more effectively to manage the various regional crises that bring about so much suffering and pain to civil populations. On our behalf, we also confirmed to President Clinton and to his staff our gratitude for what the United States of America, together with the Allies, did 50 years back, 50 years which to us have meant freedom. And I don't think that—I did underscore this explicitly—we wouldn't have had this Italy that President Clinton has met with today. This free Italy wouldn't have been here without the help of the Allies. The reconstructed Italy wouldn't have existed without the sacrifice of many young lives in America.

This is something that we always remember, we bear it in mind, and it has been this spirit of friendship and gratitude that we welcome President Clinton and his staff.

Please, Bill.

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister.

Ladies and gentlemen, I was delighted with the meeting that I had with the Prime Minister and other high officials of his government. I welcome this opportunity to get to know him better and to make the ties between our two nations even stronger.

I also think I should say, since this is my first public opportunity to do so, I was pleased to have the opportunity to meet with His Holiness Pope John Paul II earlier today and to see him looking so well and being so vigorous. We had a very, very fine conversation, and I was able to give him the best wishes of all the American people for a full recovery.

I am here overwhelmingly for the purpose of commemorating the 50th anniversary of the restoration of freedom to Western Europe. We will do that here in Italy and then in France and in England.

Italy has been a staunch ally of the United States throughout the cold war and throughout, now, this post-cold-war era. I was able to tell the Prime Minister personally how much I appreciated the support that Italy has given for NATO's efforts to resolve the conflict in Bosnia and for the support Italy has given particularly to the United States Armed Forces in all the efforts we undertake in this part of the world.

We discussed a lot of our common economic and social challenges. We talked about the G–7 meeting coming up, and I think we have laid the foundation of a very, very good and strong relationship. I was deeply impressed by the strong commitment that the Prime Minister made to the democratic process which produced his election and to the progress, that he believes that he will make and that I was very impressed by his commitment to make, on the whole range of domestic issues as well as our international partnership.

Thank you very much.

Italy

Q. What is, Mr. President, your assessment of this new era in Italy after meeting with our Prime Minister—we have a new Prime Minister—and will you bet on Italy's future, sir?

The President. Would I bet on it? Is that what you said? Well, the answer to the second question is, yes, I would bet on it. I'm not much of a betting man, but I would bet on that.

I told the Prime Minister that this whole election process has been very interesting for the American people. Because Italian-Americans are so important to the fabric of life in our country and because Italy has been such a good ally of ours and because in our relatively stable sys-

tem, we have marveled at the continued economic progress and strength of Italy throughout a series of, I think, some 53 governments since the end of the Second World War. So this whole process of political reform and elections has been very interesting to me personally and, I think, to all the American people.

I think I understand the question you asked me, and I would make only two points. First of all, the first thing the Prime Minister said to me was his government from top to bottom is unequivocally committed to democracy. Secondly, in the world in which we live, not just in Italy but in Poland, in Argentina, in any number of other countries, there are many political parties which have their roots in a less democratic past. And I have found it not only useful, but the only reasonable approach, to judge all people in governments today by what they do—what do they say and what do they do when they are in power.

In that regard, I think the United States would support the judgment of the people of Italy and their democratic elections and looks forward to a very good relationship with this Prime Minister.

Q. My question to the Prime Minister is: Why is it then, with what you have told the President, that so many people think your government is trending toward fascism? Also, in your statement you said there should be greater intervention in world crises. Would you send troops into Bosnia to fight?

Prime Minister Berlusconi. What I can tell you is what the actual situation of Italy is. I can tell you how my government stands, truly. In Italy there is no such thing as nostalgia for a period that we consider to be completely buried in the past and having been condemned by history.

All surveys, all investigations that have been carried out to assist this have led to the recognition that less than one percent of all Italians—the latest survey actually gives us the result of 0.4 percent of all Italians—feel some sentiment or have a memory, a nostalgic memory—might I define it as such, which is a rather excessive way of putting it—for fascism. So you see, this is a fake problem. It is completely far removed from all reality.

I'd like to add the fact that in the government that I preside right now, with the ministers that I've chosen for the Cabinet, there is not and there could never be any minister or any official that were not democratic in nature, that truly and deeply believed in freedom and democracy, and that believed completely that totalitarianism needs to be fought always and at all costs.

As regards to the second part of your question, we discussed about the possibility that international organizations might undertake more effective initiatives in the future. As far as certain crises in the world are concerned—the former Yugoslavia is one, but we also have the situation in Rwanda and other crises having broken out in Africa, take Somalia as an example—much has been done. But in looking at many scenes of suffering and pain on television, all of our people are starting to wonder whether or not sufficient amount of things have been done, whether everything that could be done has been done.

Now, I know right away that it's not so easy to find a solution. And I don't think that one could think that simply by sending troops in it might be possible to solve certain situations. Nonetheless, I do believe that international organizations have to be very attentive to what's going on throughout the world in order to be able to prevent, with very specific diplomatic action, the possible crises that might break out and lead to disaster and much suffering and pain throughout the world. And especially, I believe that everything has been done in order to avoid that a wound may become an ulcer, a permanent and incurable ulcer, which could be the constant source of pain and suffering.

U.N. Security Council

Q. To President Clinton: Do you support Italy as permanent member in the United Nations Security Council?

The President. As you know, the United States has previously stated that we would support membership for Japan and for Germany on the Security Council. We have not foreclosed further expansion of the Security Council. That is a matter, I think, that the Security Council itself and that the United Nations would have to discuss. But I would not foreclose that possibility, and the suggestion that I made was not with a view toward having another frozen membership for another 45 years.

Meeting With Pope John Paul II

Q. [*Inaudible*]—spoke with the Pope on the population control conference and specifically on the question of abortion?

The President. Yes. First of all, let me try to reiterate here what I said when I was at the Vatican meeting with the American seminarians, and some of you covered that. His Holiness raised a number of questions that we discussed at great length, including a long discussion of his concern about what is happening in the Islamic states and how we can work with them in a more cooperative way, and then a long discussion about what is going on in Asia, China, Japan, and North Korea. I would say those two subjects probably took up more time than any other part of our discussion.

We talked about Bosnia. We talked about Eastern Europe. We talked about Russia. We talked about Haiti a bit, and he expressed general support for what we are trying to achieve in Haiti, for which I was quite grateful.

His Holiness mentioned with regard to the Cairo conference his concern that the world community in general, and the United States in particular, not be insensitive to the value of life or appear to be advocating policies that would undermine the strength of the family.

What I said about that was pretty straightforward, but let me try to recapture it here if I might. First, I said it seemed to me that there were two issues here, one of which I thought we could resolve in ways that would bring us closer together. The first issue is that there are some genuine disagreements between us on the question of the role of contraception and population policy and in attempting to slow the rate of population growth in the developing world.

But secondly, there is no disagreement, in my judgment, on the larger issue, which is that we agree with the Vatican that the essential thing is to have a policy of sustainable development, which normally leads to improved roles for women and stabilization of population, if properly done; and that we should recognize at Cairo and everywhere else that the central role of the family as the basic institution of every society should not be undermined; and finally, that the United States does not and will not support abortion as a means of birth control or population control; that we do support active and aggressive family planning efforts, we do have differences over contraception, and we did move away from the Mexico City policy to a more neutral one in terms of the policies other countries have with regard to population planning, to contraception, and to abortion; but that I thought we had a great deal in common in terms of our overall objectives, and that we should focus on those things.

Neofascism

Q. Mr. President Clinton, you said that you will judge the Italian Government by its record. I would like to know which criteria you will use, only economical? And secondly, do you think neofascism in Europe is a danger or is over, like Mr. Berlusconi said?

The President. First of all, the answer to your question is we would evaluate people not by wholly economical criteria but by whether they were faithful to democracy and human rights, the recognition of the rights of others to speak their piece, and the respect for the democratic process of elections and public judgment.

Secondly, you have asked a different question in terms of what the role of neofascism will be. I think that depends upon, again, what happens not simply in Italy but in other countries as well. You see all across the world—and no country, I mean no country, is immune to people who run making extremist statements trying to divide people, trying to, in effect, play on both the economic frustration and the social and moral frustration that people feel in all countries where there is both economic stagnation and social disintegration.

People everywhere yearn for a certain sense of order and discipline and hopefulness about the daily conditions of life. And when those things are under stress, every political system will be vulnerable to people who try to play on fears and to divide people, and neofascism is but one label. You see that in the politics of elections in Islamic countries; you can see it in our country; you can see it in many other countries. And it is almost a constant in electoral life that then rises and falls depending on the objective conditions of any nation and the mood of the people.

I would say the thing that would be most likely to defang or diminish the influence of destructive neofascism or other extremist views is a successful government here, a government that (a) is successful economically, (b) is successful in uniting the people, and (c) is successful in making people have a higher level of confidence that government can actually function in a limited but appropriate way. And if you ask me this question in the United States, I would give you the same answer.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, North Korea has now threatened to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. What is your response to that? Secondly, do you feel now that the United States can only move toward incremental sanctions because China has expressed its opposition to a broader U.N. embargo? And now that you've mentioned it, could you share with us what the Pope, what His Holiness said to you about the Korea issue?

The President. Let me see if I can remember all of that. First of all, North Korea has said many things—that sanctions would be viewed as an act of aggression, that something bad might happen, that maybe they'll withdraw from the NPT—in an attempt somehow to shift the focus from their actions to the rest of the world. This is not about the rest of the world; this is about North Korea.

North Korea is a mature country governed by mature people who freely undertook the obligations of participation in the NPT. They did that. No one made them do it. They did it. Now they cannot have it both ways. They can't say, "Well, we'll stay in the NPT but only if we're not required to assume the obligations of membership and only if we can violate the obligations we freely undertook without anybody reacting to it."

Well, we're not, any of us, permitted to conduct ourselves that way. So this is about North Korea's conduct, not about the United States or Britain or France or Russia or China. It is about their conduct.

The second question is, I think that if the IAEA certifies that it is no longer possible to determine whether any of the fuel from the defueling in 1989 was diverted, and that in their judgment that means they cannot in good conscience go forward with just looking prospectively at what might happen, what that would say is that—the United States and the world community has worked with North Korea on this issue for 5 years now—and I believe, therefore, the question of sanctions has to be at least taken up in the United Nations Security Council and discussed.

And I must say, I was quite encouraged by what President Yeltsin said today with President Kim in Moscow. That is, he says he thinks we ought to—as you know, he's been calling for some time for a meeting, which also should be discussed in the context of the U.N. But he said—this is the first time I believe Russia has said publicly—that if negotiations are clearly going to be unsuccessful, that Russia would support sanctions. The Chinese have continued to say, as the closest ally of North Korea, that they are trying to get North Korea to comply, that North Korea ought to comply, but that they hope there will be a diplomatic solution.

They have not yet said that they would veto a sanctions resolution. So what I think the United States should be doing—and I believe Britain and France agree with this, although I will have a chance to discuss this with them in the next few days—I think we should just—if the IAEA certifies that the chain of proof is broken, that they cannot establish what has happened, then the question of sanctions will have to be moved to the U.N. Security Council, and we will have to discuss all these issues.

But this is because of North Korea's conduct, not because of Mr. Blix and the IAEA, not because of the U.S. or Russia or China or Britain or France. This is about North Korea's conduct. And I think we have to go forward. They have triggered these events, not the United States or anyone else. We have to go forward.

Q. What about His Holiness? Does he share the view——

The President. Oh, His Holiness basically was more concerned about—he wanted to know what I thought about them. And he was concerned about the whole issue of religious freedom throughout Asia, in North Korea. He said, you know, North Korea's clearly the most closed society. But he was interested in religious freedom in China, in Vietnam and all other parts of Asia, and in whether Europe and the United States would be able to have the kind of partnerships in Asia, specifically with Japan and with China, that would enable us to go into the 21st century continuing to support the move of democracy there. That was his general concern. And he asked me what I thought was going to happen to the Asian economies—of whether they would continue their explosive growth for the next three decades. That's basically what he asked.

Italy

Q. I'd like to ask Mr. Berlusconi, considering the fact that judgment on government has to be based on concrete facts, we'd like to know what are the first provisions and most urgent

to be presented to Parliament, to be submitted to Parliament? And how do you intend to act within the Senate, in which the majority has a very narrow margin? Plus, a question to President Clinton: What is your opinion about the participation of Italian troops in the U.N. mission in former Yugoslavia? Do you agree with that, or not?

Prime Minister Berlusconi. Fine. I don't think that we have to bore our guests in discussing topics that are strictly pertinent to domestic issues and domestic policy. And I do think that they've been illustrated repeatedly in presenting the government program within the Senate and even the Chamber of Deputies. We're all quite aware of the fact that what lies ahead of us is a revamping of the economy and, hopefully, new momentum which will be given to the economy and the solution of an important problem, which is a generation of new jobs, new employment possibilities. And we're going to proceed just in that direction.

And please let me underscore that as far as this problem is concerned I have a very clear recollection of what President Clinton said in Detroit a few months ago when he stated that it was not state intervention that we could base our hopes on in order to solve the employment problem, but rather the state or government should urge private entrepreneurs to undertake a business, because that's the real engine that's capable of creating new employment, new jobs.

And in those circumstances, he also made reference to the therapies, if you will, that he deemed to be most appropriate, in other words, a different relationship between individuals and their job, to be open in a different way to one's job in order to provide greater flexibility on the job market, and a great commitment on behalf of everybody in order to provide better vocational training.

I think that we're exactly pursuing this avenue. We very much share this attitude. And we're already reaping the fruit of all this because here in Palazzo Chigi we have this new government. And that justifies, I think, or bears witness to this.

We've been able to provide new elan to the economic situation and the various entrepreneurs and businesses, that I feel that they trust the government more. They would have lost all hope had there been a different government, I think. But now we've promised an intervention, we've promised especially to lower taxes, and we've promised especially to change the attitude of redtape here, vis-a-vis those who decide to undertake new job opportunities and new business opportunities. And so they're more optimistic, and they're looking with better eyes to the future of their businesses and enterprises. I think this is what we need to be concerned with; this is what we have to do; we're already doing it.

Now, about the second part of your question. Frankly, I am not concerned or worried about the fact that in certain commissions there are chairmen that have been appointed that don't belong to the majority. I think that we have a long path lying ahead of us, and I continue to be optimistic, because I always—and I continue to think that the minority will simply take stock of what's been going on, and they will realize that Italians want to be governed. They demand that there be some type of government so the minority will not, I think, want to be destructive. They will not want to make it impossible for the government to govern; rather, I think that they're going to be ready to look at the various provisions for the welfare of this country.

I think the minority is going to want to be more dialectically oriented and will decide to work not against but for our country in a constructive light.

Press Secretary Myers. This will have to be the last question.

Bosnia

The President. You asked a question. I'd like to dodge the question, but he asked it, so I should—you ask about Italian troops in Bosnia.

Let me say, first of all, the objectives of the European Community, the United Nations, NATO, the United States in Bosnia include not only doing whatever we can to bring the slaughter of innocent people to an end and to restoring some harmony to life there under conditions that everyone can live with but also limiting the conflict and not permitting it to spread.

With that in mind, there was a general consensus that in this period of the U.N. presence, that the countries which actually border the former Yugoslavia would not be asked to provide troops but instead to provide other kinds of support, just as the United States has also provided other kinds of support, air power to enforce the various NATO requirements and to supply the longest airlift in history now.

If there is a settlement which then requires a multinational force under the authority of NATO, for example, to support, that would be a different question altogether, a question that your government would have to revisit, a question we all would.

But I think in fairness, the Italian Government has been very forceful in supporting the NATO mission in Bosnia and trying to do whatever could be done to bring the conflict to an end. And I think the decision to not ask any of the countries bordering the former Yugoslavia to provide troops as a way of limiting the conflict and reinforcing the objective of limiting the conflict was a good decision.

North Korea

Q. A followup on Korea. Do you really believe that there is worldwide resolve to say to the North Koreans, you cannot go forward with this? And also, do you feel that your own leadership skills are on the line here in dealing with this crisis with North Korea?

The President. Well, on the second question, I think they're on the line every day, and they're always under challenge. This is a difficult time.

Let me say a little something about the first question. There are two issues here. One is that a Communist country and an isolated one freely undertook to join the NPT in what I believe at the time was a decision they had made to move toward integrating themselves more closely with the world community and trying to reconcile their historic differences with South Korea.

That is the direction that, frankly, has been very welcome, not just by me personally but by my predecessors and by the United States generally. And we have made it very clear that there is a future of genuine partnership with North Korea not simply with South Korea but with the United States and with the rest of the world in the context of a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. That was the path. But when that path was taken, there were certain obligations assumed. And it seems to me that the world community cannot just simply look away from those obligations.

The second issue is, what are the consequences of the North Korea policy, because they will say, "Well, what about India? What about Pakistan? What about other nonmembers of the NPT?" The difference is, of course, if this country is changing path and going back to an isolationist and to a hostile path, what could they do, maybe not today or tomorrow but a few years from now with the material that they might produce along with their well-known capacity to produce missiles? Who else might wind up with it? So it's a very serious question.

And all I can tell you is that I have been impressed by the gravity with which the other members of the United Nations Security Council, including Russia and China, have approached it. I recognize it is a more difficult question for China and for Russia than for the United States and for Britain and for France. It also matters a lot to Japan and to South Korea. I think we all have a common desire to see North Korea return to the former path. And I believe that in the end when we move to the Security Council discussions, we will come out with a policy that will show resolve and that will do that. I just don't think we can walk away from this. And so, I am hopeful, but I realize it is a difficult and a challenging issue.

Prime Minister Berlusconi. We apologize, but time is running out, and we have a certain schedule we have to go by. And so, all we can do is thank you and say good-bye.

The only think I do wish to add on my personal behalf is that in looking to the international scenario, I am very glad to be able to say that the opinion of our government is that we feel very close to the positions expressed by the United States of America.

We spoke about Partnership For Peace. We spoke about the need to open the European Union to other countries of Central and Eastern Europe. And we have also wished for participation of Russia within the Partnership For Peace agreement. And we look to this country and its development with great interest, in full awareness of the important role that Russia will play in the future, for the maintenance of international relations. Of course, both of our countries are determined, insofar as possible, to provide support and help to undertake the economic and political reform of this great state and country.

I think in that in this forum I can confirm to President Clinton and the rest of his staff the feeling that we are very close, we appreciate you, and we very deeply thank you for being here with us.

The best of luck to you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 59th news conference began at 4:46 p.m. at the Palazzo Chigi. In his remarks, the President referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea; and Hans Blix, Director-General, International Atomic Energy Agency. Prime Minister Berlusconi spoke in Italian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to Italian Citizens in Rome
June 2, 1994

Mayor Rutelli, Mrs. Rutelli, Prime Minister Berlusconi and Mrs. Berlusconi, to the citizens of Rome, for Hillary and for me, this is an historic moment. At this site of ancient glory, we say to you on behalf of all of the people of the United States, greetings.

It is humbling to stand here. Romulus walked on this ground. Michelangelo designed this magnificent place. Today we celebrate something worthy of their greatness, the towering friendship between the United States and Italy.

Among the Americans I brought here with me today is a distinguished member of my Cabinet, the watchful guardian of our Government's budget, and one of America's greatest sons of Italy, my friend, Leon Panetta. Well, I know that Washington is not Rome, that dollars are not lire. But when the budget is made, taxpayers everywhere need someone in the Government like Leon Panetta who is paid to say *basta*, enough. [*Laughter*]

Because Leon Panetta represents the best of the Italian-American partnership, and because he has such a good sense of humor, and because I am deeply in his debt as an American citizen, I have invited him to translate a part of my remarks here today. And when he is through, I want the citizens of Rome to give him a grade on how well he did. [*Laughter*] Mr. Panetta.

I am delighted to be in Rome, and I look forward to returning to Italy to visit Naples next month. There is so much of Italy in America—art, music, philosophy, and most important, the strength and wisdom of so many of your sons and daughters.

That bond of blood and spirit between our people is the heart and soul of our special relationship. America and Italy are more than mere partners. We are now and forever will be *alleati, amici, una famiglia*.

So, Leon, *grazie*. Thank you for your friendship and for teaching me a few words of Italian. [*Laughter*] Now, all of his ancestors will rest in peace forever. All of his ancestors will rest in peace.

I have come to Europe to recall its cruelest war and to help secure its lasting peace. I am honored to begin travels here in the Eternal City on the anniversary of your republic. A half-century ago, my Nation joined a great crusade to restore liberty on this continent. But no moment was prouder than 50 years ago this week when we joined with you and others to return Rome to its people, and its people to freedom.

We are still told stories about that great day, church bells ringing out a song of celebration, children climbing onto the tanks of the liberators. One brave member of the Italian Resistance said, "We cried with happiness, letting ourselves realize for the first time how scared we had been."

To honor, we must remember. Therefore, this week, as the sons and daughters of democracy, we must resolve never to forget such hallowed words as Anzio, Nettuno, Salerno, Normandy. These names speak of the sacrifices of our parents and the freedom of their children and grandchildren.

Now, for 50 years our people have stood together as Italy has worked a modern miracle. You have transformed Italy into one of the world's great economies. You have helped to build NATO, history's greatest military alliance. And you have stood firm against Soviet expansion.

America is grateful for Italy's vital role in our partnership, in your hosting NATO air operations at Aviano and in the Adriatic, in your working to build the European Union, in your investment in the continent's new democracies.

The end of the cold war is permitting all of us to do the work of renewal within our nations, to rebuild our economies, to rebuild our sense of community and common purpose, to reform our politics. We must do this. Cicero said, "Merely to possess virtue as you would art is not enough unless you apply it." I believe Italy will pursue its democratic destiny with virtue and grace, and as you pursue that destiny, America will stand with you and with Europe.

For 50 years we have stood together to help build peace and prosperity in Western Europe. Now let us expand those blessings across a broader Europe. So, to all the Italians here present, and to my fellow Americans here present, to all the citizens of other nations in this hallowed place, let us hope that, 50 years from now, the world will say of us, the children of freedom and democracy were the builders of lasting peace.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:18 p.m. in the Piazza del Campidoglio. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Francesco Rutelli of Rome and his wife, Barbara Palombelli; and Veronica Lario, wife of Prime Minister Berlusconi. A portion of the President's remarks was translated into Italian by Leon Panetta.

Text of Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi of Italy in Rome

June 2, 1994

Mr. Prime Minister, Camilo Cavour, the first Prime Minister of a unified Italy, once claimed to have discovered "the art of fooling diplomats." He said, "I speak the truth, and they never believe me." Mr. Prime Minister, I hope you will believe me when I tell you it is a joy for us to begin our commemorative journey among the wonderful people of your country.

This week we honor all those who reclaimed Europe's freedom half a century ago. In the time since, Italy has reclaimed her proud democratic heritage and become one of the world's most economically advanced nations.

Now, as winds of change blow across our world, the people of Italy, like those of America, are laboring in the vineyards of democratic reform and economic renewal. As our people have been joined by kinship and fellowship in the past, so they will be joined in the work ahead.

Robert Browning best captured what every traveler to this breathtaking land must feel, when he wrote, "Open my heart and you will see/Graved inside of it, 'Italy.'"

Tonight I open my heart and offer a toast to the Italian people, to their new Prime Minister, and to the lasting friendship between our two great nations.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for China

June 2, 1994

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

Pursuant to subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1) ("the Act"), I hereby submit the attached report concerning the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to the People's Republic of China. The report explains my reasons for having determined that continuation of the waiver currently in affect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The related memorandum is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Former Eastern Bloc States

June 2, 1994

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

Pursuant to subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1) ("the Act"), I hereby submit the attached report concerning the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period, and includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver authority and waivers currently in effect for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The related memorandum is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Ceremony Commemorating the Liberation of Italy in Nettuno

June 3, 1994

Thank you, President Scalfaro, Prime Minister Berlusconi, Secretary Brown, Chaplain Kendall; Mr. Shirley, thank you for that kind introduction and for your moving rendering of the history; to the citizens of Italy who are here, and especially those of Nettuno who have helped to make this day possible and every day special at this remarkable place; to the leaders of our Congress, our administration, my fellow Americans, and especially to the veterans and to the active military personnel who have worked so hard to make this day a success.

We stand today in fields forever scarred by sacrifice. Today it is hard to imagine that this is now a place of peace. It is lush with the pines and the cypresses. But 50 years ago when freedom was in peril, this field ran with the blood of those who fought to save the world.

Row upon row of white marble stretches now before us, 7,862 markers in all. The names of over 3,000 other Americans still missing are inscribed in the chapel here. All of them died young. But half a century later their legacy still lives. They fought as liberators in Sicily and Salerno, along the Gustav line and here at Anzio, Nettuno.

One Italian, moved forever by Salerno, said, "We were tired, hungry, and terrified. Then overnight, coming out of the mist as in a dream, the Americans arrived, bringing us hope and strength. The price was enormous. At Anzio, Nettuno, no one and no place was safe. German guns and air power made every last person here a combatant, every cook and baker, every driver and mechanic, every doctor, nurse, and chaplain. But amid the horror of the guns something rare was born, a driving spirit of common cause."

The late General Ernest Harmon, Commander of the 1st Armored Division, put it well when he said, "All of us were in the same boat. We were there to stay or die. I have never seen anything like it in the two world wars of

my experience, a confidence in unity, an unselfish willingness to help one another." That spirit is known as brotherhood, and that is why the statue behind us is called "Brothers in Arms."

Our duty is to preserve the memory of that spirit, memories like that of Private Robert Mulreany. On February 7, 1944, his brother, Private Eugene Mulreany, lay wounded in the field hospital. Robert was visiting when they heard the sound of planes overhead. As the bombs fell, Robert threw his body on top of his wounded brother. He saved his brother's life, even as he gave his own.

Italy's devastation then seemed total. I have been told a story by my cousin about my own father, who served here in Italy. Back home, his niece had heard about the beautiful Italian countryside and wrote him asking for a single leaf from one of the glorious trees here to take to school. My father had only sad news to send back: There were no leaves; every one had been stripped by the fury of the battle.

The battle for Italy, as Mr. Shirley so eloquently said, hastened Hitler's demise. It cemented the alliance, supported by the British, the French, the Canadians, free Poles, and New Zealanders. The battle here pulled German troops away from other fronts. It yielded vital lessons that helped to win the day at Normandy. It inspired the Italian Resistance, as the President has said. Along the way, the Italians took up their rightful place as loyal allies, and they have remained there ever since, through these 50 years.

The spirit of common cause did not die here. A generation of Americans went back home to carry on their work. There was a platoon leader from Kansas savagely wounded in combat; an anti-aircraft commander from South Carolina who fought in Corsica; a Hawaiian lieutenant who lost his arm while in the war's only American fighting force of Japanese ancestry; a coastguardsman from Rhode Island who served in Sicily. Today we know them as Robert Dole, Ernest Hollings, Daniel Inouye, Claiborne Pell, each a young American who came of age here, each an American patriot who went home to build up our Nation. We honor what they have given to America in the United States Senate as we honor what they did for us here. Thank you, gentlemen.

Fifty years later, we can see the difference their generation has made. America is strong; freedom is on the march. Here in Italy, the glorious trees, like the country, have been restored to life.

Too many Americans do not know what that generation did. Somewhere in America a child rummaging in an attic may find a war medal or a black and white photo of a younger but familiar face in uniform. Yet we cannot leave memory to chance. We must recall Elie Wiesel's commandment to fight forgetfulness. And we must apply it to the valor as much as to the horror, for to honor we must remember.

And then we must go forward, for our job is not only to praise their deeds but to pursue their dreams, not only to recall their sacrifices for freedom but to renew freedom's promise once again. We are the sons and daughters of the world they saved. Now our moment for common cause has come. It is up to us to ensure a world of peace and prosperity for yet another generation.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:48 a.m. in the Sicily-Rome American Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to President Oscar Luigi Scalfaro of Italy; Rev. Marcus Kendall and John Shirley, veterans of the campaign to liberate Italy; and Elie Wiesel, Holocaust survivor and humanitarian. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the American Community at the United States Embassy in Rome, Italy

June 3, 1994

Thank you very much, Ambassador and Mrs. Bartholomew, Ambassador Flynn, Mr. Secretary, Hillary, ladies and gentlemen. We are delighted to be here. I want to join my wife in saying I'm sure that many of you will be elated when we leave tomorrow because we have caused you

so much extra work. But on behalf of all the American people, I want to thank those of you who work at our Embassies in Rome and the Vatican, our mission to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, our consulates, our military personnel here, for all the work you do always, and especially to make this trip a success.

I'll be back in a month for the G–7 meeting in Naples. And the Prime Minister said that they had a little deficit problem here, too, and if I kept coming back, we'd have to start paying taxes and contribute in Italy—[*laughter*]—to the economic recovery here as well.

I do want to tell you that back at home things are turning around. The economy is picking up. Unemployment is down. We have plain evidence that our country is in a process of renewal. We're treating a lot of problems seriously we've ignored for a long time. Whether it's international trade or the education and training of our work force or the most serious approach on crime in a generation, the American people are beginning to come to grips with the challenges before us.

We still have a lot of work to do. We're trying our best. And I believe we're going to be very successful in our attempt to pass a comprehensive health reform bill this year. Our European friends find it difficult to believe that the United States is the only advanced nation in the world that can't find a way to provide health coverage to all of its people. So we're going to do that this year.

And we're going to deal with a lot of our other challenges. There is a sense of possibility of movement, that those of us in public service are part of a partnership to make America what it ought to be as we move into the 21st century. But there is also an awareness at the end of the cold war that we can no longer do what America has so often done in the past, which is to withdraw from the world and to make a clear distinction between our policies abroad and our policies at home. Now we know they are two sides of the same coin, and they must be part and parcel of our commitment to renew our country and to move with confidence and success with our friends and neighbors into the 21st century.

I can say that I have been deeply moved by the reception we've received here in Italy. I agree with what Ambassador Flynn said about my meeting with the Holy Father yesterday. And I must say that all the conversations we've had with the officials of the Italian Government have been very satisfactory from my point of view.

So I think we've got a lot of good things coming up. I look forward to coming back next month. I can't wait to come back, even if I do become a taxpaying, quasi-citizen of Italy. [*Laughter*]

I thank you again for all your enormous effort and work. You have made us very, very proud of the United States by your efforts. Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:58 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Reginald Bartholomew, U.S. Ambassador to Italy, and his wife, Rose-Anne; and Raymond L. Flynn, U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See.

Remarks on the Economy and an Exchange With Reporters in Rome
June 3, 1994

The President. As all of you know, we got some good news from the homefront today. The unemployment rate has dropped almost a half a point to 6 percent. We now know that over 3.3 million new jobs have come into the economy in the last 16 months. The economy is creating jobs at 7 times the rate of the previous 4 years. I think this is most of all a tribute to the American people, but clearly supports the wisdom of the economic strategy we have been following: a determined effort to bring the deficit down, to get investment in education and training and new technologies up, to expand trade.

We have to stay on this course. We have to pass this new budget. We have to keep going. This is the thing which will enable us to do the other kinds of reform and renewals that we need to do in America. I am very, very encouraged.

And again, I want to say how much I appreciate the work that was done by the Congress last year in passing this tough economic program. There is no question that it spurred an enormous percentage of this activity. And I am very pleased by it.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, have you spoken to Boris Yeltsin about the situation in North Korea?

The President. No, I have not talked to President Yeltsin or President Kim, but I will today. And I don't think I should—I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday except to tell you that I will talk to them, and after I do I'll be glad to——

Q. Do you support his proposal for an international conference on the situation?

The President. I don't want to say anything about President Yeltsin or President Kim until I talk to them today. I have to talk——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—say something about the United Nations, whether you think the United Nations is up on this. It has not done a very good job in Bosnia and other parts of the world. Are the allies strong enough to stand up to this regime?

The President. I have nothing to add to what I've already said about it right now.

Thank you.

Nettuno Memorial Ceremony

Q. How do you feel about this morning's ceremonies, Mr. President? Could you chat about that for a moment?

The President. I was very proud. I was very proud, and I was terribly moved by what the veterans and their family members said after the ceremony. There were so many who felt that for the first time in 50 years our country and the world had recognized the importance of the Italian campaign and the massive sacrifices that were made there. It was very moving, and I was very proud.

Q. Did you think about your father, Mr. President? I know you mentioned——

The President. Yes, I did.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. at the U.S. Embassy.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Telephone Conversations With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea

June 3, 1994

President Clinton spoke separately today with President Yeltsin and President Kim Yong-sam of the Republic of Korea, who is currently in Moscow. The topic of both calls was the current situation in North Korea.

President Clinton told President Yeltsin that following the IAEA's report to the United Nations that the continuity of safeguards had been broken, the United States is pursuing the issue of sanctions in the United Nations Security Council. They discussed President Yeltsin's proposal that an international forum on the Korean situation be convened. President Clinton said that such a meeting might be appropriate at some point while underscoring the need first to return the North Korean nuclear issue to the United Nations Security Council. The two agreed to remain in close contact as the issue develops.

In the conversation with President Kim, both Presidents agreed that the next step is to pursue the issue of sanctions in the United Nations Security Council. President Clinton reaffirmed the United States desire for a diplomatic resolution of this issue but emphasized the United States commitment to the security of the Republic of Korea. They, too, agreed to work closely together in addressing the issue.

Text of Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by President Oscar Scalfaro of Italy in Rome

June 3, 1994

Mr. President and distinguished guests, the British historian Trevelyan wrote of General Garibaldi that he would live on as "the incarnate symbol of two passions not likely soon to die out of the world, the love of country and the love of freedom." As we commemorate this 50th anniversary of the events that returned freedom to your great country, I want to praise the work you have done, Mr. President, as also embodying your commitment to the freedom-loving Italian people and the democratic Italian state.

Italy's transformation over the past half century is a modern miracle. From the ruins of World War II, it has become one of the world's great economies, an anchor of transatlantic security, and a sturdy democracy, which, like our own, is renewing its strength by pursuing reforms.

As we gather this week to pay special homage to those whose courage, vision, and sacrifice helped to create and sustain a republican Italy and a Western alliance of democratic nations, the United States salutes you, Mr. President, for your past and present efforts to safeguard Italian democracy. Mr. President, on behalf of the American people, who share so many bonds of kinship and fellowship with the Italian people, I offer a toast to you and to your country: *Viva l'Italia*!

Remarks on Arrival in the United Kingdom

June 4, 1994

Mr. Prime Minister, Hillary and I are delighted to be here. I remember well the first time I arrived in the United Kingdom. I am deeply honored to be here today representing my nation.

Fifty years ago, our two nations joined forces on the beaches of Normandy to turn back the Nazi armies that had overrun Europe. This week I have come across the Atlantic to commemorate D-Day and the many other battles of the Second World War and to honor the sacrifices borne by the war generation in all the nations.

Freedom continues to require our sacrifice and persistence. And I would like to say, on behalf of all the American people, how very sorry we are and how we offer our condolences to the loved ones of those who died in the tragic RAF helicopter accident on Thursday.

Freedom continues to require effort. When he visited the United States after World War II, Winston Churchill spoke of our two nations' role in forging the post-war world. He urged the United States and Britain to walk together in majesty and peace. For he said, "It is in the years of peace that wars are prevented and that those foundations are laid upon which the noble structures of the future can be built."

I look forward to working with the Prime Minister and the British people as we work together to meet those challenges. The Prime Minister has already mentioned the many things that we will be discussing today. I am glad to be back in Great Britain, glad to be honoring the sacrifices and the triumphs of the World War II generation, glad to be about the work of honoring what they have done for us by trying to preserve the peace and the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:48 a.m. at the Royal Air Force station, Mildenhall.

Remarks at the United States Cemetery in Cambridge, United Kingdom

June 4, 1994

Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Major, Mr. Maclean, Chaplain, Secretary Bentsen, thank you for your fine remarks. To our British hosts and to all the distinguished Americans who are also here, Members of the Congress, the administration, the Armed Forces, we have come here today, all of us, on a journey of remembrance. For some, as for Secretary Bentsen, it was a journey to retrace time, to go back 50 summers and more when they took to airfields like these. For others, it is a journey to honor those who fought and those who died for the world in which we came of age.

In this moment, all of us are joined in a sense of pride, in a sense of indebtedness, a sense of wonder, and a sense of determination to carry on that work and never to forget.

On these ancient grounds, 3,812 Americans are buried, airmen, soldiers, and sailors. More than 5,000 others are remembered on the Wall of the Missing. The names of some we honor echo still in our Nation's memory, names like Joseph Kennedy, Jr., the brother of our late President, a young man for whom a distinguished political career was predicted but who gave his life for our country, or Glenn Miller, whose wonderful "Moonlight Serenade" soothed a savage world and still makes us tap our feet. In death, all these people on the Wall and buried behind us were equal. They came from every State in the Union. They were of many races and religions. They had names like Carillo, Kaufman, and Wood. They were, all of them, American. They fought to defeat a great evil which threatened to destroy our very way of life, what Winston Churchill called "the great principles of freedom and the rights of man," which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world.

For long months Britain bravely carried that fight on alone. In the Battle of Britain, night after frightful night, the people of this besieged island withstood the fierce attacks of Nazi bombers. It was their finest hour. Amid the horror the British looked west for help. Then the Yanks came, deepening one of history's profoundest bonds.

Overnight, it seemed, tens of thousands of GI's filled the streets and camps across southern England. All these years later we find the memories of many of them still very vivid: smiling GI's tossing packs of spearmint gum to British schoolboys, new faces and funny accents at the corner pub, Lindy hops in London, kids from Milwaukee invited in for high tea, olive uniforms filling the pews at British churches.

America gave to England an infusion of arms and men and materiel. The British gave our troops the feeling that they were not so far from home after all. The British gave us inspiration; the Americans gave in return, hope.

At every level, Yanks and Brits worked together like family. American intelligence services built on Britain's brilliant successes which were here chronicled in breaking the German code. General Eisenhower chose British marshals to be his deputies. Of course, Montgomery and Ramsay and Tedder, Roosevelt and Churchill, even as they led the assault on tyranny and rallied their own people to support the crusade, encouraged each other with personal notes, all shared a sense of kinship that sustained them through the darkest moments of the war. All shared a faith that our people, nurtured on freedom, would rise to the call of history. Nowhere was our bond more important than in the air war launched from the green fields like this one. The Royal Air Force and the Army Air Corps joined in countless sorties to cripple the Luftwaffe, to decimate the Nazi war machine, to soften the Atlantic Wall. One British citizen remembered, "For a thousand days, the sky was never still."

It was some of the most dangerous work of the war, and the tales of valor still amaze us all: pilots going down with burning flames to give all the rest of the crew just a few more seconds to get out, or the two crew members who shared the only parachute left on board as they jumped together from their burning plane over England. The Marauders, Liberators, Mustangs, and Flying Fortresses, the Halifaxes and Mosquitoes, they were all sturdy. But as one American remembered, "The flak sometimes seemed so thick you could walk on it."

The wild blue yonder above Europe could quickly turn cold and gray and lethal.

In just the 2 months before D-Day, the Allied forces lost over 2,000 planes and over 12,000 men. Because of their sacrifice, by June 6th of 1944, the Allies owned the air. Under the shield of that air supremacy, our ships crossed the Channel, our men crossed the beaches.

A few days after the Normandy landing, General Eisenhower stood on the beaches of France with his young son, John, recently a graduate of West Point, and told him: "If I didn't have the air supremacy, I wouldn't be here." After D-Day, the Air Corps continued to fly toward freedom's horizon, until the entire Continent was reclaimed and a world was set free.

The victory of the generation we honor today came at a high cost. It took many lives and much perseverance. After D-Day, it took freedom another year to reach the Elbe; it took another 44 years to reach Warsaw and Prague and East Berlin. And now it has reached Kiev and Moscow and even beyond. The mission of this time is to secure and expand its reach further.

The airmen who flew these skies had a ritual that Secretary Bentsen mentioned for signaling to their comrades on the ground at the end of a mission. As they were coming in for landing, if they fired off a red flare it meant that there were casualties aboard. And if they fired off a green flare, it meant some lucky pilot had just completed his last mission before shipping out.

Well, the generation that won the Second World War completed their mission, whether they walk among us or lie among us today. And after looking down in sorrow at those who paid the ultimate price, let us lift our eyes to the skies in which they flew, the ones they once commanded. And let us send to them a signal, a signal of our own, a signal that we do remember, that we do honor, and that we shall always carry on the work of these knights borne on wings.

May God bless them and all our people.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Ed Maclean, president, 9th Army Air Force Association, and Lt. Col. Johnny R. Almond, USAF, who gave the invocation.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With Prime Minister John Major in North Aylesbury, United Kingdom

June 4, 1994

Prime Minister Major. Hello. Good afternoon. I suppose I should begin by apologizing to you for the D-Day weather; I'm sorry about that.

Could I also say, at the outset, that the President and I will be able to take a question or two afterwards, but I need to be in Portsmouth very speedily, and I know the President has a live broadcast. So I'm afraid the question time will be limited.

We've had the opportunity, this morning, of discussions for nearly a couple of hours, and we'll take the opportunity over the next 2 days to pursue some other matters as well. We looked at a wide range of issues. We looked forward, firstly, to the Naples Summit. We anticipate the emphasis there will be on employment, following the Detroit Jobs Conference, and we discussed some of the preliminary work that's now in course of preparation for that conference.

We will, of course, at Naples, be welcoming President Yeltsin. We both agree there's a more stable economic and political situation in Russia at present, a better foreign policy partnership than perhaps there has been at any stage in recent years. And we had the opportunity of looking at the responsible handling we've seen thus far by both Russia and Ukraine of the problems that exist in the Crimea.

Self-evidently today, we spent some time discussing our joint interests in Bosnia. We are at the middle, in the midst of crucial negotiations in Geneva. The United Nations continues to seek a cessation of hostilities. At present, as you'll know, the contact group is still meeting, pressing for settlement of territorial questions,

and it's my view, and that of the President as well, that it's vital for all three parties in Bosnia to recognize that continued war will not advance their positions, but would continue to strain international patience.

Saying that, we must recognize what has already been achieved in Bosnia. Many feared the war would spread beyond those borders; it hasn't done so. And I think there's some satisfaction we can draw from the peaceful developments in much of Central Bosnia as well. We have a cease-fire there, in Sarajevo, in Gorazde, and the conflict has been contained. So far, that is good. We hope we can achieve more at the end of the contact group discussions.

The joint initiative the President and I launched in Washington seems to be successful, and the reconstruction of Sarajevo is now in the United Nations hands.

We spent a while on looking at the hideous conflict in Rwanda. From our perspective, we're looking to support with logistics the Secretary General's proposals for an expanded United Nations force and, of course, the preeminent need for humanitarian aid.

We spent some time expressing our joint concern about the nuclear program in North Korea and looking at the scope for effective action by the United Nations.

I took the opportunity of briefing the President on the present state of discussions in Northern Ireland. I also took the opportunity of thanking the President for his welcome decision on renewing MFN status for China. That is, of course, important for Hong Kong. But quite apart from that, I believe it is the best way to pursue a proper dialog with the Chinese over human rights, because it is more important to have a dialog that will achieve results than simply to make gestures that may entrench the problem without satisfactorily advancing it. We have taken much the same view with human rights missions that have gone to China, and I think there is a joint determination to continue the pressure on the Chinese in this respect. Nonetheless, I believe the decision on MFN was entirely right, and I'm extremely pleased that it was made.

I'll invite the President to say a few words, and then we will take whatever questions we have time for.

The President. I'll be very brief so we can take a couple of questions. I would like first to thank the Prime Minister for his hospitality. Even though it's raining a little bit, Chequers is still a magnificent place, a welcome walk through history, and a great opportunity for a good visit.

In addition to the items mentioned by the Prime Minister, I would like to also say how much I appreciate the support the United Kingdom has given, through NATO, to the idea of the Partnership For Peace. We now have 19 nations signed up to be part of our Partnership For Peace with NATO, giving us the prospect of having a Europe that is not divided politically and militarily, perhaps for the first time since nation states dotted the continent. So we are very encouraged by that.

I would like to reaffirm what the Prime Minister said about Bosnia. We are heartened by the fact that the conflict has been limited, by the fact that the Croatians and the Bosnian Government have worked out an accord, but we believe that we need to continue to push for an agreement here. I think it unlikely that either side, anywhere in the near term and with anything like acceptable losses, can look forward to any kind of significant alteration in the parameters of the agreement that they were on the verge of making before the unfortunate incidents in Gorazde. So we are determined to redouble our efforts to try to achieve a settlement in whatever way we can. Having said that, I think since we are going to have to leave in a minute, we should take some questions.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us how seriously, sir, you take the threat from North Korea that they would regard sanctions as an act of war? And would this deter you in any way, or is it even worth risking a war to pursue sanctions in the Security Council?

The President. First of all, North Korea's actions have, in my view, made it virtually imperative that the Security Council consider the question of sanctions. They did that. They freely undertook obligations as a part of the NPT. They repeatedly said that they did not wish to be a nuclear power and that they were committed to a non-nuclear Korean Peninsula.

We have offered any number of inducements or supports to try to achieve that goal, and nothing has been forthcoming. The IAEA inspections were not allowed to proceed. And so I think we have to proceed in the Security Council. There's still time for North Korea to avoid sanc-

tions actually taking effect if we can work out something on the nuclear inspections, but this is in their hands. I think that clearly sanctions are not any sort of act of war and should not be seen as such.

Q. Do you think North Korea is unpredictable and, Mr. President, will you be beefing up American military forces in South Korea to deal with the contingency over there—[*inaudible*]?

The President. Well, as you know, we have taken some steps to support the capacity of our troops to fulfill their mission there already. And I have had continuing talks, as you would expect I would have, with Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili. When we had the commanders in chiefs in recently and General Luck and others talked with me extensively about this, we are—[*inaudible*]—prepared to do our duty.

I do not want a lot of saber rattling over this or war talk. This is a peace talk. This should be about peace. We're trying to enforce the requirements of the NPT to which North Korea voluntarily pledged its allegiance. All we want them to do is keep their word, and we're going to try to give them chances to do it.

President's Visit

Q. What is it like to be back in Britain after all this time?

The President. It's just like old times. I—actually, it's wonderful to be back. I have been back several times since I was a student here. And I have come often, but I never tire of coming. And I always look forward to it. And today, having the opportunity to fly in the helicopter fairly low across the beautiful countryside was a very nostalgic trip for me. I was very grateful to have that chance.

Unemployment

Q. The Prime Minister was talking about employment, about how you have both worked together trying to work on an employment policy, especially with the upcoming summit. I would like to know whether you've got any words of advice for the Prime Minister, considering that your administration is presiding over one of the greatest falls in unemployment that we've seen for a long time.

The President. Well, we had a tough 1980's, and we've changed some policies. We've changed our direction. And we've been bringing down our deficit. We've been increasing investment in areas critical to job growth. We've been trying to work on greater flexibility in our work force. These things are not easy to do.

I will say this: Great Britain is having a quite impressive run of growth. And eventually, the growth rates you've enjoyed in the last few months will bring lower unemployment, there's no question about it. I think the question is, though, that we all have to face is, how low can we get it in a global economy? And then, how can we deal with those people who want to work, but are isolated, either isolated in geographic areas where there has been disinvestment—in the United States that's mostly big inner-city areas and rural areas—and are isolated because they don't have sufficient skills to compete in a global economy in a wealthy country.

Those are the challenges that we have to face, what are our big policies, and how do we target the people that are left out? We have been very fortunate that our policies have paid off handsomely. We've got about 3.3 million new jobs in the last 16 months, but we, too, have a long way to go. And I think we can all learn from each other. But I will say this: If your growth rates continue the way they have been, you will have a drop in unemployment; it's unavoidable. People will—you can't absorb all this growth without hiring more people.

Prime Minister Major. Great. We'll have to stop there. I know he'll be pleased to know our unemployment has been falling for 15 months, and it will go on.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2:30 p.m. at Chequers, the Prime Minister's residence. In his remarks, the President referred to Gen. Gary E. Luck, USA, senior U.S. commander in South Korea.

The President's Radio Address
June 4, 1994

Good morning. Today I am speaking to you from Aylesbury, England, just outside of London. Hillary and I are in the middle of a journey of remembrance and discovery as we honor the sacrifices of the remarkable Americans who helped to liberate Europe in World War II.

The generation of heroes who defeated fascism left a safer world for the generations after them, and we are grateful. Our country led the forces of freedom during the World War, and our economy led the world in the decades that followed.

This morning I want to talk about some very good news that shows how much we can still accomplish together when we as a nation act decisively.

In 1993, I took office determined to renew our economy so that we could pass on prosperity and opportunity to our own children. Remember, our economy had suffered from a decade or more of deficits and drift, slow growth or no growth. Then we made some tough choices, to bring down the deficit, to provide more incentives to invest, and to invest more in the education and training of our people on new technologies, and on helping to convert from a defense to a domestic economy.

Well, now we're beginning to see the results. Our economy is back. It's expanding steadily. Most important, it's creating jobs, millions of good-paying jobs. Yesterday, the Government released new statistics showing the success of our efforts. Since this administration took office in January 1993, the United States has created over 3 million jobs, most of them good-paying jobs, nearly all of them in the private sector. We're creating new private sector jobs at 7 times the rate that occurred during the previous administration. During the 1992 campaign we said we'd create 8 million jobs in 4 years. We're running way ahead of schedule now. America is on the way to creating 2 million more in '94.

But mere statistics tend to be abstract. Everywhere, all around us, we see signs of steady economic renewal. The Big Three in Detroit are back, adding shifts, and once again making the best cars in the world. New businesses are being incorporated at a record pace. Consumer confidence is up. Inflation is in check. Business failures are down. And core economic conditions, to quote the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, are "the best they've been in two decades."

As I meet with our allies and visit historic places in Europe, I'm constantly reminded our economy is now the strongest in the world. Let's remember how this came about. These 3 million new jobs are the product of the ingenuity, the entrepreneurial energy, and the willingness to change of the American people. They are the result of an economic plan that has seen to it that Government has been shrinking in the first quarter of this year, while the private sector grows for the first time in a decade.

We've cut the deficit by $500 billion. By 1995, if we stick to this plan, the deficit will have declined for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was in the White House. In fact, our deficit is now smaller, as a fraction of our national income, than all but one of our major trading partners.

We've made our cuts fairly. We've sought cuts in more than 300 programs in each of the first 2 years of the budget. We've sought to eliminate over a hundred Government programs. Only the wealthiest 1.2 percent of our people were asked to pay higher income taxes. Working families didn't pay a cent more in income taxes because of higher rates. In fact, for every person who had taxes increase, at least 10 working families had their taxes cut. We are protecting the middle class.

Now we have an obligation to keep going to make sure that every citizen benefits from a changing world. Too many Americans haven't yet been touched by the economic renewal. This year we want to build on our success by taking concrete steps to keep the economy growing and to give our people the tools they need to succeed.

A good start is to increase our exports to other countries. Trade means jobs. Thanks to the North American Free Trade Agreement we may soon sell more to Mexico than we do to Japan. This year I'll present to Congress a worldwide trade agreement that will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs and billions of dollars of exports for America. That's good for

America. And that's why Congress must and will ratify the world trade agreement soon.

When we create these good export jobs, we must make sure our people are ready to fill them. These days, what you earn depends on what you learn. Skills and knowledge are the most important asset of all. That's why we're working on a lifetime learning system to train every citizen from the first day of preschool to the last day before retirement.

Now we have to fix our broken unemployment system to replace it with a reemployment system so that when someone loses a job, he or she can find a good new job as quickly as possible. I am fighting for Congress to pass this reemployment act this year, too.

Finally, our deficit will grow and our expansion will sputter if we don't reform our health care system. Health care costs are going up more and more and more than any other part of our budget, not for new health care but to pay more for the same health care. As you know, I am fighting hard to guarantee health care for every American in a way that can never be taken away but that will bring costs in line with inflation.

So there's still a lot more to do. But let's be proud of what Americans have done. America is going back to work. Unemployment is down. Jobs are up. Inflation is down. Growth and new business is up. Our economy is clearly leading the world. We've made this world better by making the tough choices. That's what we've got to keep doing.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:06 p.m. from Hartwell House in Aylesbury, England.

Remarks to the Crew of the U.S.S. *George Washington* in Portsmouth, United Kingdom

June 5, 1994

Thank you very much. And thank you, Captain Sprigg. Thank you, gentlemen, for that welcome. It's nice to be here.

Just a few moments ago, my wife and I were on the royal yacht *Britannia* with the heads of 15 nations around the world. And when we went by the *George Washington*, they were all ecstatic. They asked me questions about this magnificent carrier, and thankfully, I'd done my homework and I could answer them. So you now have 15 more fans around the world, thanks to this wonderful day.

Exactly 50 years ago at this very time, young people just like you were right here in this channel on some 5,000 ships preparing for the most important battle of this century. Imagine how they must have felt, in choppy seas and bad weather. Imagine how they must have looked to the enemy when they came across the horizon. Imagine what the enemy forces would have thought then if they had seen this magnificent ship.

You are beyond question the best trained, the best equipped fighting force the world has ever known. And I want you to know that I am committed unequivocally, absolutely, to ensuring that you continue to have what you need to do your job. You deserve it. Our security demands it.

Let me also say that it has been one of the great honors of my life for me to be able to come here to represent our entire country in commemorating D-Day and the other great battles of World War II. Yesterday, I was near Cambridge, England, at the magnificent cemetery which has over 3,800 Americans buried there who were part of the air war against Germany, and on the wall a list of 5,000 others who never returned. I was with a man from my home State who flew 149 missions in that difficult endeavor.

This has been a very emotional time for Hillary and me. Her father was in the Navy during the Second World War; my father was in the Army in part of the Italian campaign. Yesterday and the day before, when we commemorated the landings at Anzio and Nettuno, were incredible experiences.

Just before I came aboard here I met some other proud veterans of World War II who made the crossing on the U.S.S. *Jeremiah O'Brien*, a World War II Liberty ship. You've

seen it, I'm sure. It's right here near you. It was one of the many ships that were part of the lend-lease program, bringing aid to the British even before the United States formally entered the war.

As I met with them, and now as I look out at all of you and hear your enthusiasm and your strength, I am reminded that for all of our incredible technological advances, the strength of our military is not really in our ships, our tanks, or our aircrafts, it is in you, the dedicated professionalism of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces.

Even though the cold war is over, we are still on the eve of great endeavors, not to turn back armies of oppression which threaten our very existence but to protect our safety and security and to expand the blessings of liberty. This work will not be done in a day or year. It will not be finished during the term of your service. It may not be finished in the life of this great Nation, but it must continue. It will take you all across the globe, from the Adriatic to the Indian Ocean, from the Persian Gulf to the Sea of Japan.

As we honor those who served in World War II, we must also honor those of you who serve now, who are continuing the legacy they left us. For if we learned any lesson from the magnificent, heroic, almost unbelievable endeavor of D-Day, it was that if the allies would stay together and stay strong, we would never need another D-Day. That is what you are guaranteeing, and your country is deeply in your debt.

Let me also say, as I conclude my remarks and congratulate those who are reenlisting, I know this has been a difficult time for many young people who wanted to commit their careers to our Armed Forces because of the downsizing that inevitably came. I want you to know, number one, we're more than halfway through; number two, it will be over in 2 years; number three, there will be more advancements this year than last year, more advancements next year than this year. We still need you. We need your devotion. We need your talent. And the military of the United States is still going to be an important and good place to make a career because it's still defending the security of the greatest nation in the history of the world.

And now I would like to introduce, to continue the reenlistment, the new Chief of Naval Operations, a man who has done a terrific job for our country in dealing with the problems in Bosnia and elsewhere throughout his naval career, a man who has come a long way since he started, Admiral Mike Boorda. Please welcome him.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:01 p.m. aboard the ship. In his remarks, he referred to Capt. Robert Sprigg, USN, captain of the U.S.S. *George Washington*.

Interview With Wolf Blitzer of CNN
June 5, 1994

Foreign Policy

Mr. Blitzer. Mr. President, did you ever think that you'd be going on this 50th anniversary commemoration of D-Day, a past war, and have to focus at the same time on a potential new one?

The President. Well, I never thought I'd be going on the D-Day thing, and it's been a great honor to do it. But even as we honor the past, we know the only way we can ultimately honor the past is to keep faith with it in the present. So I have to continue to deal with the problems that are here.

Mr. Blitzer. Where is the most likely spot in the world today for the next war?

The President. I don't want to say that, because if I do it'll only be interpreted as predicting American involvement. Our interests are at stake obviously in a number of places. I will say this, the possibility of a war that can be damaging to our existence is significantly less now. We concluded this agreement with the Russians and the Ukraines, the Kazakhs and the people from Belarus, so they're moving nuclear weapons out of those other three states into Russia. The Russians and the Americans are no longer pointing their nuclear weapons at each

other. We are working hard at defusing the kinds of problems that could really threaten our existence.

But it's still a very dangerous world. At any given time for the last several years there have been lots of wars, small wars, going on around the world. And there are still a lot of ethnic and racial hatred, still a lot of problems caused by vast numbers of poor people, without any kind of sustainable environment, pouring across national borders that are artificial and fighting with each other. It's a big problem not just in Africa but in other places. And we're going to have a difficult time containing those conflicts and promoting democracy as we move into the 21st century.

But I believe we can do it. And I believe one of the reasons we'll be able to do it is that the vision of the people who won the D-Day battle was that the allies and others of goodwill might work together to contain future conflicts. And that's what we're doing.

North Korea

Mr. Blitzer. How serious is the situation involving North Korea right now?

The President. Well, that's largely up to them. The important thing is that they agreed several years ago to be part of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which means that they agreed to subject themselves to inspections that would enable the rest of the world to determine whether they were diverting nuclear fuel from their reactors that would be used to make nuclear weapons or could be. They have subjected themselves to those inspections now as it relates to anything they could do from now into the future. But they still haven't been willing to subject themselves to appropriate inspections relating to removals they did in 1989.

Is it serious at the moment? Perhaps not. Could it be used to make a bomb and could that bomb be used either against their neighbors in South Korea or maybe be sold to another rogue state? Perhaps so. So we're being very firm. We're moving toward the United Nations Security Council with a sanctions resolution. We're engaging our allies and others in the area that have a real interest in this. I think both China and Japan, as well as Russia and South Korea, clearly do not want North Korea to be a nuclear state. And we're doing the best we can to head it off.

Mr. Blitzer. Is there a diplomatic way out? How are you creating a situation for North Korea to back down with some face-saving opportunity?

The President. Well, we have created many, many such opportunities, and they've rejected them all. After all, we've worked real hard to get these negotiations on track. And the North Koreans did in fact allow the inspections that would enable us to tell today about what they could do tomorrow. It is the past that they don't want to permit us to look into. And they still will have significant numbers of opportunities before they'll be, I think, hurt by the sanctions. But we have to go forward with the sanctions resolution, I think.

Mr. Blitzer. Is there a window, 3 to 4 weeks, 5 weeks, during which period the North Koreans could back down?

The President. Well, there's a window, and the window—of course, there's nothing to stop them from reaching an accommodation from now on into the future. But I think we have to move ahead now.

The incentives are enormous. When North Korea decided to join the nonproliferation group and say we won't make atomic weapons and we want you to inspect, they made a bigger decision. Their decision was, we're going to reach out to the rest of the world, not withdraw from it. They made a decision they would try to work out their problems with South Korea, that they wanted a relationship with the United States and Japan as well as with China and Russia. Now China and Russia have both changed. They've moved closer to our way of thinking, and the North Koreans, for reasons we don't understand, are seeming to move in the other way.

The door is still open for them to become part of the world community, and that's what we want. And I think that's in their national interest. It's good for their people; it's good for their prestige.

Mr. Blitzer. Some have said that there's this cat-and-mouse game—they've come up and gone back down—that they're doing this again, testing you. Are they?

The President. It's hard to know what they're doing. All I know is that our actions all along have been dictated by their actions. That is, we have not sought a confrontation with them. We have been very firm. We have a treaty obligation to South Korea. Our interests are tied

to South Korea's security. And our commitment, our solemn word is tied there.

But more importantly, North Korea promised not to become a nuclear power. They're still isolated. They're still very Communist. They still deal with a lot of rogue states that support terrorism. And so we're just responding to their actions. But the door is always open for them to take a different path, and we hope they will.

President's Cabinet

Mr. Blitzer. On the eve of your departure for this D-Day commemorative event, there were all sorts of stories in Washington—you were thinking of shaking up your national security team, Secretary of State, National Security Adviser. You took the unusual step of calling a reporter from the L.A. Times and trying to deny that. Why?

The President. Well, the reason I called the reporter is that we had been notified that he allegedly had talked to someone fairly high in the administration who said that. And since it wasn't so, I thought I ought to say that.

I didn't think on the eve of this trip, which is so terribly important for our relationships in Europe, not just looking backward but building on this magnificent achievement of D-Day, looking to the post-cold-war era, with all the things that are going on in Korea and elsewhere, that we needed to have another story about personnel. I think that our policies are sound, that we're moving to implement them. I wanted to be free to talk to the British Prime Minister, to the French Prime Minister and President, to the new Prime Minister of Italy about what we're going to do together. And I think I have been free to do that. That's why I did that.

President's Father

Mr. Blitzer. You've spent some time speaking publicly about your father and his role in the war in Italy. How much has that been a part of this whole experience for you—going back and—a father you never knew?

The President. It's been very important for me. When I was a little boy my mother would—told me all she knew and all my father would say about the war. A lot of the veterans didn't want to talk much about it. But she told me he'd worked in maintaining the motorized vehicles and trying to figure out how they were going to get them off of the landing craft and onto the beaches and how they would keep them maintained.

I didn't know much about the Italian campaign until I was older and began to read about it. But coming back here, one of the things I was able to do is read the history of his unit. It's written by the lieutenant who was the designated historian. I read the monthly histories, I guess, for a year and a half during the period he was in Italy. It only mentioned him, I think, once or twice, once when he briefly transferred out to another unit and came back. But it talked about the movies they saw, the fact that Joe Louis came to see them, described what they did. And in some ways, I guess, it was the most graphic account I had of any period in his life. So it meant a lot to me. And I was again very proud that he had participated in this.

Foreign Policy

Mr. Blitzer. Throughout these last several days, as you've reflected on what your predecessors had to do 50 years ago, has it ever entered your mind that you may be in that same situation—or have you been in a similar kind of situation—where you have to make a decision involving the life and death of a lot of young men and women?

The President. Yes, it has entered my mind. And the thing that I am impressed by is that Roosevelt and Churchill when they thought of the United Nations were cold-eyed realists. They never had any idea that there could be some utopian world, a government, you know, where all problems would go away. What they thought was that after this war we would be able, the great powers would be able to find ways to contain aggression before it got too big to deal with, short of a horrible war like this and a D-Day invasion, if they worked together, not that they could solve all the problems, not that we should enter every conflict but at least that we could help to contain these things.

And now in the post-cold-war era, when we really now are returning to what they were thinking about 50 years ago, that is, during the cold war our very existence was once again on the line in a very different way. Now the question is whether we will have the vision and the discipline to deal with these problems and at least contain them and try to work through them over the long run. That's what we've sought to do in Bosnia, not to commit our sol-

diers to intervene in the conflict but to contain it and work toward its resolution. And that's what we've sought to do in many other places in the world. That's what we have sought to do with our humanitarian aid mission in Somalia, to at least give those people some breathing space so they could put something back together and you wouldn't have a conflict that again could engulf millions of people.

We will not always be successful, but the big success, that is, preventing another world conflict and preventing the commitment of millions of Americans to a life-or-death struggle, we can avoid that if we proceed with discipline. And that is a thing that weighs on my mind as I watch Normandy unfold again after 50 years.

Mr. Blitzer. Thank you very much. We're out of time.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 8 p.m. aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* en route to Normandy, France. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With Harry Smith of CBS News
June 5, 1994

Role as Commander in Chief

Mr. Smith. I've been talking with a lot of veterans, and a lot of them respect you as Commander in Chief. Some of them aren't so sure. Do you feel like you have something to prove to them?

The President. No more than to any other Americans, except I think that the veterans of this country are entitled to know what they fought for in the Second World War is not going to be squandered at the end of the cold war. We understood, I think all of us understood, what we had to do as a country when communism rose at the end of the Second World War and took over Eastern Europe. And basically there was nothing we could do about it. I think everybody knew there was nothing we could do about that. But we were able to draw a line in the sand in Europe; we were able to limit the expansion in Korea. Maybe we made some mistakes in overreacting not perhaps just in Vietnam but in Central America because we were so worried about communism. But at least we did do that. We contained communism until it could collapse of its own failures and the truth reaching in to all these Communist countries. And even when we erred, we did so with—in good faith I think.

Now, at the end of the cold war, people are having a lot of questions about what's our national defense for or how do we keep our prestige alive and what's our job now in the world. It is a difficult and different world. And what I owe them is to make sure that we always have a strong, well-prepared, well-motivated, highly supportive military and that we move to contain the chaos and madness that is still abroad in the world and limit it so that our very existence is not again threatened by alien powers and so we never again have to do a D-Day. I owe them that. And I'm going to do my best to pay them.

Mr. Smith. Do you feel comfortable in your role as Commander in Chief?

The President. Oh, yes. I worked very hard at it. I've spent an awful lot of time with the service chiefs. I've spent a good deal of time out and around with the various services. I have tried to get to know pretty well a lot of the officers who have to make recommendations on policies and then have to carry them out. I've really worked at it.

If you come to the Presidency from a Governorship, you only have experience insofar as any of your forces, that is, our National Guard had been involved in something like Desert Storm, or if you've got to call them up for some terrible emergency. It's very different. It's something that I knew I'd have to invest a lot of time and effort in, especially at the end of the cold war. A Governor could more easily move into the role of Commander in Chief during the cold war because the road map was a lot clearer. So I have had to devote a good deal of time to it and still do. But it's something I enjoy, something I believe in, and something that is very important to me. The lives of these men on this ship are very precious to me. And I

am well aware that if I send them out into harm's way, I need to be as right as God will let me be right and that this enormous power the United States has now has its limits and its possibilities and clearly its responsibilities.

D-Day Commemoration

Mr. Smith. It is hard to be in Europe now during this time, especially in places that you've been and places you will go, and not do some soul-searching. Have you been doing some?

The President. Sure, I think we all have. I think everybody who's been part of this experience is so overwhelmed by the magnitude of the effort, by the level of courage and will that was required to prevail and how—it was not a foregone conclusion. It could have gone the other way. And if D-Day hadn't succeeded, even if we ultimately had won, millions of more people would have died, literally millions, before it could have been resolved. And it's made me think more deeply, more soberly, more prayerfully even, about the responsibilities that I have now and the problems that we're facing now.

Vietnam War

Mr. Smith. Has it made you think or reconsider at all your own lack of service during the Vietnam war?

The President. Not in that way, not in the way you ask it. I thought then, based on what I knew then, and I knew quite a bit for a person my age because I'd studied a lot of the documents, that our involvement was an error and that I should try to do what I could honorably to oppose it and to change it. I still believe that.

But I think that military service is an honorable thing, and it's something that in that sense I wish I had experienced. And none of us can control the time and place in which we live and the kinds of things that happen. We can only control our reaction to it. At the time I did the best I could. And you know, of course, from what came out that I felt—I had very mixed feelings about it. I tried to get myself even back into the draft because I was so confused about it. But I did the best I could at that time, and I'm doing the best I can now.

One of the things that I think we learned from that war is that even when we are extremely well-motivated, heroic, and willing to die in large numbers, we cannot win a fight for someone else. We can support other people on their own land fighting for their own destiny, but we can't win a fight for someone else. There are limits to what we can do. And the enormous reaction after that war happened and after the South Vietnamese forces collapsed 10 days after our final withdrawal almost caused our country to go into a shell for a while. That was also bad. First we overreached, and then we didn't do perhaps what we should have done to sort of stick a stake in the ground.

And what I'm determined to do is learn as much as I can from history but not be imprisoned by it and certainly not be bogged down by it. I have a job to do now. And nobody else in the world has it but me. And one thing I owe these people who are in the armed services is to get up every day and do it the very best I can, unencumbered by anything anybody else says about it but always listening to other people.

North Korea

Mr. Smith. Along these lines, are you still going to pursue sanctions against North Korea?

The President. We're going to take the sanctions debate to the United Nations. There is still time for North Korea to change its course. There is still time for North Korea to work with other countries. It's important that the American people understand what's at stake here. They agreed, North Korea did, not to become a nuclear power. Since I've been President they have let us inspect, because we worked very hard at it, all their facilities for what they're doing now and what they might do in the near future. They have not permitted us to go back and inspect for what they did back in 1989 before I took office.

The international inspectors say that means they could divert and may have already diverted nuclear fuel for nuclear weapons. Now, they gave their word they wouldn't do that, and they gave their word they'd let us inspect. They deal with a lot of countries that are rogue countries that promote terrorism. We feel that they ought to keep their word. And if they don't, then we feel we have to seek sanctions. But they can still turn away.

Mr. Smith. The North Koreans have said that sanctions would to them be an act of war.

The President. Well, they say that, but they keep trying to blame other people for their behavior, Mature, disciplined adults can't do that. They have to take responsibility for their own

behavior. They cannot anymore blame us for their behavior. This is about their behavior, not mine. I approached them in the spirit of peace. I was elated when they joined this nonproliferation group, when they said, "We want to work our differences out with South Korea; we want a relationship with the rest of the world." I would like to have a relationship with North Korea. I would like for them to work out their differences with South Korea. But that's up to them, not me.

Mr. Smith. If they act on these sanctions—[*inaudible*]—does that mean we are prepared to go to war with North Korea?

The President. Well, I don't want to join their escalation of words. We have a treaty commitment that commits us to the security of South Korea. They are our friends; they are our allies. There are American soldiers today on the DMZ. I have visited them there. They are brave; they're good people; they're doing their job. And we will honor our treaty commitments.

But we are not trying to provoke North Korea. We are only asking them to do what they have already promised to do. And if they will keep their promise, the promises of the West and of Japan and of South Korea and now even of China and Russia who do not want them to do this, to be a part of a great world community—[*inaudible*]. These people have talent. They have achieved some things. They have quite a lot of technological proficiency, even though they're very poor economically. They've done well in other things. We want them to come be a part of our world, not to run away from it.

Mr. Smith. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thanks, Harry.

NOTE. The interview began at 8:13 p.m. aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* en route to Normandy, France. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With Sam Donaldson of ABC News
June 5, 1994

North Korea

Mr. Donaldson. Mr. President, thank you very much for the interview. A lot of people have suggested that if North Korea can't be brought to reason and other nations such as China and Russia don't support tough sanctions, that the United States ought to impose them unilaterally. Do you agree?

The President. Let me first say that the American people need to understand what's at stake here. They agreed not to become a nuclear power. They have honored the testing requirements for what they've done since I've been in office. But they still haven't allowed us to test for what they did in 1989. Under those circumstances, I don't think we have any choice but to go to the United Nations for sanctions. I have talked with President Yeltsin, along with Prime Minister Major and the new Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Berlusconi. I'm going to see the French leaders the day after tomorrow. We are in touch with the Chinese.

I believe there is a general sense in the world community that we have to go forward with a sanctions resolution in the United Nations. I don't want to say what I'll do if we lose there because I'm not prepared to say we will lose there. I think most people know and believe that the North Koreans should cooperate on this. After all, they promised to do it. We're just asking them to keep their word.

Mr. Donaldson. I understand, sir, but Secretary Perry suggested today that in fact the United States would do it alone if it had to.

The President. Well, there is—we would not have to go it alone. The real question is could we have what has been called a coalition of the willing that included as many nations as would observe the sanctions as possible? The answer to that is we would certainly consider that if we failed at the United Nations. But keep in mind, China and Russia have both moved toward the West. And both have interests like Japan's, South Korea's, and the United States. None of us wish North Korea to be a nuclear power. And all of us know they promised they wouldn't be one. All of us know they still deal with other rogue states who support

terrorists. And we don't think this is a very good trend. So I think we'll work together. I predict to you that we'll work out a common course. And of course what I hope is that the North Koreans will turn away and come back to us.

Mr. Donaldson. Senator Dole said yesterday that North Korea's bluffing, he believes, when it says that it would invade the South if tough sanctions are imposed. Do you think they're bluffing?

The President. I don't think that they would risk the certain terrible defeat and destruction that would occur if they did that. But we can't afford to assume anything. That is, what I have tried to do is to make sure our people are well prepared and well disciplined for all eventualities, as they have been, I think, throughout their presence in Korea.

General Luck asked me for some extra support, and we've provided that. And I'm confident we're there, prepared to do our job. But I don't want any war talk. I want this to be about peace talk. What happens in North Korea and to North Korea is a function of what North Korea does, not the rest of us.

Mr. Donaldson. I understand, sir, that you don't want any war talk, but to put it very bluntly, I think a lot of people want to know whether the Clinton administration will back down if push comes to shove.

The President. No, the answer to that is no. The answer is we are in South Korea. We have a solemn commitment to them. They are our allies. They are certainly prepared to go forward in the United Nations; so are we.

Senator Dole says they're bluffing when they consider sanctions to be an act of war; I think that may be the opinion most people have. But nonetheless, we are going to be extra prepared. We want to do what we can to do our mission and to protect the American troops there as much as possible. I just don't want to raise any red flags of fear. We need to be very firm, very resolute, and go forward.

I'm talking to the other world leaders about it. I think we will go forward.

The Economy

Mr. Donaldson. Mr. President, Bob Woodward's coming out with a book in which he says that Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Fed, has been sort of a teacher to you and in fact has swayed you from your original campaign commitments in a populist sense. Is that right?

The President. No. But it is true that I've had probably a more candid relationship with Mr. Greenspan than previous Presidents. That's because I believed very strongly that unless we got interest rates down last year we couldn't spur this economy. I think in general our economic plan, our process for developing the plan was a good one. The decisions we made were right. I think that there is no better populism than producing 3.36 millions jobs in 16 months. I think we've done a pretty good job.

And I talked with Mr. Greenspan extensively without asking him to promise me what he was going to do, because I wanted to get a feel for how the Fed looked at this. What we wanted to do was get the deficit down, get interest rates down, cut spending, but increase investment in education and training and new technologies. We have done that.

Mr. Donaldson. Interest rates did come down, but now long-term interest rates are about where they were when your Presidency began. And short-term rates are being jacked up by the Fed.

The President. But why? Why are they going up? They're going up this time because there is robust growth in the economy, because jobs are being created, because, to quote the Fed, they want "short-term interest rates to be a neutral position," that is, neither promoting growth nor retarding it, so that the natural growth of the economy can take place. And the Fed announced the last time they raised rates that they—implicitly they said they weren't going to do it for a while. And if they don't do it for a while, the economy will continue to grow.

Mr. Donaldson. So it would suit you if we've seen the last hike in short-term interest rates this year?

The President. In the absence of evidence of inflation, yes. There is no compelling evidence that there's a lot of long-term inflation on the horizon. We have good growth in the economy. The strategy is working; we're creating jobs. That's the only thing that matters. Are the American people going back to work? Are we turning the economy around? The answer to that is yes.

Mr. Donaldson. But you know, I think a lot of people don't understand that when employment rises and when growth is pretty good, the

bond market goes nuts. Does that make any sense?

The President. It hasn't been an entirely rational policy. And I'm not sure that people who fix the interest rates the Government charges weren't surprised a little by what the bond market has done. Keep in mind, we can't be governed by the momentary trends in the bond market or the stock market to a lesser extent because they move for reasons that may not be tied to the real economy.

I can remember times, if you go back to the eighties and the early nineties, where the stock market would go up and the bond market would go up and the economy would go down. And what we want is, we want a healthy stock market, we want a healthy bond market, that is, strong bond prices, low interest rates, but we really want a healthy real economy. We want it on Main Street. We want people working. Right now, the Main Street economy is coming back. That's the economy that I wanted to change as President.

Virginia Senatorial Campaign

Mr. Donaldson. Let me move on to another topic. Colonel Oliver North was nominated yesterday in Virginia by the Republicans. Is it going to be a tough race for Senator Robb? What do you think?

The President. Well, I expect so. Colonel North represents a clear choice for the people of Virginia and the clear triumph for the radical right. They have been working to try to take over, first, the Republican Party and, second, this country, pretty hard now for 15 years. They've been up; they've been down. They're up again right now. And they represent a dramatic break there. They can raise a lot of money. They will stop at nothing. They will say anything. I know; I'm probably the prime recipient of their venom. And my guess is that the people of Virginia, once they see what their stark choices are, will choose Senator Robb. He distinguished himself as a Marine Corps officer in combat, in peacetime. He was a good Governor. He's been a good Senator. I believe he will prevail.

D-Day Commemoration

Mr. Donaldson. All right. Let me move now to D-Day. Mr. President, I was here 10 years ago when Ronald Reagan gave all those wonderful speeches and brought tears to everyone's eyes. Now, that's a tough act to follow. Are you going to be able to follow it?

The President. I don't think of it that way. What I have tried to do is to speak for the American people on this occasion. I worked hard to learn as much as I could about it, to talk to many veterans, to talk to people who actually came out of those landing craft and poured onto the beaches. And I'm going to do my best to speak for America. My job is to do the very best I can in the moment that I am President with this responsibility. I can't think about what anybody else did. I was moved by what he said. And I hope that I will capture the moment for America.

Vietnam War

Mr. Donaldson. Sir, you know that there are going to be a lot of people out there who resent the fact that you didn't serve and particularly because they believe you made a deliberate effort to avoid service. What would you say to them?

The President. Well, I can't add much to what I said in the campaign and much to what the evidence shows. I did feel ambivalence. I also at one time made an attempt, as you know, to get back into the draft, but that's not the important thing. I can't change the fact that I was opposed to our involvement in Vietnam. I still think on balance it did more harm than good even though we were well motivated. But we can't rewrite history. You can only live in the time and place that you are. And I am doing my best to do a good job and to be faithful to my duties as Commander in Chief. I have worked hard at it. I have aggressively sought out the best opinions I could get in the military. And I work at it every day.

I must say I've been very touched by the World War II veterans who in such large numbers—particularly when I was in Italy, had the chance to spend a couple hours with them—said that they were supporting me. And these young men here said the same thing. I have to do my job now. I can't be encumbered by what other people think about that.

Mr. Donaldson. Mr. President, my time is up. I thank you for the interview. Rick Kaplan wanted me to ask a number of mean questions, and I want the record to show that I refrained from doing so. [*Laughter*]

The President. You tell Rick not to discipline you too hard. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Donaldson. Thank you very much, sir.
The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:25 p.m. aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* en route to Normandy, France. In his remarks, the President referred to Rick Kaplan, executive producer, "ABC World News Tonight." A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With Tom Brokaw of NBC News
June 5, 1994

D-Day Commemoration

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, I know you did a lot of homework for this occasion, but could any amount of homework prepare you for the emotion of what you've been going through and what you will go through?

The President. No. You know, we were in Italy, and I knew that many, many of our service people who fought there in that very difficult campaign thought that their service had never been adequately recognized. But nothing prepared me for the impact of the thousands of graves at Nettuno and what the veterans felt. Nothing, nothing could have prepared me for the emotional impact of what I saw outside of Cambridge with that Wall of the Missing, the 5,000 people, including Glenn Miller and Joseph Kennedy who died in air crashes, were never recovered. You can read about it, you can talk to people about it, but until you're there and it hits you, you can't imagine.

Mr. Brokaw. For this generation, your generation, for that matter, what are the lessons to be learned now from that day, D-Day, and that time?

The President. First of all, I think it's important to remember that what D-Day proved more than anything else was, to use General Eisenhower's words, the fury of an aroused democracy is still the most important force in the world. The fact that we were a free people—and yes, maybe we were a little slow, you can argue in hindsight, to respond to Hitler's aggression, but the fact that we were a free people, full of young, gifted men and women, like these young men sitting behind you today, who figured out how to win this war and would not be denied is a great lesson for today. Our system of government is still the best, and we should never forget that, because it is disorganized to some extent or messy but at least it allows us to govern ourselves from the inside, from our genuine emotions.

The second lesson I think we have to learn is that if we do what the people who won that war want us to do, if we do what Roosevelt and Churchill and Eisenhower and the others wanted us to do in the post-cold-war era, that is, if we stay involved in the world knowing we can't solve every problem, knowing we can't end every conflict, but knowing that we have to contain these things so that they don't flare up, then we'll never have to have another D-Day. That is the ultimate lesson. They all fought and died so that we wouldn't have to do that again. And the only way we can be sure is to stay strong and stay involved. And in a very uncertain world, knowing that from time to time we may make mistakes but that the ultimate lesson is as long as we're involved and we're trying to stop and contain these conflicts, we won't have another D-Day.

Foreign Policy

Mr. Brokaw. Those leaders that you just cited always knew when to draw the line. There is a continuing perception that you're still not comfortable with national security decisions. Can you help correct that during this occasion?

The President. Well, I think for one thing, the answer is—the short answer to that is yes, but the longer answer is slightly more complex, and I'd like to have the chance to answer it.

What we're trying to do is to do in the post-cold-war era what the leaders after World War II had to do. Keep in mind, they didn't quite know where to join the line either. For years people criticized President Truman because Russia built a Communist empire and occupied all of Eastern Europe. It took some time to figure out, you know, what was NATO going to do, what was the Marshall plan all about, what was our position in Asia going to be. And

that's the period we're in now. We're working at the line-drawing.

We do have some clear lines. We have a continuing security commitment to Korea and Japan, for example, which is unbending and cannot be breached. We have a continuing effort with Russia to make the world less nuclear, which is immediate in its implications in our security. And we are working through a lot of other things. In Bosnia what we have done is to say we're not sure we can solve this, but we can limit its reach, and we must. And we've been somewhat successful there, I think more successful than most people acknowledge.

And I think what you will see is as we work through these things and the shape of the post-cold-war world becomes clear, the lines that America will draw will become clear. We are not withdrawing. That's the main thing. We are trying to stay engaged.

North Korea

Mr. Brokaw. Isn't it possible that the North Koreans are responding to your various overtures because they believe that you'll talk the talk but, in the modern jargon, not walk the walk, that you've been ambivalent about Bosnia and Haiti and even about trade with China?

The President. No. I don't think that's what's going on. I think that they may think that the world community won't impose sanctions on them, but I think the world community will impose sanctions if they don't——

Mr. Brokaw. But if the world community does not, will this President say, "We're going to do it on our own; we're going to lead the way"?

The President. We won't have to do it on our own. There will be lots of countries there willing to help us, the so-called coalition of willing. I prefer to have the United Nations take the appropriate action because we know that Russia and China on the Security Council agree with us on this issue. They don't want North Korea to become a nuclear power. And they know North Korea promised not to become a nuclear power. So I prefer to do it that way.

But we are going to proceed firmly on this. I hope and believe the U.N. will do it. If it doesn't, then we'll look at who else wants to do it and what else we can do. But we can't turn away from this. This is not about the United States; this is about North Korea. They promised that they wouldn't be a nuclear power. They promised to let us inspect. I will say this, since I've been President we've engaged them more, and we have been able to inspect now. What is at issue here is the inspections they did not allow back in 1989 and what they're going to do about it and whether that gives them the ability to make nuclear weapons. Now, since they still deal with countries that we know are rogue states and support terrorism, that's of great concern to us. That is a big issue for the American people and the long-term security of the world. So we've got to be firm here.

Will the United Nations support us? I believe they will. If they don't, what will we do? I think there are other options open to us. But we cannot just walk away from this.

Mr. Brokaw. If they continue to test, for example, the Silkworm missile, which is the shipkiller, and any kind of picket line you would put around North Korea would be exposed to that kind of thing, but you think ultimately that they'll respond only to the military option?

The President. I'm not sure of that. They have said that they would consider sanctions an act of war, but I don't really believe that. Keep in mind there are lots of countries in the world that have nuclear programs. When President Kennedy was President, he thought by this time two dozen countries would be nuclear powers. We don't have two dozen nuclear powers because the United States and our allies have worked very hard to reduce the number of nuclear powers. North Korea promised they wouldn't do it. We're just asking them to keep their word to be part of the world community, to reach out and grow.

You know, the ultimate sanction is going to be for them to decide what kind of country they want to be. Do they want to be isolated and alone and impoverished, or do they want to work out their relationship with South Korea, with the United States, ultimately now with Japan, with China, with Russia. Everybody is saying, "Come on and be part of this world. Don't withdraw and be part of a dark future." And I still believe there's a chance they'll come back. But we just have to steadily keep on the course we're on. It is dictated by their behavior, not by ours.

Vietnam War

Mr. Brokaw. Mr. President, you've been getting all the respect that is due—[*inaudible*]—Commander in Chief during these D-Day ceremonies. As you live in this kind of a military

environment, do you ever late at night regret your own decision to avoid military service when you were a young man?

The President. I don't regret the fact that I opposed the conflict in Vietnam and our policy there and I did what I could to—honorably—to bring it to an end. I still think I was right on that. I think on balance it did our role in the world more harm than good, although we were well motivated. We certainly didn't—the only lesson in Vietnam is that you can't fight someone else's fight for them. You can't do that. There is a limit to what we can do for someone else.

But there are plenty of times when I wish I'd had the experience, because I, after all, I'm a child of World War II. I grew up on the war movies, you know, on John Wayne and John Hodiak and Robert Mitchum and all those war movies. I grew up with the memories of a father I never knew, with a picture of his uniform on in World War II.

What I'm doing this week has brought me back to my roots in a very profound way. You and I are about the same age, and you know what I'm talking about. There's nothing that can compare with it. And I think all the people who grew up in my generation were hurt maybe worse than any other generation could have been by their ambivalence over Vietnam because we all loved the military so much.

Mr. Brokaw. Do you understand the quiet resentment of many of the veterans who are here: you did not serve and that you are now the Commander in Chief?

The President. Sure, but I've been stunned by the number of the World War II veterans, by the dozens the other day when I spent hours with them at Nettuno, who said that they had supported me, they had voted for me, and that they thought it was not good for America that these personal attacks continue. I told them that they should stay in a good humor about it and I would, too. I can't worry about that. There is nothing I can do about the past. All I can do is get up every day and be faithful to these young men and women in uniform today, faithful to the oath that I swore to uphold, and make these calls the best I can.

And if I spend all my time worrying about what somebody else thinks, I can't do that job. What I owe the people, whether they support me or resent me, I owe every one of them the same thing, to do the very best I can every day. And that's what I'm doing.

American Values

Mr. Brokaw. Finally, Mr. President, do you think that we'll ever be able to restore in our country the values and the sense of common cause that existed 50 years ago?

The President. Well, we will be able to if the American people in peacetime can understand that their existence is threatened by some things that are going on inside our country, by what has happened to our families, to our communities, by the fact that crime has reached epidemic proportions and violence among so many of our young people, and that that also threatens who we are as a people.

One of the things I tried to say to the American people in 1992 that I try still to say is that our national security is a product of being strong on the outside and also being strong on the inside. And if we can face up to things that—we're facing up to our economic problems. We're doing much better there. But we still have problems with our children, problems on our streets, other problems we have to face up to. If we can face up to them, then we will have the kind of sense of community that we had in World War II.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:37 p.m. aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* en route to Normandy, France. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks Commemorating the United States Navy Role in the Normandy Invasion

June 6, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Rockwell, Mr. Secretary, Admiral, Captain Sprigg, Chaplains, distinguished leaders of the Congress, the Cabinet, members of the Armed Services, veterans, family, and friends. This new and historically accurate dawn reminds us of that dawn 50 years ago that brought a new era, when thousands of warships assembled to begin Europe's liberation. Allied naval guns unleashed a storm of fire on Normandy's beaches as the sky brightened to a cold gray. Legions of young men packed into landing crafts set out to take those beaches.

After more than a year of brilliant planning by General Eisenhower and his Allied staff and those who were here even before and one agonizing weather-caused delay, D-Day arrived at last, exactly 50 years ago this day. We gather in the calm after sunrise today to remember that fateful morning, the pivot point of the war, perhaps the pivot point of the 20th century.

But we should never forget that at this hour on June 6, 1944, victory seemed far from certain. The weather was menacing, the seas were churning, the enemy was dug in. Though the plans had been prepared in great detail, chaos of battle can overwhelm the best laid plans, and for some of our units the plans went awry. Indeed, General Eisenhower had already drafted a statement in case the operation did not succeed.

As H-Hour approached, everyone in the invasion was forced to prepare in his own way. We know now from the records then that some soldiers and sailors wrote to their wives back home or to children they had never held. Some played dice, hoping for a string of good luck. Others tried to read, and many simply prayed. One Jewish officer, Captain Irving Gray, asked the chaplain on his landing craft to lead a prayer "to the God in whom we all believe, whether Protestant or Catholic or Jew, that our mission might be accomplished and that we may be brought safely home again."

Back home, as news of the invasion reached our fellow Americans, Americans spoke softly to God. In one Brooklyn shipyard, welders knelt down on the decks of their Liberty ship and said together the Lord's Prayer. The soldiers who landed on Utah and Omaha needed those prayers, for they entered a scene of terrible carnage. Thousands would never return. For those who did, it was faith in their Maker's mercy and their own ability that helped to carry the day. It was also raw courage and love of freedom and country.

One of the most stirring tales of D-Day is that to which the Secretary of the Navy has already referred, the tale of the U.S.S. *Corry.* Ripped by mines while blasting enemy positions on Utah Beach, the *Corry* began to go under. But one man stayed aboard. He climbed the stern, removed the flag, and swam and scrambled to the main mast. There, he ran up the flag. And as he swam off, our flag opened into the breeze. In the *Corry*'s destruction, there was no defeat. Today, the wreckage of that ship lies directly beneath us, an unseen monument to those who helped to win this great war. Thirteen of the *Corry*'s crew rest there as well, and these waters are forever sanctified by their sacrifice.

Fifty years ago, General Eisenhower concluded his order of the day with these words: "Let us all beseech the blessing of almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking." As we begin this new day of remembrance, let us also ask God's blessing for all those who died for freedom 50 years ago and for the Americans who carry on their noble work today. May God bless them, and may God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:21 a.m. aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington* off the coast of Normandy, France. In his remarks, he referred to Dean Rockwell, D-Day veteran who introduced the President, and Adm. J.M. Boorda, commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day at Pointe du Hoc in Normandy, France

June 6, 1994

General Downing, Mr. Hathaway, honored leaders of our military, distinguished veterans and members of the armed services, family and friends, my fellow Americans. We stand on sacred soil. Fifty years ago at this place a miracle of liberation began. On that morning, democracy's forces landed to end the enslavement of Europe.

Around 7 a.m., Lieutenant Colonel James Earl Rudder, 2d Ranger Battalion, United States Army, led 224 men onto the beaches below and up these unforgiving cliffs. Bullets and grenades came down upon them, but by a few minutes after 7, here, exactly here, the first Rangers stood. Today let us ask those American heroes to stand again. [*Applause*]

Corporal Ken Bargmann, who sits here to my right, was one of them. He had just celebrated his 20th birthday out in the Channel, a young man like all the rest of them, cold and wet, far from home, preparing for the challenge of his life. Ken Bargmann and the other Rangers of Pointe du Hoc and all the other Americans, British, Canadian, and Free French who landed, were the tip of a spear the free world had spent years sharpening, a spear they began on this morning in 1944 to plunge into the heart of the Nazi empire. Most of them were new to war, but all were armed with the ingenuity of free citizens and the confidence that they fought for a good cause under the gaze of a loving God.

The fortunate ones would go home, changed forever. Thousands would never return. And today we mourn their loss. But on that gray dawn, millions, literally millions, of people on this continent awaited their arrival. Young Anne Frank wrote in her diary these words: "It's no exaggeration to say that all Amsterdam, all Holland, yes, the whole west coast of Europe talks about the invasion day and night, debates about it, makes bets on it, and hopes. I have the feeling friends are approaching."

The young men who came fought for the very survival of democracy. Just 4 years earlier, some thought democracy's day had passed. Hitler was rolling across Europe. In America, factories worked at only half capacity. Our people were badly divided over what to do. The future seemed to belong to the dictators. They sneered at democracy, its mingling of races and religions, its tolerance of dissent. They were sure we didn't have what it took.

Well, they didn't know James Rudder or Ken Bargmann or the other men of D-Day. The didn't understand what happens when the free unite behind a great and worthy cause. For human miracles begin with personal choices, millions of them gathered together as one, like the stars of a majestic galaxy. Here at this place, in Britain, in North America, and among Resistance fighters in France and across Europe, all those numberless choices came together, the choices of lion-hearted leaders to rally their people, the choices of people to mobilize for freedom's fight, the choices of their soldiers to carry on that fight into a world worn weary by devastation and despair.

Every person in the democracies pitched in. Every shipbuilder who built a landing craft, every woman who worked in a factory, every farmer who grew food for the troops, every miner who carved coal out of a cavern, every child who tended a victory garden, all of them did their part. All produced things with their hands and their hearts that went into this battle. And on D-Day, all across the free world, the peoples of democracy prayed that they had done their job right. Well, they had done their job right.

And here, you, the Army Rangers, did yours. Your mission was to scale these cliffs and destroy the howitzers at the top that threatened every Allied soldier and ship within miles. You fired grappling hooks onto the cliff tops. You waded to shore, and you began to climb up on ropes slick with sea and sand, up, as the Germans shot down and tried to cut your lines, up, sometimes holding to the cliffs with nothing but the knives you had and your own bare hands.

As the battle raged at Juno, Sword, and Gold, on Omaha and Utah, you took devastating casualties. But you also took control of these commanding heights. Around 9 a.m., two Rangers discovered the big guns hidden inland and dis-

abled them with heat grenades. At the moment, you became the first Americans on D-Day to complete your mission.

We look at this terrain and we marvel at your fight. We look around us and we see what you were fighting for. For here are the daughters of Colonel Rudder. Here are the son and grandson of Corporal Bargmann. Here are the faces for whom you risked your lives. Here are the generations for whom you won a war. We are the children of your sacrifice. We are the sons and daughters you saved from tyranny's reach. We grew up behind the shield of the strong alliances you forged in blood upon these beaches, on the shores of the Pacific, and in the skies above. We flourished in the Nation you came home to build.

The most difficult days of your lives bought us 50 years of freedom. You did your job; now we must do ours. Let us begin by teaching our young people about the villainy that started this war and the valor that ended it. Let us carry on the work you began here. The sparks of freedom you struck on these beaches were never extinguished, even in the darkest days behind the Iron Curtain. Five years ago the miracle of liberation was repeated as the rotting timbers of communism came tumbling down.

Now we stand at the start of a new day. The Soviet empire is gone. So many people who fought as our partners in this war, the Russians, the Poles, and others, now stand again as our partners in peace and democracy. Our work is far from done. Still there are cliffs to scale. We must work to contain the world's most deadly weapons, to expand the reach of democracy. We must keep ready arms and strong alliances. We must have strong families and cohesive societies and educated citizens and vibrant, open, economies that promote cooperation, not conflict.

And if we should ever falter, we need only remember you at this spot 50 years ago and you, again, at this spot today. The flame of your youth became freedom's lamp, and we see its light reflected in your faces still and in the faces of your children and grandchildren.

We commit ourselves, as you did, to keep that lamp burning for those who will follow. You completed your mission here. But the mission of freedom goes on; the battle continues. The "longest day" is not yet over.

God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. William A. Downing, USA, commander in chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, and D-Day veteran Richard Hathaway, president, Ranger Battalions Association of World War II, who introduced the President.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day at Utah Beach in Normandy

June 6, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much, General Talbott, Secretary Perry, Secretary Brown. Let me begin by asking all the veterans here present, their families, their friends, the people from France who have been wonderful hosts to us, to acknowledge those who worked so hard to make these D-Day ceremonies a great success: General Joulwan, the SAC here, and his European command, 2,700 members of the Armed Forces who worked to put these events together; and the Secretary of the Army's World War II commemorative committee, General Mick Kicklighter and all of his committee. Let's give them a big hand; they have done a wonderful job. [*Applause*]

My fellow Americans, we have gathered to remember those who stormed this beach for freedom who never came home. We pay tribute to what a whole generation of heroes won here. But let us also recall what was lost here. We must never forget that thousands of people gave everything they were, or what they might have become, so that freedom might live.

The loss along this coastline numbs us still. In one U.S. company alone, 197 of 205 men were slaughtered in just 10 minutes. Hundreds of young men died before they could struggle 20 feet into the red-tinged tide. Thousands upon thousands of American, Canadian, and British

troops were killed or wounded on one brutal day.

But in the face of that mayhem emerged the confident clarity born of relentless training and the guiding light of a just cause. Here at Utah Beach, with the Army's 4th Division in the lead, the Allies unleashed their democratic fury on the Nazi armies.

So many of them landed in the wrong place; they found their way. When one commanding officer, Russell "Red" Reeder, discovered the error, he said, "It doesn't matter. We know where to go."

Here to help point the way were the fighters of the French Resistance. We must never forget how much those who lived under the Nazi fist did to make D-Day possible. For the French, D-Day was the 1,453d day of their occupation. Throughout all those terrible days, people along this coast kept faith. Whether gathering intelligence, carving out escape routes for Allied soldiers, or destroying enemy supply lines, they, too, kept freedom's flame alive with a terrible price.

Thousands were executed. Thousands more died in concentration camps. Oh, the loved ones of all who died, no matter what their nationality, they all feel a loss that cannot be captured in these statistics. Only one number matters: the husband who can never be replaced, the best friend who never came home, the father who never played with his child again.

One of those fathers who died on D-Day had written a letter home to his wife and their daughter barely a month before the invasion. He said, "I sincerely pray that if you fail to hear from me for a while you will recall the words of the Gospel: 'A little while and you shall not see me, and again a little while, and you shall see me.' But in your thoughts I shall always be, and you in mine." He was right. They must always be in our thoughts. To honor them, we must remember.

The people of this coast understand. Just beyond this beach is the town of Ste. Mere Eglise. There brave American paratroopers floated into a tragic ambush on D-Day, and there the survivors rallied to complete their mission. The mayor's wife, Simone Renaud, wrote the families of the Americans who had fought and died to free her village. And she kept on writing them every week for the rest of her life until she died just 6 years ago. Her son, Henri-Jean Renaud, carries on her vigil now. And he has vowed never to forget, saying, "I will dedicate myself to the memory of their sacrifice for as long as I live."

We must do no less. We must carry on the work of those who did not return and those who did. We must turn the pain of loss into the power of redemption so that 50 or 100 or 1,000 years from now, those who bought our liberty with their lives will never be forgotten.

To those of you who have survived and come back to this hallowed ground, let me say that the rest of us know that the most difficult days of your lives brought us 50 years of freedom.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, USA (Ret.), president, Society of 1st Infantry Division, and Gen. George A. Joulwan, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day at the United States Cemetery in Colleville-sur-Mer, France

June 6, 1994

Mr. Dawson, you did your men proud today. General Shalikashvili, Mr. Cronkite, Chaplain, distinguished leaders of our Government, Members of Congress, members of the armed services, our hosts from France, and most of all, our veterans, their families, and their friends:

In these last days of ceremonies, we have heard wonderful words of tribute. Now we come to this hallowed place that speaks, more than anything else, in silence. Here on this quiet plateau, on this small piece of American soil, we honor those who gave their lives for us 50 crowded years ago.

Today, the beaches of Normandy are calm. If you walk these shores on a summer's day, all you might hear is the laughter of children

playing on the sand or the cry of seagulls overhead or perhaps the ringing of a distant church bell, the simple sounds of freedom barely breaking the silence, peaceful silence, ordinary silence.

But June 6th, 1944, was the least ordinary day of the 20th century. On that chilled dawn, these beaches echoed with the sounds of staccato gunfire, the roar of aircraft, the thunder of bombardment. And through the wind and the waves came the soldiers, out of their landing craft and into the water, away from their youth and toward a savage place many of them would sadly never leave. They had come to free a continent, the Americans, the British, the Canadians, the Poles, the French Resistance, the Norwegians, and others; they had all come to stop one of the greatest forces of evil the world has ever known.

As news of the invasion broke back home in America, people held their breath. In Boston, commuters stood reading the news on the electric sign at South Station. In New York, the Statue of Liberty, its torch blacked out since Pearl Harbor, was lit at sunset for 15 minutes. And in Newcastle, Pennsylvania, a young mother named Pauline Elliot wrote to her husband, Frank, a corporal in the Army, "D-Day has arrived. The first thought of all of us was a prayer."

Below us are the beaches where Corporal Elliot's battalion and so many other Americans landed, Omaha and Utah, proud names from America's heartland, part of the biggest gamble of the war, the greatest crusade, yes, the longest day.

During those first hours on bloody Omaha, nothing seemed to go right. Landing craft were ripped apart by mines and shells. Tanks sent to protect them had sunk, drowning their crews. Enemy fire raked the invaders as they stepped into chest-high water and waded past the floating bodies of their comrades. And as the stunned survivors of the first wave huddled behind a seawall, it seemed the invasion might fail.

Hitler and his followers had bet on it. They were sure the Allied soldiers were soft, weakened by liberty and leisure, by the mingling of races and religion. They were sure their totalitarian youth had more discipline and zeal.

But then something happened. Although many of the American troops found themselves without officers on unfamiliar ground, next to soldiers they didn't know, one by one they got up. They inched forward, and together, in groups of threes and fives and tens, the sons of democracy improvised and mounted their own attacks. At that exact moment on these beaches, the forces of freedom turned the tide of the 20th century.

These soldiers knew that staying put meant certain death. But they were also driven by the voice of free will and responsibility, nurtured in Sunday schools, town halls, and sandlot ballgames, the voice that told them to stand up and move forward, saying, "You can do it. And if you don't, no one else will." And as Captain Joe Dawson led his company up this bluff, and as others followed his lead, they secured a foothold for freedom.

Today many of them are here among us. Oh, they may walk with a little less spring in their step, and their ranks are growing thinner. But let us never forget, when they were young, these men saved the world. And so let us now ask them, all the veterans of the Normandy campaign, to stand if they can and be recognized. [*Applause*]

The freedom they fought for was no abstract concept, it was the stuff of their daily lives. Listen to what Frank Elliot had written to his wife from the embarkation point in England: "I miss hamburgers a la Coney Island, American beer a la Duquesne, American shows a la Penn Theater, and American girls a la you." Pauline Elliot wrote back on June 6th, as she and their one-year-old daughter listened on the radio, "Little DeRonda is the only one not affected by D-Day news. I hope and pray she will never remember any of this, but only the happiness of the hours that will follow her daddy's homecoming step on the porch."

Well, millions of our GI's did return home from that war to build up our nations and enjoy life's sweet pleasures. But on this field there are 9,386 who did not: 33 pairs of brothers, a father and his son, 11 men from tiny Bedford, Virginia, and Corporal Frank Elliot, killed near these bluffs by a German shell on D-Day. They were the fathers we never knew, the uncles we never met, the friends who never returned, the heroes we can never repay. They gave us our world. And those simple sounds of freedom we hear today are their voices speaking to us across the years.

At this place, let us honor all the Americans who lost their lives in World War II. Let us

remember, as well, that over 40 million human beings from every side perished: soldiers on the field of battle, Jews in the ghettos and death camps, civilians ravaged by shell fire and famine. May God give rest to all their souls.

Fifty years later, what a different world we live in. Germany, Japan, and Italy, liberated by our victory, now stand among our closest allies and the staunchest defenders of freedom. Russia, decimated during the war and frozen afterward in communism and cold war, has been reborn in democracy. And as freedom rings from Prague to Kiev, the liberation of this continent is nearly complete.

Now the question falls to our generation: How will we build upon the sacrifice of D-Day's heroes? Like the soldiers of Omaha Beach, we cannot stand still. We cannot stay safe by doing so. Avoiding today's problems would be our own generation's appeasements. For just as freedom has a price, it also has a purpose, and its name is progress. Today, our mission is to expand freedom's reach forward; to test the full potential of each of our own citizens; to strengthen our families, our faith, and our communities; to fight indifference and intolerance; to keep our Nation strong; and to light the lives of those still dwelling in the darkness of undemocratic rule. Our parents did that and more; we must do nothing less. They struggled in war so that we might strive in peace.

We know that progress is not inevitable. But neither was victory upon these beaches. Now, as then, the inner voice tells us to stand up and move forward. Now, as then, free people must choose.

Fifty years ago, the first Allied soldiers to land here in Normandy came not from the sea but from the sky. They were called Pathfinders, the first paratroopers to make the jump. Deep in the darkness, they descended upon these fields to light beacons for the airborne assaults that would soon follow. Now, near the dawn of a new century, the job of lighting those beacons falls to our hands.

To you who brought us here, I promise we will be the new pathfinders, for we are the children of your sacrifice.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:58 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Walter Cronkite, master of ceremonies, and Maj. Gen. Matthew A. Zimmerman, USA, Chief of Chaplains.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

June 6, 1994

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1), and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council.

It remains our judgment that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has effectively disbanded the Iraqi nuclear weapons program at least for the near term. The United Nations has destroyed Iraqi missile launchers, support facilities, and a good deal of Iraq's indigenous capability to manufacture prohibited missiles. The U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) teams have reduced Iraq's ability to produce chemical weapons and they are inventorying and destroying chemical munitions. The United Nations now is preparing a long-term monitoring regime for facilities identified as capable of supporting a biological weapons program. But serious gaps remain in accounting for Iraq's missile and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs and the destruction process for all designated Iraqi weapons programs is not yet complete.

The international community must also ensure that Iraq does not break its promise to accept ongoing monitoring and verification as Iraq has repeatedly done in the past on other commitments. Continued vigilance is necessary because we believe that Saddam Hussein is committed to rebuilding his WMD capability.

We are seriously concerned about the many contradictions and unanswered questions re-

maining in regard to Iraq's WMD capability, especially in the chemical weapons area. The Secretary General's report of April 22 has detailed how the Iraqi government has stalled, obstructed, and impeded the Special Commission in its essential efforts. This report indicated that information supplied by Iraq on its missile and chemical programs was incomplete. Not only had the Iraqi government failed to furnish requested information, but the Iraqi government sought to sidestep questions that the Special Commission had posed.

It is, therefore, extremely important that the international community establish an effective, comprehensive, and sustainable ongoing monitoring and verification regime as required by U.N. Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 715. A monitoring program of this magnitude is unprecedented. Rigorous, extensive trial and field testing will be required before UNSCOM can judge the program's capability.

Rolf Ekeus, the Chairman of UNSCOM, has told Iraq that it must establish a clear track record of compliance before he can report favorably to the Security Council. This view is endorsed by most members of the Security Council. Chairman Ekeus has said he does not expect to be able to report before the end of the year at the earliest. We strongly endorse Chairman Ekeus' approach and reject any attempts to limit UNSCOM's flexibility by the establishment of a timetable for determining whether Iraq has complied with UNSCR 715. We insist on a sustained period of complete and unquestionable compliance with the monitoring and verification plans.

The "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq permit the monitoring of Iraq's compliance with UNSCRs 687 and 688. Over the last 2 years, the northern no-fly zone has assisted in deterring Iraq from a major military offensive in the region. Tragically, on April 14, 1994, two American helicopters in the no-fly zone were mistakenly shot down by U.S. fighter aircraft causing 26 casualties. An investigation into the circumstances surrounding this incident is underway. In southern Iraq, since the no-fly zone was established, Iraq's use of aircraft against its population in the region has stopped. However, Iraqi forces have responded to the no-fly zone by continuing to use artillery to shell marsh villages.

In April and May, the Iraqi military continued its campaign to destroy the southern marshes. A large search-and-destroy operation is taking place. The operation includes the razing of villages and large-scale burning operations, concentrated in the triangle bounded by An Nasiriya, Al Qurnah, and Basrah. Iraqi government engineers are draining the marshes of the region while the Iraqi Army is systematically burning thousands of reeds and dwellings to ensure that the marsh inhabitants are unable to return to their ancestral homes. The population of the region, whose marsh culture has remained essentially unchanged since 3500 B.C., has in the last few years been reduced by an estimated three-quarters. As a result of the "browning" of the marshes, civilian inhabitants continue to flee toward Iran, as well as deeper into the remaining marshes toward the outskirts of southern Iraqi cities. This campaign is a clear violation of UNSCR 688.

In northern Iraq, in the vicinity of Mosul, we continue to watch Iraqi troop movements carefully. Iraq's intentions remain unclear.

Three years after the end of the Gulf War, Iraq still refuses to recognize Kuwait's sovereignty and the inviolability of the U.N. demarcated border, which was reaffirmed by the Security Council in UNSCRs 773 and 833. Despite the passage of time, Iraq has failed to accept those resolutions. Furthermore, Iraq has not met its obligations concerning Kuwaitis and third-country nationals it detained during the war. Iraq has taken no substantive steps to cooperate fully with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), as required by UNSCR 687.

Indeed, Iraq refused even to attend the ICRC meetings held in July and November 1993 to discuss these issues. Iraq also has not responded to more than 600 files on missing individuals. We continue to press for Iraqi compliance and we regard Iraq's actions on these issues as essential to the resolution of conflict in the region.

The Special Rapporteur of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, Max van der Stoel, in his February 1994 report on the human rights situation in Iraq, described the Iraqi military's continuing repression against its civilian populations in the marshes. The Special Rapporteur asserted that the Government of Iraq has engaged in war crimes and crimes against humanity, and may have committed violations of the 1948 Genocide Convention. Regarding the Kurds, the Special Rapporteur has judged that the extent and gravity of reported violations place the survival of Kurds in jeopardy. The

Special Rapporteur noted that there are essentially no freedoms of opinion, expression, or association in Iraq. Torture is widespread in Iraq and results from a system of state-terror successfully directed at subduing the population. The Special Rapporteur repeated his recommendation for the establishment of human rights monitors strategically located to improve the flow of information and to provide independent verification of reports. We have stepped up efforts to press for the deployment of human rights monitors and we strongly support their placement. The United Nations Human Rights Commission (UNHRC) has extended van der Stoel's mandate for another year, asking for additional reports to the U.N. General Assembly in the fall and to the UNHRC in February 1995.

The United States continues to work closely with the United Nations and other organizations to provide humanitarian relief to the people of northern Iraq. Iraqi government efforts to disrupt this assistance persist. We continue to support U.N. efforts to mount a relief program for persons in Baghdad and the South, provided that supplies are not diverted by the Iraqi government. We are also seeking the establishment of a U.N. commission to investigate and publicize Iraqi crimes against humanity, war crimes, and other violations of international humanitarian law.

Examples of Iraqi noncooperation and noncompliance continue in other areas. For instance, reliable reports indicate that the Government of Iraq is offering reward money for terrorist acts against U.N. and humanitarian relief workers in Iraq. The offering of bounty for such acts, as well as the commission of such acts, in our view constitute violations of UNSCRs 687 and 688.

For 3 years there has been a clear pattern of criminal acts linked to the Government of Iraq in a series of assassinations and attacks in northern Iraq on relief workers, U.N. guards, and foreign journalists. These incidents continued to occur during April and May. In the first week of April alone, there were four attacks. On April 3, for example, a German journalist and her Kurdish bodyguard were killed under suspicious circumstances. The most recent example of such Iraqi-sponsored terrorism occurred on April 12 in Beirut where Iraqi government officials assigned to the Iraqi Embassy assassinated an Iraqi oppositionist living there. In response, Lebanon has broken diplomatic relations with Iraq. In other terrorist attacks during this period, 10 persons were injured, including 6 U.N. guards. In total, there have been eight incidents of attacks on U.N. guards in Iraq since January 1994. Neither now, nor in the past, has Iraq complied with UNSCR 687's requirement to refrain from committing or supporting any act of international terrorism.

The Security Council maintained sanctions at its May 17 regular 60-day review of Iraq's compliance with its obligations under relevant resolutions. Despite ongoing lobbying efforts by the Iraqi government to convince Security Council members to lift sanctions, member countries were in agreement that Iraq is not in compliance with resolutions of the Council, and that existing sanctions should remain in force without change.

The sanctions regime exempt medicine and, in the case of foodstuffs, requires only that the U.N. Sanctions Committee be notified of food shipments. The Sanctions Committee also continues to consider and, when appropriate, approve requests to send to Iraq materials and supplies for essential civilian needs. The Iraqi government, in contrast, has continued to maintain a full embargo against its northern provinces over the past 2 months and has acted to distribute humanitarian supplies throughout the country only to its supporters and to the military.

The Iraqi government has so far refused to sell $1.6 billion in oil as previously authorized by the Security Council in UNSCRs 706 and 712. Talks between Iraq and the United Nations on implementing these resolutions ended unsuccessfully in October 1993. Iraq could use proceeds from such sales to purchase foodstuffs, medicines, materials, and supplies for essential civilian needs of its population, subject to U.N. monitoring of sales and the equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies (including to its northern provinces). Iraqi authorities bear full responsibility for any suffering in Iraq that results from their refusal to implement UNSCRs 706 and 712.

Proceeds from oil sales also would be used to compensate persons injured by Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The U.N. Compensation Commission (UNCC) has received about 2.3 million claims so far with another 200,000 expected. The United States Government has now filed a total of 8 sets of individual claims with the Commission, bringing

U.S. claims filed to roughly 3,000 with a total asserted value of over $205 million. The first panel of UNCC Commissioners recently submitted its report on an initial installment of individual claims for serious personal injury or death. The Governing Council of the UNCC was expected to act on the panel's recommendations at its session in late May.

With respect to corporate claims, the United States Government filed its first group of claims with the UNCC on May 6. The filing consisted of 50 claims with an asserted value of about $1 billion. The United States Government continues to review about 100 claims by U.S. businesses for future submission to the UNCC. The asserted value of U.S. corporate claims received to date is about $1.6 billion.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 permits the use of a portion of frozen Iraqi oil assets to fund crucial U.N. activities concerning Iraq, including humanitarian relief, UNSCOM, and the Compensation Commission. (The funds will be repaid, with interest, from Iraqi oil revenues as soon as Iraqi oil exports resume). The United States is prepared to transfer to a U.N.-managed escrow account up to $200 million in frozen Iraqi oil assets held in U.S. financial institutions, provided that U.S. transfers do not exceed 50 percent of the total amount transferred or contributed by all countries. We have transferred a total of about $124 million in such matching funds thus far.

Iraq can rejoin the community of civilized nations only through democratic processes, respect for human rights, equal treatment of its people, and adherence to basic norms of international behavior. Iraq's government should represent all of Iraq's people and be committed to the territorial integrity and unity of Iraq. The Iraqi National Congress (INC) espouses these goals, the fulfillment of which would make Iraq a stabilizing force in the Gulf region.

I am fully determined to continue efforts to achieve Iraq's full compliance with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. Until that time, the United States will maintain all the sanctions and other measures designed to achieve full compliance.

I am grateful for the support by the Congress of our efforts.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 7.

Exchange With Reporters During a Meeting With Mayor Jacques Chirac of Paris, France

June 7, 1994

The President. Good morning. How are you? It's a wonderful city. It's wonderful to be back.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you think that the Bosnian Muslims should accept Akashi's proposal for a 4-month ceasefire?

The President. Well, we'd very much like to see a cessation of the fighting, and we're working on it. Ambassador Redman is here today, and I hope to have a chance to talk to him about it. I think I should defer any other comments until I get a chance to get a direct briefing. But we're trying to work out our schedule so I can see him today and get a firsthand account.

Anything we can do to stop the fighting, in my judgment, is a good thing.

France

Q. Mr. President, how would you qualify the relationship between France and the United States today, as you are in Paris?

The President. I think it's very good. And I think it will get better.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia, is the French Government applying any kind of pressure on Washington to apply pressure on the Bosnian Government to accept the peace plan that is proposed——

The President. Well, I wouldn't characterize it in that way. We're having discussions—I just talked with the mayor about it. And I intend to meet with the Prime Minister and the President today and, of course, to speak to the Assembly. But all of us want to try to bring an end to the fighting and have a settlement which can be a part of a comprehensive resolution to this.

North Korea

Q. [*Inaudible*]—the North Koreans didn't show up to the armistice meeting today, do you see that as a provocation?

The President. Excuse me, I didn't——

Q. The North Koreans didn't turn up to the armistice meeting today. Do you see that as a provocation?

The President. Not particularly. They've argued about the armistice setup for some years on and off. I don't—we're not in a good position there, as you know. Our relationships with them are not the best now because of this problem. And we're proceeding with the United Nations as we should. But I don't—this doesn't add any particular extra element to it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:51 a.m. in the U.S. Ambassador's residence. In his remarks, he referred to Yasushi Akashi, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for the Former Yugoslavia, and Charles E. Redman, U.S. Special Envoy to the Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks With Prime Minister Edouard Balladur of France and an Exchange With Reporters in Paris

June 7, 1994

The President. The Prime Minister and I had a very good meeting, and we just had a wonderful lunch.

We discussed a large number of topics. But the things I think I should emphasize are first, our common commitment to complete the GATT round and to continue the work of broadening and expanding trade as a way of promoting economic growth; second, our desire to use the G–7 meeting which is coming up as a way of dealing with some of the difficult questions that the wealthier countries have to face in a global economy, the questions of labor standards, of environmental protection, the question of how to generate new jobs for our people. These are questions, in many ways, that advanced economies have never seriously discussed with one another. We are attempting to do that.

We also, of course, discussed our common concerns in the area of foreign policy. And we reaffirmed our determination to work together very closely on the question of Bosnia to try to first encourage both sides to support Mr. Akashi's proposal for a cease-fire and secondly to support the work of the contact group in attempting to come up with an appropriate division of territory, which can be the basis of a lasting settlement there. We intend to be as supportive as we can. We can work on the cease-fire, and we have to await the final results of the contact group on the territorial recommendations.

On balance, I felt it was a very good meeting. I reaffirmed the support of the United States for a stronger, a more integrated, more involved Europe in terms of security, political, and economic affairs. And in that regard, the last point I would like to make is how pleased I am that 19 other nations have agreed to join France and the United States and the other NATO nations in the Partnership For Peace. This is very encouraging. We should have some joint exercises before the end of the year, which will put us on the road to a more united Europe, in a very important security dimension.

So these are the things that we discussed. We discussed other things as well, but these are the highlights from my point of view. I'd like to now have the Prime Minister say whatever he wishes to say, and then perhaps we can answer a question or two.

Prime Minister Balladur. The President of the United States has just said, with great precision, exactly what we actually talked about. And I,

we agreed on the importance of the fact that the trade negotiations should lead speedily to arrangements which would take into account the questions of labor and social legislation in various parts of the world. And the President suggested that we should ask experts to deal with these problems, and I, of course, immediately agreed.

Secondly, we stressed the importance for Europe and for the whole world of the nuclear safety issue, with particular reference to the Ukraine, and steps that should be taken to ensure that the situation there should not get worse, which would also have an impact on a number of other European countries.

Those, I think, are the main points that we talked about. But in addition, we had a very friendly conversation. If I may say so, Mr. President, I think we can say it was also a fruitful one. We, of course, reaffirmed the great importance and strength of the friendship between our two countries.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, did you discuss North Korea at all, or sending a special emissary to Seoul?

The President. We did discuss North Korea, of course. And I reaffirmed the position of the United States that the Security Council must take up this question and consider a sanctions resolution.

I believe that the Prime Minister agrees with that position. You might want to ask him, but I was very satisfied with the response with regard to North Korea. Of course, France's position on this is pivotal, since it is one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

Prime Minister Balladur. I agree that nonproliferation is an extremely important aim, both for the United States and for France. And I assured the President of our support for a Security Council resolution.

Europe-U.S. Relations

The President. Is there a French question?

Q. Yes, sir, thank you. Mr. Prime Minister, are you satisfied with President Clinton's position on Europe and the relations with France? Are you reassured after one year of American foreign policy about which we said that it was a rather uncertain one?

Prime Minister Balladur. I am not reassured, because I wasn't in the least worried. I have full responsible confidence in the United States administration and President Clinton's administration. Now, naturally, we don't necessarily see everything exactly from the same viewpoint, and the opposite would be extremely surprising. But we do share the common aim of peace and security worldwide.

And I would like to add that I found in President Clinton a great openness of mind and a great appreciation of European problems and the need that Europe should organize itself better, and indeed, he made this point at the end of the luncheon. So I think that most of the causes that could possibly earlier have led to difficulty in understanding each other's viewpoint have, in fact, disappeared.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:20 p.m. at the Hotel Matignon. Prime Minister Balladur spoke in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to the French National Assembly in Paris
June 7, 1994

Mr. President, distinguished Deputies, representatives of the people of France, it is a high honor for me to be invited here, along with my wife and our distinguished Ambassador, Pamela Harriman, to share with you this occasion. There is between our two peoples a special kinship. After all, our two republics were born within a few years of each other. Overthrowing the rule of kings, we enthroned in their places common ideals: equality, liberty, community, the rights of man.

For two centuries, our nations have given generously to each other. France gave to our Founders the ideas of Montesquieu and Rousseau. And then Lafayette and Rochambeau helped to forge those ideas into the reality of

our own independence. For just as we helped to liberate your country in 1944, you helped to liberate our country two full centuries ago.

Your art and your culture have inspired countless Americans for that entire time, from Benjamin Franklin to John and Jacqueline Kennedy. In turn, we lent to you the revolutionary genius of Thomas Jefferson, the fiery spirit of Thomas Paine, and the lives of so many of our young men when Europe's liberty was most endangered.

This week you have given us yet another great gift in the wonderful commemorations of the Allied landings at Normandy. I compliment President Mitterrand and all the French people for your very generous hospitality. I thank especially the thousands of French families who have opened their homes to our veterans.

Yesterday's sights will stay with me for the rest of my life: the imposing cliffs of Pointe du Hoc, the parade of our Allied forces on Utah Beach, the deadly bluffs at bloody Omaha, the rows upon rows of gravestones at our cemetery at Colleville.

D-Day was the pivot point of the 20th century. It began Europe's liberation. In ways great and small, the Allied victory proved how democracy's faith in the individual saved democracy itself. From the daring of the French Resistance to the inventiveness of the soldiers on Omaha Beach, it proved what free nations can accomplish when they unite behind a great and noble cause.

The remarkable unity among the Allies during World War II, let us face it, reflected the life-or-death threat facing freedom. Democracies of free and often unruly people are more likely to rally in the face of that kind of danger. But our challenge now is to unite our people around the opportunities of peace, as those who went before us united against the dangers of war.

Once in this century, as your President so eloquently expressed, following World War I, we failed to meet that imperative. After the Armistice, many Americans believed our foreign threats were gone. America increasingly withdrew from the world, opening the way for high tariffs, for trade wars, for the rise to fascism and the return of global war in less than 20 years.

After World War II, America, France, and the other democracies did better. Led by visionary statesmen like Truman and Marshall, de Gaulle, Monnet, and others, we reached out to rebuild our allies and our former enemies, Germany, Italy, and Japan, and to confront the threat of Soviet expansion and nuclear power. Together, we founded NATO, we launched the Marshall plan, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other engines of economic development. And in one of history's great acts of reconciliation, France reached out to forge the Franco-German partnership, the foundation of unity and stability in modern Western Europe. Indeed, the members of the European Union have performed an act of political alchemy, a magical act that turned rubble into renewal, suspicion into security, enemies into allies.

Now we have arrived at this century's third moment of decision. The cold war is over. Prague, Warsaw, Kiev, Riga, Moscow, and many others stand as democratic capitals, with leaders elected by the people. We are reducing nuclear stockpiles, and America and Russia no longer aim their nuclear missiles at each other. Yet once again, our work is far from finished. To secure this peace, we must set our sights on a strategic star. Here, where America and our allies fought so hard to save the world, let that star for both of us, for Americans and for Europeans alike, be the integration and strengthening of a broader Europe.

It is a mighty challenge. It will require resources. It will take years, even decades. It will require us to do what is very difficult for democracies, to unite our people when they do not feel themselves in imminent peril to confront more distant threats and to seize challenging and exciting opportunities. Yet, the hallowed gravestones we honored yesterday speak to us clearly. They define the price of failure in peacetime. They affirm the need for action now.

We can already see the grim alternative. Militant nationalism is on the rise, transforming the healthy pride of nations, tribes, religious and ethnic groups into cancerous prejudice, eating away at states and leaving their people addicted to the political painkillers of violence and demagoguery, and blaming their problems on others when they should be dedicated to the hard work of finding real answers to those problems in reconciliation, in power-sharing, in sustainable development. We see the signs of this disease from the purposeful slaughter in Bosnia to the random violence of skinheads in all our nations. We see it in the incendiary misuses of history and in the anti-Semitism and irredentism of

some former Communist states. And beyond Europe, we see the dark future of these trends in mass slaughter, unbridled terrorism, devastating poverty, and total environmental and social disintegration.

Our transatlantic alliance clearly stands at a critical point. We must build the bonds among nations necessary for this time, just as we did after World War II. But we must do so at a time when our safety is not directly threatened, just as after World War I. The question for this generation of leaders is whether we have the will, the vision, and yes, the patience to do it.

Let me state clearly where the United States stands. America will remain engaged in Europe. The entire transatlantic alliance benefits when we, Europe and America, are both strong and engaged. America wishes a strong Europe, and Europe should wish a strong America, working together.

To ensure that our own country remains a strong partner, we are working hard at home to create a new spirit of American renewal, to reduce our budget deficits, to revive our economy, to expand trade, to make our streets safer from crime, to restore the pillars of our American strength, work and family and community, and to maintain our defense presence in Europe.

We also want Europe to be strong. That is why America supports Europe's own steps so far toward greater unity, the European Union, the Western European Union, and the development of a European defense identity. We now must pursue a shared strategy, to secure the peace of a broader Europe and its prosperity. That strategy depends upon integrating the entire continent through three sets of bonds: first, security cooperation; second, market economics; and third, democracy.

To start, we must remain strong and safe in an era that still has many dangers. To do so we must adapt our security institutions to meet new imperatives. America has reduced the size of its military presence in Europe, but we will maintain a strong force here. The EU, the WEU, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other organizations must all play a larger role. I was pleased that NATO recently approved an American proposal to allow its assets to be used by the WEU. To foster greater security cooperation all across Europe, we also need to adapt NATO to this new era.

At the NATO summit in January, we agreed to create the Partnership For Peace in order to foster security cooperation among NATO allies and the other states of Europe, both former Warsaw Pact countries, states of the former Soviet Union, and states not involved in NATO for other reasons. And just 6 months later, this Partnership For Peace is a reality. No less than 19 nations have joined, and more are on the way. Russia has expressed an interest in joining.

The Partnership will conduct its first military exercises this fall. Imagine the transformation: Troops that once faced each other across the Iron Curtain will now work with each other across the plains of Europe.

We understand the historical anxieties of Central and Eastern Europe. The security of those states is important to our own security. And we are committed to NATO's expansion. At the same time, as long as we have the chance, the chance to create security cooperation everywhere in Europe, we should not abandon that possibility anywhere.

There are signs that such an outcome may be possible. Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus have now committed to eliminate all the nuclear weapons on their soil. And by this August we may well see all Russian troops withdrawn from Eastern Europe and the Baltics for the first time since the end of World War II.

Do these developments guarantee that we can draw all the former Communist states into the bonds of peaceful cooperation? No. But we would fail our own generation and those to come if we did not try.

Do these arrangements mean we can solve all the problems? No, at least not right away. The most challenging European security problem and the most heartbreaking humanitarian problem is, of course, Bosnia. We have not solved that problem, but it is important to recognize what has been done, because France, the United States, Great Britain, and others have worked together through the United Nations and through NATO. Look what has been done. First, a determined and so far successful effort has been made to limit that conflict to Bosnia, rather than having it spread into a wider Balkan war. Second, the most massive humanitarian airlift in history has saved thousands of lives, as has the UNPROFOR mission, in which France has been the leading contributor of troops. We have prevented the war from moving into the air. We have seen an agreement be-

tween the Bosnian Muslims and the Croats. Progress has been made.

What remains to be done? Today the United Nations has put forward the proposal by Mr. Akashi for a cessation of hostilities for a period of several months. The United States supports this program; France supports this proposal. We must do all we can to get both sides to embrace it.

Then, the contact group is working on a map which can be the basis of a full and final cessation of hostilities there. We must do all we can, once all parties have been heard from, to secure that agreement.

And finally, let us not forget what has happened to make that more likely, and that is that Russia has been brought into the process of attempting to resolve this terrible crisis in what so far has been a very positive way, pointing the way toward a future in which we may all be able to work together to solve problems like this over a period of time. We must be patient. We must understand that we do not have total control of events within every nation. But we have made progress in Bosnia, and we must keep at it, working together, firmly together, with patience and firmness, until the job is done. We can do this if we stay together and work together.

The best way to sustain this sort of cooperation is to support the evolution of Europe across the board. We must also have an economic dimension to this. We must support Europe's East in their work to integrate into the thriving market democracies. That brings me to the second element of our strategy of integration. Integration requires the successful transition to strong market economies all across broader Europe.

Today, the former Communist states face daunting transitions. Our goal must be to help them succeed, supporting macroeconomic reforms, providing targeted assistance to privatization, increasing our bonds of trade and investment. That process invariably will proceed slowly and, of course, unevenly. It will depend in part on what happens within those countries. We have seen voters in former Communist states cast ballots in a protest against reform and its pain. Yet as long as these states respect democratic processes, we should not react with too much alarm. The work of reform will take years and decades.

Despite many problems the economic reforms in Europe's East have still been impressive. Russia's private sector now employs 40 percent of the work force, and 50 million Russians have become shareholders in privatizing companies. In Prague last January, I said the West needed to support such reforms by opening our markets as much as possible to the exports of those nations. For if our new friends are not able to export their goods, they may instead export instability, even against their own will.

We can also support other reforms by stimulating global economic growth. One of the most important advances toward that goal in recent years has been the new GATT agreement. It will create millions of jobs. France played an absolutely pivotal role in bringing those talks to fruition. I know it was a difficult issue in this country. I know it required statesmanship. I assure you it was not an easy issue in the United States. We have issues left to resolve. But now that we have opened the door to history's most sweeping trade agreement, let us keep going until it is done. My goal is for the United States Congress to ratify the GATT agreement this year and to pursue policies through the G–7 that can energize all our economies.

We have historically agreed among the G–7 nations that we will ask each other the hard questions: What can we do to promote economic growth and job creation? What kind of trade policies are fair to the working people of our countries? How can we promote economic growth in a way that advances sustainable development in the poorer countries of the world so that they do not squander their resources and, in the end, assure that all these endeavors fail? These are profoundly significant questions. They are being asked in a multilateral forum for the first time in a serious way. And this is of great significance.

In the end, no matter what we do with security concerns or what we do with economic concerns, the heart of our mission must be the same as it was on Normandy's beaches a half a century ago, that is, democracy. For after all, democracy is the glue that can cement economic reforms and security cooperation. That is why our third goal must be to consolidate Europe's recent democratic gains.

This goal resonates with the fundamental ideals of both of our republics. It is, after all, how we got started. It also serves our most fundamental security interests, for democracy is a powerful deterrent; it checks the dark ambi-

tions of would-be tyrants and aggressors as it respects the bright hopes of free citizens.

Together, our two nations and others have launched a major effort to support democracy in the former Communist states. Progress will not come overnight. There will be uneven developments, but already we see encouraging and sometimes breathtaking results. We have seen independent television stations established where once only the state's version of the truth was broadcast. We've seen thousands of people from the former Communist world, students, bankers, political leaders, come to our nations to learn the ways and the uses of freedom. We've seen new constitutions written and new states founded around the principles that inspired our own republics at their birth. Ultimately, we need to foster democratic bonds not only within these former Communist states but also among our states and theirs.

There is a language of democracy spoken among nations. It is expressed in the way we work out our differences, in the way we treat each other's citizens, in the way we honor each other's heritages. It is the language our two republics have spoken with each other for over 200 years. It is the language that the Western Allies spoke during the Second World War.

Now we have the opportunity to hear the language of democracy spoken across this entire continent. And if we can achieve that goal, we will have paid a great and lasting tribute to those from both our countries who fought and died for freedom 50 years ago.

Nearly 25 years after D-Day, an American veteran who had served as a medic in that invasion returned to Normandy. He strolled down Omaha Beach, where he had landed in June of 1944, and then walked inland a ways to a nearby village. There, he knocked on a door that seemed familiar. A Frenchwoman answered the door and then turned suddenly and called to her husband. "He's back. The American doctor is back," she called. After a moment, the husband arrived, carrying a wine bottle covered with dust and cobwebs. "Welcome, Doctor," he cried. "In 1944, we hid this bottle away for the time when you would return. Now let us celebrate."

Well, this week, that process of joyous rediscovery and solemn remembrance happened all over again. It unfolded in countless reunions, planned and unplanned. As our people renewed old bonds, let us also join to resume the timeless work that brought us here in the first place and that brought our forebears together 200 years ago, the work of fortifying freedom's foundation and building a lasting peace for generations to come. I believe we can do it. It is the only ultimate tribute we can give for the ultimate lesson of World War II and Normandy.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:13 p.m. at the Palais Bourbon.

Interview With the French Media in Paris
June 7, 1994

Europe

Q. Are you disappointed with Europe today as opposed to the kind of determination it showed 50 years ago?

President Clinton. No. No, because I don't think the two situations are easily comparable; it's not the same thing. I think the real question is, how is Europe today as compared with after the Second World War or after the First World War? And I think the answer is, we're doing much better than we did after the First World War, in a roughly similar time, with a lot of uncertainty in the world but where no one's security seems to be immediately at risk.

I see Europe coming together politically, economically, in terms of security. I see more cooperation with the United States economically with GATT, in terms of security with NATO and the Partnership For Peace. I see us working together to try to deal with the problem of Bosnia. I know it has not been solved, but after all, some progress has been made. The conflict has been limited. The Croatians and the Muslims have made an agreement. We are on the

verge of getting a recommended territorial settlement from our contact group.

So I think that Europe is on the way to a better situation in the 21st century. Have we solved all the problems? No. But I'm optimistic, especially after this trip.

[*At this point, a question was asked and President François Mitterrand answered in French, but the translation was incomplete.*]

Bosnia

Q. I'd like to ask President Clinton a question, hoping that—[*inaudible*]—problem—[*inaudible*]—President of your country—[*inaudible*]—and he said that after 1919—[*inaudible*]—everything seems possible today. [*Inaudible*]—are coming out of a long period of—[*inaudible*]—this is the best—[*inaudible*]—perhaps one day he might ask your boys to intervene again, for instance, in Bosnia?

President Clinton. I do think the situation is similar to 1919, not the same but similar. But the difference is that in 1919, Europe did not unite and the United States withdrew. In 1994, Europe is growing together in terms of the economy and the political system and the security system, and the United States is still actively engaged in Europe.

Are there circumstances under which we might commit American troops? Absolutely, there are. First of all, we still have a NATO commitment, which we intend to honor. Secondly, we have already put our pilots at the disposal of NATO in Bosnia in enforcing the no-fly zone and in having the airlift for humanitarian reasons. We have troops in——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—more on the ground?

President Clinton. Well, we have troops in Macedonia also to limit the conflict. We have said we would put in troops to enforce an agreement if an agreement was made but that we did not believe the United States should go into Bosnia to try to resolve the conflict in favor of one side or the other. And I think if we were involved there now in the U.N. mission, it would only make for more controversy and increase the likelihood of the international community being pulled into the conflict.

If we can get the parties to agree—and I think President Mitterrand and I agree on this—if we can get the parties to agree to a settlement, then the United States is prepared to work with our allies to make sure that settlement is honored.

[*President Mitterrand then responded in French, and two additional questions were asked and answered in French, but translations were not provided.*]

Algeria

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Let me make sure I understand your question by restating our position. We have tried to support the current government in working with France, for example, to reschedule their debt. But we have also encouraged this government to reach out to dissident groups who are not involved in terrorism, who disavow terrorism. We have had some very low-level contacts with people who, themselves, have not been involved in terrorism. We don't support people who pursue violent means like that anywhere, and we won't.

We hope that the present Algerian government will be able to broaden its base and reach out and deal with those with whom it has difficulties, who feel shut out, but who are committed to a peaceful resolution of these problems.

We are very concerned about the rise of militant fundamentalism in the Islamic states. And the potential is enormous. There are—17 of the 22 Islamic states in the world have declining incomes. Seventy percent of the Muslims in the world today are young people. The potential for explosion is great. And we have a great stake in promoting governments like the Moroccan government, for example. King Hassan has run a very responsible regime, has been helpful in peace in the Middle East, in many other ways. And we share the concern that the French have for the potential of the situation in Algeria getting out of hand. But what the United States wants to do is to stand up against terrorism and against destructive fundamentalism, but to stand with the people of Islam who wish to be full members of the world community, according to the rules that all civilized people should follow.

Rwanda

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. No, but we're willing to help. We have already offered several million dollars in aid. And we have discussed with our friends in Africa the prospect of an African force, which we would help to finance and

which we would also support with personnel equipment and other armored equipment and other transportation assistance. We are in a position to help there, and I think we should.

But I think many of the African nations are interested in trying to provide troops and helping to provide the manpower in that region. I think that is about all we can do at this time when we have troops in Korea, troops in Europe, the possibility of new commitments in Bosnia if we can achieve a peace agreement, and also when we are working very hard to try to put the U.N. agreement in Haiti back on track, which was broken.

However, we do want very much to try to help in Rwanda. And we are prepared to help to finance it and to provide the armored support necessary if the African nations will provide the troops. I don't think it would take all that many troops to stop a lot of this fighting if several African nations would go in together and do it.

[*A question was asked and President Mitterrand answered in French, but a translation was not provided.*]

President Clinton. If I might make one point about that. One of the things we learned in Somalia, where we were able to save hundreds of thousands of lives and where we lost some of our people, most of them in one unfortunate incident, was that even a humanitarian mission will inevitably be caught up in the politics of a country, unless people are starving and dying because of a natural disaster. If there is not a natural disaster causing all this human misery, then there is some politics behind people dying.

So in this case, where it's even more obvious, that is, Rwanda—even more obvious what the political and military problems are than in Somalia—I think the U.N. was very wise in asking the African countries to take the lead because they will be there over the long run. That is where the partnerships must be built. That is where the national territorial boundaries must be respected. And countries like France and the United States should support them. But I think this is an important test for them. And if they can do it, it will mean much more over the long run to Africa.

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Yes.

[*At this point, two questions were asked and President Mitterrand answered in French, but translations were not provided.*]

International Economy

President Clinton. I think this recommendation grows out of the work Mr. Delors has been doing about the problem of growth in Europe and generating jobs. And this is a problem, of course, that we will be taking up in another month when the G–7 meets in Naples, discussing this. There are many people, thoughtful people, who believe that there is a disconnection, if you will, between the real economy—that is, the economy in which people get up and go to work every day—and what happens in the financial markets and that perhaps the financial markets overreact to a little bit of growth, run the interest rates up, and then shut growth off before there is a real danger of inflation. So this is something which ought to be discussed.

Now, whether there could ever be an economic security council, I don't know. Keep in mind the Security Council of the U.N. deals with a whole range of different issues on a case-by-case basis. We would have to think, what would the jurisdiction be; what could be done?

But what Mr. Delors is doing, as he normally does, is asking us to think hard about a real problem for which there is presently no response in the global community. So I applaud him, but I can't say I have thought it through enough to endorse the idea.

Foreign Aid

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Well, we're prepared to invest quite a lot in it. We have brought down our defense budget quite a lot, from my point of view, as much as I think we should cut it. So I'm having discussions with my Congress now, asking them not to cut the defense budget any more and also to provide good increases in aid to many of the states of the former Soviet Union, not simply Russia but also Ukraine and other of those new countries. Now, we have a big stake in their success, also Eastern Europe. A lot of what needs to be done is in the way of assuring the success of their private economies and getting more investment and trade going.

But I think we should—all the countries of the West need to be very concerned that now that communism is gone, what rises up in its

place succeeds. You don't want them to go back to sort of a precommunist state of almost hostility toward the rest of the world. So the market economy has to begin to take hold there and has to succeed for ordinary people. And we should help it do that.

[*A question was asked and President Mitterrand answered in French, but a translation was not provided.*]

International Economy

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Well, first of all, let me say that there is no simple answer to this. The United States has somewhat more flexible labor markets than most European countries inasmuch as the unemployment benefits, for example, are less generous and the average payroll cost, over and above wages, tends to be lower. That may be one of the reasons that even with a relatively open economy, we have a lower unemployment rate. But keep in mind, we pay a price for that. We have lower unemployment, but we also have had very little growth in wages over the last 20 years. And the inequality, the gap in earnings between the richest Americans and the middle class has been growing. And that's not a good thing for democracy.

So I think what I hope we can do through the G–7, and perhaps through the OECD, is to really look at what all of us do individually about this problem, and see if we can reach the best conclusion about how you can maximize employment and still be fair to middle-income earners.

Let me also say that I think over the long run, we will have to involve these labor questions and environmental questions in our trade dealings with the developing nations. That is, they should want not only investment from our countries and us to buy their products but also they should want the wage base in their own countries to grow at a reasonable rate.

[*President Mitterrand then responded in French, but a translation was not provided.*]

Media Criticism

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Well, let me say, every time I'm in Paris, I love being here. And yesterday, when I heard President Mitterrand make his wonderful speech, I envied the French. But I love my country. I don't like everything about our political system. And if you have a very broad range of freedom of speech, sometimes that freedom is abused, not only in getting into areas that shouldn't be gotten into, but sometimes you don't even have the truth.

But that's just all part of it. I trust that, in the end, that our democracy will work its way through this. And all I can do is get up every day and do my job for the American people. I do the very best I can every day, and I'll let them worry about the attacks on me. If I weren't trying to change the country, if I weren't trying to do things that I believe will advance our country, then the people who oppose me wouldn't be attacking me, personally or otherwise. So I take it as a compliment and go on.

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Well, I have a pretty thick hide. You have to have a high pain threshold to be in politics in America today. But I say, on the book there, if people don't like my process—I like to get people together around a table and let everybody say what they want and argue and debate and fight. And I think that's the way ideas get fleshed out in a new and difficult time. I don't think you can have a hidebound decisionmaking process when you're entering a world where no one has the answers.

But I'll say this, let my critics answer the results: We have 3.3 million jobs in 16 months; the unemployment rate is down over a point and a half; the growth rate is up. Let them criticize my economic decisionmaking. We produce results. That's all that matters. The American people are better off, and we're going in the right direction. And so I can stand criticism if the results are there.

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. I like that. [*Laughter*]

American Political System

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Well, perhaps, although the American people are more jealous of their executive power. I think if they lengthen the term of the President, they would only let him serve one term.

Four years has really, normally has been enough. Now, in my case, there was really no honeymoon; I mean, they started campaigning immediately after I took office. But that's all part of it. I still think the more important thing is to keep sharply focused on achieving results for the people you represent.

There are pluses and minuses to every system; there is no perfect political system. The challenge of democracy today is to mobilize people's energies enough to get things done. The real problem is, everywhere in countries, there are so many forces working against doing anything when what we need to do is to move on these problems, not just to talk about them but to do things. And that has been my whole orientation.

President's Goals

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Yes. Well, I want my country to go into the 21st century still strong and healthy, not just economically but spiritually. I want us to have stronger communities. I want us to be together, even though we're very diverse. And I want us to be engaged in the world, leading, playing a positive role. That is what I want. I think that's what we all want. That's what democracy should be able to produce in this time.

Hillary Clinton

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. I don't know. She's a very able person. But she always told me, as long as we've been together, that she never wanted to run for office herself, that that was never one of the—she loves many jobs. And she works like crazy. She works very hard on things that she passionately believes in. But from the first time I met her, she always said she never wanted to run for elected office. The more I do it, the more I understand why. [*Laughter*]

[*A question was asked and President Mitterrand answered in French, but a translation was not provided.*]

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Thank you.

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. Bill, Mr. President, either one.

Q. [*In French; translation not provided.*]

President Clinton. You know more about that than I do.

Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:05 p.m. at the Elysee Palace. The interviewers were Patrick Poivre d'Arvor, TF1, and Christine Ockrent, FRANCE 2 television. In his remarks, the President referred to Jacques Delors, President, European Commission.

Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by President François Mitterrand of France in Paris

June 7, 1994

Mr. President, Madame Mitterrand, Mr. Prime Minister, Madame Balladur, distinguished citizens of France, my fellow Americans, and honored guests, this week, as our two nations mark the 50th anniversary of D-Day and the battles of World War II, I'm glad to have this chance to note the special place France will always have in America's heart. So many of our greatest sons and daughters have shared that attachment. Our first two ministers to this great land were Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Franklin Roosevelt loved France. So did John and Jacqueline Kennedy.

As President, every day as I go to work I am reminded of the bonds between our two nations. The park across the street from the White House is Lafayette Park. No statue in all of Washington stands closer to the Oval Office itself than that of Rochambeau. Today we're building new bonds between our republics as we work together to address the great endeavors of our time, many of which the President has already outlined, building bridges toward the East, opening the world markets, doing what we can to support democracy, working to strengthen the NATO Alliance and to unify Europe through the Partnership For Peace, cooperating to address the most difficult and painful conflicts of this era. Mr. President, the United States supports a strong Europe, an integrated Europe, a Europe with political and economic and security unity and singleness of purpose with its appreciation of diversity.

We wish to be partners with you in the common struggles of the 21st century. The fact that we have sometimes a difficult partnership makes it all the more interesting and also makes some things in life less necessary.

Our wonderful Founding Father, Benjamin Franklin, once said, "Our enemies are our friends, for they show us our faults." Sometimes with the French and the Americans we no longer need enemies. [*Laughter*] But it is always in the spirit of goodwill and brotherhood.

I can honestly say that with every passing day of my Presidency I come to appreciate France more, the strength, the will, the vision, the possibilities of genuine partnership. I think it is our common destiny, as you alluded, Mr. President, to see that our countries remain forever young, forever restless, forever questing, forever looking for new hills to climb, new challenges to meet, new problems to solve.

As I was preparing for this visit, I was given something by another of America's greatest admirers of your nation, our Ambassador, Mrs. Harriman. She sent me a poem composed in memory of the gallant soldiers who died on D-Day, from the members of the Allied effort to storm the beaches of Normandy to the shadow warriors of the French Resistance and the Free French army, without whom Europe would not be free today. Here it is:

Went the day well.
We died and never knew.
But well or ill,
Freedom, we died for you.

Mr. President, the United States and France are destined forever to be the beacons of freedom for the entire world. Please join me now in a toast to the democratic spirit of our beloved nations, to the heroes of D-Day whose sacrifices we came to honor, and to the proposition that the spirit of liberty should burn forever brightly in the hearts of all the people of France and the United States of America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:19 p.m. in the Salle des Fetes at the Elysee Palace. In his remarks, he referred to Danielle Mitterrand, wife of President Mitterrand; Marie Joseph Balladur, wife of Prime Minister Balladur; and Pamela Harriman, U.S. Ambassador to France.

Statement on Assistance to California

June 7, 1994

Californians have been working extraordinarily hard to get their homes, their businesses, and their lives back to normal. This is creating unexpected and unprecedented need for assistance from the Federal Government. This recommendation should assure the people of southern California that our commitment to help them get back on their feet remains strong and unwavering.

NOTE: The statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on the President's request to Congress for additional funds to assist the State of California in the wake of the earthquake earlier this year.

Remarks on Receiving a Doctorate in Civil Law From Oxford University in Oxford, United Kingdom

June 8, 1994

Thank you very much, Chancellor, distinguished members of the university community. I must say that it was quite easy for me to take the chancellor's gentle ribbing about the Presidency, since he is probably the only chancellor of this great university ever to have written a biography of an American President. I thank you for your biography of President Tru-

man and for your leadership and for honoring me.

You know, as I walked today through the streets of Oxford with my wife and with my classmate, now the Secretary of Labor in our administration, Mr. Reich, who is here, it seemed almost yesterday when I first came here. And I remembered when I walked in this august building today how I always felt a mixture of elation and wariness, bordering on intimidation, in your presence. I thought if there was one place in the world I could come and give a speech in the proper language, it was here, and then I heard the degree ceremony. [*Laughter*] And sure enough, once again at Oxford I was another Yank a half step behind. [*Laughter*]

This week the world has taken a profound journey of remembrance. Here in Great Britain, in the United States and France and Italy, all around the world we have reflected on a time when the sheer will of freedom's forces changed the course of this century.

Many of you in this room, including my good friend, the former warden of Rhodes House, Sir Edgar Williams, who is here with me today, played a major role in that great combat. It was a great privilege and honor for me to represent the United States in paying tribute to all the good people who fought and won World War II, an experience I have never had the like of and one which has profoundly deepened my own commitment to the work the people of the United States have entrusted to me.

I am also deeply honored by this degree you have bestowed on me, as well as the honorary fellowship I received from my college today. I must say that, as my wife pointed out, I could have gotten neither one of these things on my own. [*Laughter*] I had to be elected President to do it—with her help. Indeed, it was suggested on the way over here that if women had been eligible for the Rhodes Scholarship in 1968, I might be on my way home to Washington tonight at this very moment. [*Laughter*]

I am profoundly grateful for this chance to be with you and for this honor, not only because of the wonderful opportunity I had to live and study here a quarter century ago but because of the traditions, the achievements, the spirit of discovery, and the deep inspiration of this noble university. Even in a country so steeped in history, there are few institutions as connected to the past as Oxford. Every ritual here, no matter how small, has a purpose, reminding us that we must be part of something larger than ourselves, heirs to a proud legacy.

Yet Oxford could hardly be called backward-looking. Over the centuries, as a center of inquiry and debate, this great university has been very much involved in the action and passion of its time. Just listen outside here: everything from disputes over battles to the nature of the Italian Government to the character of the word "skinhead"—[*laughter*]—is being debated even as we are here.

This university has been very much committed to passing on our legacy to yet another generation. Our first obligation is what I have been doing here this week: It is remembrance—to know how we came to be what we are we have all learned again this week in reflecting on the uncommon valor and the utter loss that bought us 50 years of freedom. I know I speak for everyone in this theater when I say, again, a profound thank you to the generation which won World War II. We can never forget what was done for us. Our memories of that sacrifice will be forever alive.

But our obligations surely go beyond memory. After all, when the soldiers of D-Day broke through at Normandy, when the sons and daughters of democracy carried on their struggle for another half-century, winning the cold war against the iron grip of totalitarian repression, they fought not for the past but for the present and the future. And now it falls to us to use that hard-won freedom, to follow through in this time, expanding democracy, security, prosperity, fighting bigotry, terrorism, slaughter, and chaos around the world.

There are—make no mistake about it—forces of disintegration at work in the world today, and to some extent even within our own countries, that could rob our children of the bright future for which so many of our parents gave their lives.

There are also, to be sure, forces of humanity in progress which, if they prevail, could bring human history to its highest point of peace and prosperity. At this rare moment, we must be prepared to move forward, for in the end, the numberless sacrifices of our forebears brought us to precisely this, an age in which many threats to our very existence have been brought under control for the moment.

So what shall we do with the moment? Our challenge is to unite our people around the opportunities of peace, as those who went before

us united against the dangers of war and oppression. The great Oxford don Sir Isaiah Berlin once said, "Men do not live only by fighting evils; they live by positive goals, a vast variety of them, seldom predictable, at times incompatible."

History does not always give us grand crusades, but it always gives us opportunities. It is time to bring a spirit of renewal to the work of freedom—to work at home to tap the full potential of our citizens, to strengthen our families and communities, to fight indifference and intolerance; and beyond our borders, to keep our nations strong so that we can create a new security, here especially, all across Europe; to reverse the environmental destruction that feeds the civil wars in Africa; to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and terrorism; to light the lives of those still dwelling in the darkness of undemocratic rule.

Our work in this world, all of it, will surely take all of our lifetimes and more. But we must keep at it, working together with steadiness and wisdom, with ingenuity and simple faith. To those of you here in this ancient temple of learning and those beyond who are of a younger generation, I urge you to join this work with enthusiasm and high hope.

This week, at the gravesites of the generation that fought and died to make us the children of their sacrifice, I promised that we would be the new pathfinders, lighting the way in a new and still uncertain age, striving in peace as they struggled in war. There is no greater tribute to give to those who have gone before than to build for those who follow. Surely, that is the timeless mission of freedom and civilization itself. It is what binds together the past, the present, and the future. It is our clear duty, and we must do our best to fulfill it.

Thank you very much for this wonderful day.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:32 p.m. in the Sheldonian Theater. In his remarks, he referred to the Right Honorable Lord Jenkins of Hillhead, chancellor of the university.

Message to the Congress on the Elections in South Africa
June 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to sections 4(a)(2) and 5(b)(1) of the South African Democratic Transition Support Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–149; 22 U.S.C. 5001 note), I hereby certify that an interim government, elected on a nonracial basis through free and fair elections, has taken office in South Africa.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 8, 1994.

Message to the Congress Reporting Budget Deferrals
June 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report two revised deferrals of budget authority, now totaling $555.2 million.

The deferrals affect the Department of Agriculture. The details of the two revised deferrals are contained in the attached report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

June 8, 1994.

NOTE: The report detailing the deferrals was published in the *Federal Register* on June 21.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Commodity Credit Corporation
June 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress (15 U.S.C. 714k), I transmit herewith the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1992.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 8, 1994.

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
June 8, 1994

The President announced today the nominations of four individuals as Federal judges. He nominated James L. Dennis to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and announced the following U.S. District Court nominees: Napoleon A. Jones, Jr., for the Southern District of California; David F. Hamilton for the Southern District of Indiana; and Sarah S. Vance for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

"Each of these individuals has demonstrated both excellence in the legal profession and commitment to public service," the President said.

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

Statement on Congressional Action on Health Care Reform
June 9, 1994

Today is an historic day. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee has become the first full congressional committee to report out a health care reform bill. The action of Chairman Kennedy's committee gives me great confidence that Congress will pass legislation this year that meets the expectation of the American people: guaranteed private insurance for every American that can never be taken away. Once again, Chairman Kennedy has demonstrated the leadership that has made him a driving force in the fight for quality health care for the last three decades.

Under the leadership of Chairman Moynihan, the Senate Finance Committee is moving. Chairman Moynihan is committed to achieving universal coverage and bringing legislation to the American people this year.

For the first time in our history, committees in both the Senate and the House are seriously moving forward on health care reform. While much work remains, today's actions prove that the job will be done. The momentum demonstrated in the House and Senate this week is heartening to me and all Americans who want and deserve real health security.

Remarks Announcing Additional Economic Sanctions Against Haiti
June 10, 1994

Good afternoon. Today I want to have Bill Gray, our Special Adviser on Haiti, announce two new steps that are necessary to intensify the pressure on that country's military leaders, a ban on commercial air traffic and sanctions on financial transactions.

As Bill Gray will explain, these steps represent an important new stage in our efforts to restore democracy and return President Aristide to Haiti. The message is simple: Democracy must be restored; the coup must not endure.

In the past month, we have taken steps to advance the interests of the Haitian people and the United States. Our national interests, to help democracy thrive in this hemisphere and to protect the lives of thousands of Americans who live and work in Haiti, require us to strengthen these efforts.

Under our leadership, comprehensive United Nations trade sanctions have gone into force. To enforce these sanctions, we are moving to assist the Dominican Republic to seal its shared border with Haiti. The Dominican Republic has agreed to welcome a multilateral sanctions monitoring team to help the Dominicans seal their border.

We've deployed U.S. naval patrol boats to the area to stop smugglers and have begun detaining ships suspected of violating the sanctions. We've also made important strides in dealing with the difficult issue of Haitians who leave that country by sea. A facility to interview Haitians who have been interdicted will soon open in Jamaica. And one month from now, we will open a second interview facility on the Turks and Caicos Islands. I want to thank the governments of those countries and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees for their collaboration in this effort.

I want to be clear about this issue. I continue to urge all Haitians to avoid risking their lives in treacherous boat voyages. Anyone who fears persecution should apply for refugee status at our facilities within Haiti. Since our administration began, those offices have arranged resettlement for some 3,000 Haitian political refugees, far, far more than was the case prior to that time. They stand ready to review further cases and represent the safest and fastest way for Haitians to seek refuge.

Now I'd like to ask Bill Gray, who stepped into this very difficult role and has used great skill to make real progress, to explain these new steps which we're announcing today.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:22 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. The Executive order on financial transactions with Haiti is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress on Additional Economic Sanctions Against Haiti
June 10, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 of October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 of October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c), I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 of June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under

United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 of June 16, 1993.

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 of October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. On May 7, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12914 of May 7, 1994, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. On May 21, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12917 of May 21, 1994, to impose economic measures required by Resolution 917. These latter actions were taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

On June 10, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12920 of June 10, 1994, prohibiting additional transactions with Haiti.

This new Executive order:

—prohibits payment or transfer of funds or other assets to Haiti from or through the United States or to or through the United States from Haiti, with exceptions for activities of the United States Government, the United Nations, the Organization of American States, or foreign diplomatic missions, certain payments related to humanitarian assistance in Haiti, limited family remittances, funds for travel-related expenses, and payments incidental to exempt shipments of food, medicine, medical supplies, and informational materials;

—prohibits the sale, supply, or exportation by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of any goods, technology, or services to Haiti or in connection with Haitian businesses, or activities by United States persons or in the United States that promote such sale, supply, or exportation, except for the sale, supply, or exportation of informational materials, certain foodstuffs, and medicines and medical supplies;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to tighten the embargo against Haiti with the goal of the restoration of democracy in that nation and the prompt return of the legitimately elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, under the framework of the Governors Island Agreement.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 10, 1994.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Memorandum on Air Transportation to Haiti
June 10, 1994

Memorandum for the Secretary of Transportation

Subject: Scheduled Air Service Ban

In furtherance of the international effort to remove the *de facto* regime in Haiti and to restore the democratically elected Aristide government, I have taken certain steps in the Executive order that I issued today.

In addition, I have determined that it is in the essential foreign policy interests of the Unit-

ed States that additional action beyond that in Executive Order No. 12914 of May 7, 1994, be taken regarding transportation by air to Haiti. I have determined that, with respect to regularly scheduled commercial passenger flights of U.S. and Haitian air carriers, and except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, authorizations, or licenses that may be issued by the Department of the Treasury in consultation with the Departments of State and Transportation, the following is prohibited: the granting of permission to any aircraft to take off from, land in, or overfly the territory of the United States, if the aircraft, as part of the same flight or as a continuation of that flight, is destined to land in or has taken off from the territory of Haiti.

The Department of Transportation should take appropriate action to implement this decision. That action should be effective as of 11:59 p.m., eastern daylight time on June 24, 1994, and these measures should remain in effect until further notification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation With Senator Edward M. Kennedy on Health Care Reform

June 10, 1994

The President. Hello.

Senator Kennedy. Mr. President.

The President. How are you, Senator?

Senator Kennedy. Well, real well, better today than any other time than we've been for a long time. Your program is on track. We've got a lot of enthusiasm for it. People are excited. They know that for the first time in the history of the country we're going to get a chance to debate this. And your leadership and Mrs. Clinton's leadership has just made an extraordinary difference.

The President. Well, I thought you were terrific. I tell you, you and all the people that voted with you in the committee are really going to give the country a chance to have an honest debate about this now. There's been an awful lot of charges and countercharges in the air and a lot of misinformation. But the fundamental fact is that we're now going to have a chance to decide as a nation whether we're going to give health care coverage to all of our people in the context that will enable us to bring some of the costs down and keep some of the bad things from occurring that are happening today. And I'm really elated about it.

Senator Kennedy. Well, I think the people are really beginning to sort of understand that after all the posturing and statements and speeches, that we are for the first time going to have a chance to do something for families in this country. And I think that's really the good news.

The one thing that we have seen very, very clear in the last 2 weeks is that the politics of negativism and the politics of criticism and the naysayers may be able to get attention for the early rounds, but I just can't believe that that kind of attitude can last. I find in traveling around Massachusetts, people are asking, "If you're against the program, what are you really for?" And I think that the fact that you've been out there day-in and day-out, fighting for something that's going to make a difference for families, working families, is really making a difference. And we've had good conversations today and last night with Chairman Moynihan and a number of the members of that committee this morning. And I know we've got a battle through there, but quite frankly, I think that this health program of yours has come to pass.

The President. Well, you were there a long time before anybody else. I still remember the speech you gave in Memphis in 1978. And you convinced me we needed to get off our dime and go to work. It's just taken us 16 years to get a bill out of committee, but I'm ready to roll. [*Laughter*] And the American people are deeply in your debt, and we now have a chance to do it. And I just want to assure you, I'm going to do everything I can.

I want to also say a special word of thanks to you for making the effort to reach out to Republicans and give them a chance to be part of the process. You and I know they're under enormous partisan pressure not to participate.

But Senator Jeffords voted with us yesterday, and many of the Republicans offered amendments and did other things that you gave them a chance to do. And I hope this will be eventually like Social Security and Medicare, where a number of them will finally come around in the end. And I think they will, in part because you kept the door open and worked with them so carefully.

Senator Kennedy. Well, just on that, on the benefit package approach on it, we had 17 to nothing, all the Republicans as well as the Democrats; and the long-term care, we are 15 to 2; on the privacy provisions that are going to even fill in some of the abuses that exist today, we had virtually unanimous support; the training programs, 11 to 6; the quality issues, which are so important, 13 to 4. We picked up many Republicans on different provisions of it. And I think, obviously, I know how you have worked to try and make sure they're going to be there during the debate on the floor. I think they will be.

The President. We've just got to keep hitting it. I'm ready if you are.

Senator Kennedy. Okay. Listen, it's good to—really appreciate you. We're all looking forward to you coming back to Massachusetts sometime.

The President. Me, too.

Senator Kennedy. Particularly Patrick. He said you had a good time up there with him the other day, too.

The President. We really had a good time. And I was so pleased. He seemed to be doing very well, and he seemed to be enjoying himself immensely.

Senator Kennedy. Well, it was very kind.

I talked to the First Lady this morning, as well. So she's already busy strategizing and moving along on the program.

The President. Thanks.

Senator Kennedy. Thanks an awful lot.

The President. All right, man.

Senator Kennedy. Good to talk to you.

The President. Goodbye. Thank you, sir.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President. Bye-bye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:48 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Rhode Island congressional candidate Patrick Kennedy, the Senator's son.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation With Senator James M. Jeffords on Health Care Reform

June 10, 1994

The President. Hello.

Senator Jeffords. Hello, Jim Jeffords here.

The President. Hi, Senator. I just wanted to thank you for your help yesterday and for your leadership on the health care bill and to say especially how much I appreciate the work you did to get the WIC program fully funded. I know how much it means to you and how much good it's going to do for the children of this country.

Senator Jeffords. Well, thank you, Mr. President. I deeply appreciate that. And I want to thank you for your leadership. You got us going on this road, and I think with Senator Kennedy's help we took a big step yesterday to getting our health care bill that we all want.

The President. Well, I really appreciate the fact that you were willing to work with us and to vote for it. I know that some other Republicans offered some amendments and voted for some of the provisions of the health care bill in the committee, and I hope that by the time we get around to voting on the floor we'll have a bill that can get some more bipartisan support. I know they're under a lot of pressure not to vote for anything, but I know that you have some colleagues who agree with you and who will eventually put the interests of the country first just as you have done.

I'm just honored to be in this fight with you, and I think we have to keep working and reaching out to others and trying to broaden the

base. And I know that's what you want to do, too.

Senator Jeffords. I certainly do, and we made a big step in that direction yesterday. And Nancy Kassebaum and also Dave Durenberger, with me, put an amendment in that I think if we'd been able to pass it, it probably would have gotten on board. And——

The President. What was the amendment?

Senator Jeffords. ——it gave me confidence that we're going to be able to do it on the floor. And I've talked to a number of others. I'm confident, again, that when we get on the Senate floor and with a little more tinkering, we'll be able to get a good bipartisan bill for you.

The President. Well, I'm ready to work with you. We can do it. We can do it. Thanks to you, and I'll never forget it. And let's just keep working at it.

Senator Jeffords. Okay, thank you. And I thank the First Lady for her call this morning. I deeply appreciated that, and it's been great working with her and Ira Magaziner. They're two wonderful people.

The President. Thanks. Have a good day.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:54 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

The President's Radio Address
June 11, 1994

Good morning. For me and for many of you, last week was a time of remembrance and rededication. As we marked the 50th anniversary of D-Day, a grateful nation honored the generation of heroes who fought and won World War II and built us 50 years of freedom.

I had the privilege of representing our country at ceremonies honoring all those who liberated Europe. It was an experience I'll never forget. And I came home with a renewed sense of commitment to the work we must do in our time.

The generation of heroes whom we honored last week never lost faith in the promise of America. They worked their way out of the Great Depression, defeated fascism on three continents, and built half a century of prosperity for their children and grandchildren. With the history they made they proved what a great democracy can accomplish when we work together for a great purpose.

Yet today, too many have lost that faith. After years of deadlock and division and drift, too many doubt that our democratic process can change our lives for the better. Well, democracy can be imperfect. After all, it's run by and it represents human beings. Its workings are often untidy, and its pace can be frustratingly slow. But unlike any other system of government, it allows the people's wisdom to prevail, and ultimately something good and decent gets done.

This morning I want to tell you about something profoundly important we're working to accomplish. For weeks we've been told that health care reform is dead, that America will continue to be the only advanced country in the world that spends more than anybody else on health care and does less with it, leaving tens of millions of our fellow citizens without health insurance, tens of millions more with inadequate insurance, and even more with the constant risk of losing their coverage. But the truth is, in spite of all the naysayers, our Nation is closer than ever before to achieving a goal that President Truman set after World War II, "real health care security for every family."

Last week, for the first time in history, Congress took several giant steps toward a bill that answers the call of history and provides guaranteed private insurance for every American. Senator Kennedy's Labor and Human Resources Committee approved a bill providing guaranteed private insurance for every family. The Senate Finance Committee is moving forward under the leadership of Chairman Moynihan, who is also committed to achieving coverage for all Americans.

Meanwhile, other important congressional committees continue their work, and soon the House and the Senate will debate and decide on a bill that will make our families' anxieties about health care a thing of the past.

This isn't just about the uninsured, although their numbers are growing and nearing 40 million. It's also about the tens of millions of Americans, most of them hard-working, middle class people, who live with the uncertainty of never knowing whether their health care will be there when they need it. After all, they could have a member of their family get sick or they could lose their jobs or they could change jobs and they couldn't get insurance on the new one. The only way all of our people will be secure is when every American knows that whether they lose their job, change jobs, move their home, get sick, get injured, or just grow old, their health care will be there.

Others urge half-measures and quick fixes. They say they're reforming the health care system, but they fail to provide every American with the ironclad guarantee that they'll have private health insurance that can never be taken away. Health care reform just isn't the real thing unless middle class working people are guaranteed coverage, and after at least 50 years of delay, the American people deserve the real thing.

I'll tell you why I'm fighting so hard for this health care reform. Every day Hillary and I, the Vice President, people in our administration, we all hear about hard-working Americans whose lives are being torn apart by uncertainties about their health care. People like Jim Bryant, who told the Boston Globe that he works 70 hours a week but has no health insurance for his family. He wonders if it's fair that he misses his son's soccer games on Saturdays to go to his second job while people who are on welfare have health benefits he and his family don't have. In a moment of frustration he pointed out to his wife that if they broke up she and their sons could get benefits that working families like theirs can't afford.

That's just not right. No one who works should have to go on welfare to get health insurance. And everyone on welfare should have the opportunity to go to work without losing health care coverage. It's families like the Bryants who will get no help at all from half-measures, quick fixes, and Band-Aid-style reforms. For the sake of these hard-working families, let's not leave anyone out. Let's cover everyone. Let's get the job done this year.

In the weeks ahead, you'll hear from special interests who do very well in the present system and who prefer the deadlock of political systems to the reform of health care. For months, those who do well in the present system and those who want for political reasons to beat health care reform, have blitzed the American people with mountains of false information about our health care plan. They say it means Government regulation of the whole system. They say it means taking away benefits from Americans. But the truth is what we want is private insurance for everyone. We want to keep the private health care delivery system that's the best in the world for people who have access to it. We want to give a break to small businesses so they can afford health insurance that's good. But we think everybody should be covered and everyone should take responsibility for doing it.

Now, if you keep faith with democracy, if you'll make your voice heard, we can break gridlock even on this most difficult issue that has frustrated Americans for 50 years. And the national interests will prevail over narrow interests. I know we can succeed.

Helen Keller once wrote that "the world is moved along not only by the mighty shoves of its heroes but also by the aggregate of the tiny pushes of each honest worker." Americans from every part of the country and every walk of life have called for fundamental health care reform this year. The steps that Congress took last week proved that the voice of the people is being heard.

I urge you to tell your elected Representatives that we need to do this, do it right, and do it now.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks at the Welcoming Ceremony for Emperor Akihito and Empress Michiko of Japan

June 13, 1994

Your Majesties, distinguished guests: On behalf of the people of the United States, I am deeply honored to welcome Your Majesties to Washington and our Nation for your first visit since you ascended to the Chrysanthemum Throne.

When Hillary and I had the great pleasure of visiting your beautiful country last year, we were honored by your invitation to the wonderful banquet at the Imperial Palace for the G–7 leaders. The people of Japan welcomed us with open arms and left us deeply impressed by their warmth and their society, which blends the most ancient traditions with the most modern technologies.

During the next 2 weeks, as you make your way across our land, the American people will have the opportunity to return the hospitality that you showed to us. From the great cities of the East to the peaks of the Rocky Mountains to the ports of the West, we welcome you not as visitors but as honored guests and old friends.

In the next 2 weeks, you will see much more than vistas, landscapes, and monuments. You will also meet, as Your Majesty said on your last visit here, as many people from as many walks of life as possible. Our people, after all, are the essence of America. I know they look forward to welcoming you into their homes and communities. And I am certain you will be impressed with them and that they will be impressed with you and your great knowledge of our Nation, our culture, and our history.

You will also witness the tremendous contributions that Japanese-Americans have made to our society and the growing influence of Japanese cultural heritage in America. The list is long. It includes distinguished artists and musicians. It includes athletes. It includes business leaders and eminent leaders of our political system.

In your travels, you will find that almost every American city boasts buildings inspired by the fluid and elegant lines of Japanese architects. In millions of American homes you will see the works of Japanese printmakers and gardens that might well fit in Kyoto. And in our elementary schools and colleges, you will meet thousands of Americans struggling to learn and to master your wonderful Japanese language. These studies, in fact, are among the fastest growing courses in our schools today.

Think how different the world was when Your Majesty first came to America more than 40 years ago. Nations were rebuilding from the devastation of war, and vivid memories of that conflict divided our two people. Misunderstanding and even ignorance divided us, and more than borders blocked the sharing of ideas. When you visited New York in 1953, you were shown a demonstration of a brandnew technology. Your eager American hosts called it color television. Today, as we gather here, millions and millions of Japanese citizens are watching us as we speak because their households are linked by sets to us through the miracle of satellite.

Today's ceremony is but one symbol of what the combined talents and ingenuity of our two people can produce. Surely we have come far since the days when one of our great teachers on Japan, your friend and our Ambassador, Edwin O. Reischauer, observed that our two countries were using the same set of binoculars but looking through opposite ends. Today, we share a common vision.

It is a vision of democracy and prosperity, of a world where we trade freely in ideas and goods, a vision of a world that protects and secures the rights and freedoms of all human beings, a vision of a world at peace. You have called the era of your reign, *Heisei,* "fulfilling peace," and nothing could be more important to our Nation than working with you to achieve that goal.

Your Majesties visit us at a moment when it is clear that the destinies of our two peoples are inextricably linked, a moment in history when every day yields new challenges. But those challenges bring with them the opportunity for us to carve new paths together.

Let us listen to the elegant words left to us by the Japanese poet, Tachibana Akemi: "It is a pleasure when, rising in the morning, I go outside and find a flower that has bloomed that was not there yesterday." That verse is more than a century old, but its message is timeless.

Every day brings with it the promise of a new blossom: the prospect of progress and growing friendship between our two peoples.

Your Majesties, our commitment to common ideals is firm. Our determination to work with you is strong. Our welcome to you today is sincere and heartfelt. We are privileged to receive you in the United States.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:14 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Teleconference With the U.S. Conference of Mayors

June 13, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mayor Abramson, for what you said and for the outstanding leadership that you've given this year. I want to say hello to you and to Mayor Ashe and to your host mayor, Mayor Katz, my good friend. I wish I were there to be with all of you in the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I know you've had a wonderful stay, and I wish that I could have come out there and seen you, especially in Portland, the city I always love to visit.

I appreciate what you said, Mayor Abramson, about the work we've done together. And I appreciate the leadership that you gave and the initiative and the energy that you put into making sure that I followed through on our common ambitious goals for our country. Both of us want the same things. We want to bring our people back together. We want to move our country forward. We want to restore the importance of work and responsibility. We want to strengthen our families and our communities. We want to provide opportunity. We want to promote values, but when we do, we know we are strengthening the fiber of American life in ways that will take this country into the 21st century, will make our cities and our communities work again but will also ensure that our country will go into the next century still the greatest country in the world.

That's why our administration has sought to strengthen families by rewarding parents who work. Tomorrow I will continue that effort when I present our blueprint for welfare reform in Kansas City, Missouri. I'll be there with one of your number, Mayor Emanuel Cleaver, who, along with others in the U.S. Conference of Mayors, has been a terrific help to the White House on this welfare reform issue.

If our people are willing to work hard and to hold their families together, then it seems to me the rest of us have a shared responsibility to help them hold their lives and their communities together. That's also one reason why the crime bill is important to me.

I want to just thank all of you for helping to move that crime bill through both Houses of Congress. But I also want to remind you that the bill is not yet law. This week, Members of the House and the Senate will sit down together and start to hammer out a conference report that both Chambers can pass and that all of us can support, that I can sign into law this year, and begin to move this year. We have now waited 6 long years for a national comprehensive crime bill, and we shouldn't have to wait much longer. So while you're out there in Portland, I hope you'll give your delegation in Congress a call. Take advantage of the boiler room that Mayor Abramson and the conference staff has set up to make it easier for you to send this message. And tell the Congress that our communities do need more police, more punishment, more prevention, and they need it now. Tell them you need that crime bill so we can hire 100,000 new police officers and put them to work in communities that need them most, that we need more certain punishment of criminal behavior and smarter and more comprehensive prevention efforts.

Too many of our young people have grown up without appreciating that there are consequences to their behavior. The crime bill must change that. You and I both know that punishment, however, can only be part of the solution. We've got to give our children something to say yes to. We've got to reinforce the fact that responsible behavior will ultimately bring rewards. That's why we've got to have a crime

bill with a youth employment and a skills program to create opportunities for kids in places where very few now exist; why I want a crime bill with an Ounce of Prevention Council, to keep kids off the street by keeping schools open after hours and expanding boys and girls clubs; why I want to promote more partnerships between our police officers and our young people, and things like midnight basketball leagues that cost so little but make a very big difference in communities like yours.

Investing in our young people through activities and summer jobs builds self-esteem, respect for others, a healthy work ethic at an early age. It's an investment worth making, especially when you consider how we pay for it, not through any new taxes but by cutting spending elsewhere in the Federal budget. What we do here in Washington, however, can only work if we give the people in your communities back home the tools they need to get the things done that have to be done.

As a former Governor who faced the burdens of Federal mandates for 12 long years, I know how questions over funding concern everything else you do, from putting more police on the street to providing clean water for people in your cities. That's why our people have been working with Members of Congress who are focused on this mandates issue. I can report to you that we're getting closer to a workable bill. And although there are still a few issues that remain to be resolved, I think we can see legislation acceptable to the Nation's mayors soon. And let me also assure you that resolving the issue of unfunded mandates does not mean abandoning our responsibilities to govern. I do believe that we must proceed in a more realistic way, providing greater flexibility about the constraints facing our State and local governments.

I know we share the same desire to see that every American has a chance to succeed. That's why we've worked to pass the lifetime learning agenda, from Head Start reauthorization to our education reforms to our school-to-work initiative to train America's high school students before they enter the work force. We've already seen more than 3 million new private-sector jobs created in this administration. But we still have to change our outmoded unemployment system to a reemployment system.

The reemployment act will enable cities to modernize their training and job placement systems. They'll set up one-stop centers where a worker can walk in, apply for unemployment benefits, find a new job, and arrange for long-term training. The reemployment act helps working families, and we should pass it this year, too. Working families, after all, are the building blocks of healthy cities and our healthy society.

They also shouldn't have to worry about the danger of losing their health care. That's why, last week, for the first time in the history of our Republic, believe it or not, a Senate committee finally approved a bill that guarantees private health insurance for every American family. Now other congressional committees are moving forward to achieve coverage for all Americans on health care.

I think the momentum is swinging to our side, and it's time to give every American a rock-solid guarantee that their health care can never be taken away. So I want to ask you to work with me to push aside half-measures, half-measures which are exploding the health care budgets of cities and States and the Federal Government, to make sure that every American will have the health care they need when they need it.

Let's be clear about what we should have. I want private insurance for everyone. I do not want a Government-run system. I do not want to take any part of the private system away from the private sector. But I do want to make sure private insurance is available for every American family.

Finally, let me just say that over the last year and a half, we've done a lot to make our national economy, our working families, and the American community more healthy, more safe, and more secure. A great deal has been accomplished already. But I know we can do a lot more, and you know we have a lot more to do.

So let's keep working together; let's keep working hard. Let's not be diverted or distracted or divided. Let's stay with our minds focused on the people we were elected to represent. Together we can do what we have to do for this great country to make sure that, as we near the end of this decade and this century, America will still be the greatest and the best place in the world to live.

Thank you very much.

Mayor Jerry Abramson. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I wonder if we might ask a couple of questions so that we can have a little bit of dialog before you have to go.

The President. I'd be disappointed if you didn't. It wouldn't be you. [*Laughter*]

[*Mayor Abramson of Louisville, KY, asked about Federal mandate legislation.*]

The President. Well, we're very close, I think, to resolving all the outstanding questions. And I think they will be resolved soon. I have nothing but the highest compliments for Senator Kempthorne and Senator Glenn, Congressman Condit. They've been very good to work with us just to try to deal with some of the practical issues involved. And I expect that we will get a bill out this year that all of us can support. And I'm looking forward to it. And we've devoted a lot of time and energy to it. And I recognize that we have to have legislation. We cannot do everything we need to do with Executive orders. I believe we'll get that bill out.

There are just a couple of outstanding issues; they are not really big ones. And I think we'll get them resolved. And I believe that there's a good chance since a majority have signed on in both Houses that we can roll out an agreed-upon bill before the end of the year.

Mayor Abramson. Excellent. So Chairman Glenn, who will be, I guess, carrying the responsibility for the majority party as well as the White House, is in there presently negotiating those few remaining issues so that we can ultimately join together.

The President. But this has really been a pretty good bipartisan effort. I mean, Senator Kempthorne has also worked with us directly, along with John Glenn, who's a very good friend of mine and of the Nation's mayors. I feel very good about the spirit and the atmosphere and openness on this.

[*Mayor Abramson introduced Mayor Victor Ashe of Knoxville, TN, who asked about funding for crime prevention in the proposed crime bill and also suggested an increase in funding for youth service projects.*]

The President. On the first question, let me say I will work very hard to keep that prevention money in there. I think it is very important. Good prevention programs work. They are far less expensive, and more importantly, they save more lives and better futures.

On the other issue, I will see what I can do. I am generally very sympathetic to what you've said, but you've asked me a question that may have budgetary implications that I don't know the answer to. So I will double-check it. I will get back to you.

I think that it's important that the cities have as much flexibility as possible to hire young people, to give them things to do, to engage them in positive things. And I think that, clearly, there's lots of evidence that that helps to prevent crime.

Let me also just get in one more plug while I'm at it. I hope that all of you, as we increase the scope of our national service program, will see that in at least one instance in every city of any size in the country there will be an approved national service program so we can channel some of that funding in to help your young people work on the problems of your community.

I am very excited about it. We are going to have 20,000 people this fall, but by year after next we'll have 100,000 young Americans earning credit against education by serving in their communities. And I hope all of you will take full advantage of that.

[*Mayor Abramson introduced Mayor Norman Rice of Seattle, WA, who asked about financing for welfare reform.*]

The President. Well, let me say, I don't necessarily agree that there are better options available because I've looked with a fine-tooth comb through the Federal budget for them. But I'm certainly willing to work with you on other alternatives. If you have some alternatives, I'm willing to work with you on it.

Let me say that if you look at what we did with our bill as compared with, let's say, the Republican alternative, which has a lot in common with our bill and has some very good things in it, but they were funding it by essentially cutting off benefits to nonresident—or to resident but not legal—immigrants. And if you do that, that's really going to throw a big cost on local governments and State governments.

What we did with deeming rules were designed to—it was designed to keep costs from coming on to the Government that should be borne by families of immigrants who actually have good incomes and can afford to pay. So that's what we were attempting to do. I understand what the concerns are, I believe, of the mayors, and I'm more than willing to work with you if you can find any other ideas. But I have to say, we had to find money for the GATT round this year. And we had to find money

for our reemployment bill, and we have to find money for welfare reform. And under the budgeting rules of the Federal Government, we have to follow very strict procedures. We can't, for example, assume what I think is a reasonable reduction in welfare caseloads by the success of this reform. We can't assume what I think is a reasonable growth in the economy as a result of GATT. So we have very tough rules in terms of dedicating funds to this program.

And I had, myself, I had at least three long meetings on welfare reform, which major portions of the meeting were going over funding options as a result of the work Mr. Panetta did. So if you can find something better, I'll be glad to talk to you about it. But I can't say that I agree that there's a better way, because if I thought there was, I would have it there. I have, myself, been unsuccessful. But there are a lot of you who have proved over time that you're as creative and innovative as anybody in this country. So have at it, and see what you can come up with.

[*Mayor Abramson discussed the Department of Commerce's involvement in defense conversion and thanked the President for making the process easier in many cities.*]

The President. Thank you very much, Mayor. You know, we had tried very hard to do a couple of things with this base closing, based on the experiences I had as a Governor and what mayors and Governors all over the country talked to me about.

First is to bring Commerce in and to bring this whole notion of business development in. And the second is to change the rules by which the facilities are turned over to local communities to try to accelerate the process, to not let the environmental cleanup obligations delay it too long, to make the best financial deal we could to the mayors, and to make sure that we focused on creating jobs and opportunities to replace those that were lost.

I think the dramatic change in priorities that we've made is really going to make a difference. I was out in the Inland Empire area of California not very long ago, celebrating the successes that the communities are having there with one of their bases that they're now redeveloping.

We can do this all over America. These resources can be put to use to develop the economy of the 21st century. But the Federal Government is going to have to be much more aggressive and flexible and responsive in working with you. I think we're on the way, and I think the Commerce Department has a lot to do with that. But I also have to say that in the last year and a half, I have seen a dramatic change in the attitude of the Defense Department as well. So we're going to work hard and do our best to be there for you.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 12:05 p.m. The President spoke from Room 459 in the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Vera Katz of Portland, OR.

Remarks at the State Dinner for Emperor Akihito and Empress Michiko of Japan

June 13, 1994

Ladies and gentlemen, Your Majesties, our other distinguished guests from Japan, ladies and gentlemen. We are honored and privileged to welcome this evening the Emperor and Empress of Japan.

You are no strangers to the United States, but it gives me particular pleasure to host you here at the White House on this, the occasion of your first visit to America since you ascended to the Chrysanthemum Throne.

As citizens of a relatively young nation, we Americans are honored by your presence, and we deeply value the rich culture and history you represent. You embody a tradition that stretches back century after century and a people who have brought the world a civilization of great elegance.

At a time when the call of tradition so often clashes with the demands of the modern world, Your Majesties revere your ancestors and your

past and, yet, revel in your own people's extraordinary ability to innovate for tomorrow.

Your personal interest in your nation's cultural heritage is matched by your vital curiosity about the world around you. And your travels have surely taken you far and wide. You have fully pursued professional knowledge, and yet, in your devotion to your family, you have set an example for us all. Through your words and deeds, Your Majesties have earned the respect and the admiration of the Japanese people. But those are sentiments we Americans also share.

Today, the ties that bind our two nations have never been stronger. The miracles of technology and the common search for democracy, prosperity, and peace have brought us together. Exchange between our two peoples has opened windows and shed great light. Yet, there is always more to learn. And as we gather here tonight in 1994, our relationship is still unfolding.

The Japanese poet Basho put it well in a haiku that sums up the distance ahead:

Nearing autumn's close,
My neighbor—how does he live?
I wonder.

May Your Majesties' visit provide new answers to that question and bring our peoples closer still. May your journey across our land be enjoyable and leave you wanting to visit us again. And may the sea that separates us be also a shining path between us.

Your Majesties, Hillary and I thank you for gracing our Nation's home tonight. It is with deep admiration and respect for you and the great nation you represent that I now ask all of us to raise our glasses to join in a toast to you and to the people of Japan.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:58 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks on Welfare Reform in Kansas City, Missouri
June 14, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for that warm introduction and welcome. And thank you, Yolanda Magee, for presenting me today and, far more importantly, for presenting such a good example of a young American determined to be a good parent and a good worker and a successful citizen. Thank you, Mr. Kemper, for giving her a chance to be all that. Thank you, Congressman Wheat, for your leadership on welfare reform. And thank you, Mayor Cleaver, for your leadership on this issue. Thank you, Governor Carnahan, for proving once again that the States, just as James Madison and Thomas Jefferson intended, are still the laboratories of democracy, still capable of leading the way to change things that don't work in this country and to unleash the potential of our citizens. This is a remarkable welfare reform plan that you have put together. I'd like to thank also Secretary Shalala for her work here. Many people in the White House and in the Department of Health and Human Services worked with people all over America in putting this welfare reform plan together today. I thank them all.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an important day for me because I have worked on this issue for about 14 years, and I care a great deal about it. I came out here to the heart of America, to a bank where Harry Truman had his first job, to talk about the values that sustain us all as citizens and as Americans, faith and family, work and responsibility, community and opportunity.

Last week, on behalf of all Americans, I took a journey of remembrance—many of you, at least, took it too through the television—to honor the sacrifices of the people who led our invasions at D-Day and on the Italian Peninsula. I came home from Normandy with a renewed sense, which I hope all of you share, of the work that we have to do in this time to be worthy of the sacrifices of that generation and to preserve this country for generations still to come.

The people who won World War II and rebuilt our country afterward were driven by certain bedrock values that have made our country the strongest in history. Facing the dawn of

a new century, it is up to us to take those same values to meet a new set of challenges.

Our challenge is different. Today we have to restore faith in the beginning in certain basic principles that our forebears took for granted: the bond of family, the virtue of community, the dignity of work. That is really what I ran for President to try to do, to restore our economy, to empower individuals and strengthen our communities, to make our Government work for ordinary citizens again.

I think we've made a good beginning. In the last year and a half, we have reversed an economic trend that was leading us into deeper and deeper debt, less investment, and a weaker economy. The Congress, as Congresswoman Danner and Congressman Wheat will attest, is about to put the finishing touches on a new budget which will give us 3 years of declining deficits in the Federal accounts for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We worked to expand trade and the frontiers of technology, to have tax incentives for small businesses and for working families on modest wages to keep them moving ahead. And the results are pretty clear. Our economy has produced about 3.4 million jobs in the first 17 months of this administration. So we're moving ahead.

We're trying to empower people with new systems for job training and community service and other options for young people to rebuild their communities and go to college. We're trying to make this Government work again for ordinary citizens by reforming the way it works with our reinventing Government program that will lead us within 5 years to the smallest Federal bureaucracy since John Kennedy was President, doing more work than ever done before by the Federal Government; that will lead the Congress, I hope, in just a couple of weeks to pass the most comprehensive anticrime bill in the history of the country; that is helping all of us to restore that bond that has to exist between a Government and its people.

But I have to tell you that the challenge of the welfare system poses these issues, all of them in stark terms: how to make the economy work; how to make the Government work for ordinary citizens; how to empower individuals and strengthen communities. These difficulties are all present in the challenges presented by the current welfare system. There's no greater gap between our good intentions and our misguided consequences than you see in the welfare system.

It started for the right common purpose of helping people who fall by the wayside. And believe it or not, it still works that way for some, people who just hit a rough spot in their lives and have to go on public assistance for awhile, and then they get themselves off, and they do just fine. But for many the system has worked to undermine the very values that people need to put themselves and their lives back on track. We have to repair the damaged bond between our people and their Government, manifested in the way the welfare system works. We have to end welfare as we know it.

In a few days, as has already been said, I will send to Congress my plan to change the welfare system, to change it from a system based on dependence to a system that works toward independence, to change it—[*applause*]—thank you—to change it so that the focus is clearly on work.

I also want to say that I developed a phrase over the last few years that would end welfare as we know it by saying welfare ought to be a second chance, not a way of life. One young woman I met a few moments ago said, "It ought to be a stepping stone, not a way of life." Maybe that's even better, but you have the idea.

Long before I became President, as I said, I worked with other Governors and Members of Congress of both parties. I worked on it with people who were on welfare, a lot of them. And let me say first of all to all those whom I invite to join this great national debate, if you really want to know what's wrong with the welfare system, talk to the people who are stuck in it or who have been on it. They want to change it more than most people you know. And if you give them half a chance, they will.

Before I came down to see you, I met with Yolanda Magee, and she told me her story. I also met with several other people who are now working in this area, who used to be on welfare, people who get up every morning and go to work in factories or small businesses or banks, who do their best to take care of their children and to advance their capacity to succeed in our complex, modern society.

And I want to introduce them all to you and ask them to stand, so that when you look at them you'll know what this whole deal is about. And let me just—they're over here: Kathy Romero, who works at Lutheran Trinity Hospital—

stand up—Arlenda Moffitt, who works at Pitney-Bowes Management Services; Vicki Phelps who works at Continuum Vantage Research; Pamela Ruhnke, who works at Cates Sheet Metal; Birdella Smith at HOK Sports Facilities; Christine McDonald who works for Pepsi-Cola; Mimi Fluker who works at Payless Cashways; Audrey Williams who works at Allied Security; Judy Sutton, a teacher in the Kansas City School District; and Tracy Varron, a home health registered nurse at Excelsior Spring City Hospital.

Every one of those American citizens at one point in her life was on welfare. Every one now, thanks to programs and incentives and help with medical coverage and child care and training and just helping people put their lives back together through the initiatives that have already been discussed here, is now a working American. And I say to you, if these American citizens can do this here in Kansas City, we ought to be able to do this in every community in the country. And we ought to be able to change the system and get these people out of it.

How shall we change this system? Let me say first, I think we have to begin with responsibility, with the elemental proposition that governments do not raise children, people do, and that among other things, an awful lot of people are trapped in welfare because they are raising children on their own when the other parent of the child has refused to pay child support that is due, payable, and able to pay.

This plan includes the toughest child support enforcement measures in the history of this country that go after the $34—listen to this—the $34 billion gap in this country. That is, it is estimated that there are $34 billion worth of ordered but uncollected child support today in America, $34 billion.

How are we going to do that? First, by requiring both parents to be identified at a hospital when a baby's born. Second, by saying, if you don't provide for your children, you should have your wages garnished, your license suspended; you should be tracked across State lines. If necessary, you should have to work off what you owe. This is a very serious thing. We can no longer say that the business of bringing a child into the world carries no responsibility with it and that someone can walk away from it.

The second thing that responsibility means is not just going after people who aren't fulfilling it but rewarding those who are being responsible. The system now does just the opposite. Just for example, the welfare system will pay teen parents more to move out of their home than to stay there. In my opinion, that is wrong. We should encourage teen parents to live at home, stay in school, take responsibility for their own futures and their children's futures. And the financial incentives of the welfare system ought to do that instead of just the reverse. We have to change the signals we are sending here.

We also have to face the fact that we have a big welfare problem because the rate of children born out of wedlock, where there was no marriage, is going up dramatically. The rate of illegitimacy has literally quadrupled since Daniel Patrick Moynihan, now a Senator from New York, first called it to our attention 30 years ago. At the rate we're going, unless we reverse it, within 10 years more than half of our children will be born in homes where there has never been a marriage.

We must keep people from the need to go on welfare in the first place by emphasizing a national campaign against teen pregnancy, to send a powerful message that it is wrong to continue this trend, that children should not be born until parents are married and fully capable of taking care of them. And this trend did not develop overnight. There are many reasons for it. It will not be turned around overnight. But be sure of this: No Government edict can do it.

This is a free country with hundreds of millions of people making their decisions, billions of them every day. To change a country on a profound issue like this requires the efforts of millions and millions and millions of you talking openly and honestly and freely about these things; talking to people who have lived through these experiences and many of them doing the very best they can to be honorable and good parents; talking about what we can do to involve churches and civic clubs and groups of all kinds in this endeavor, not to point the finger at people to drive them down or embarrass them but to lift them up so that they can make the most of their lives and so they can be good parents when the time comes to do that.

But let us be clear on this: No nation has ever found a substitute for the family. And over the course of human history, several have tried. No country has ever devised any sort of program that would substitute for the consistent, loving devotion and dedication and role-modeling of

caring parents. We must do this work. This is not a Government mission; this is an American mission. But we must do it if we want to succeed over the long run.

And let me say finally that if you strengthen the families, we still can't change the welfare system unless it is rooted in getting people back to work. You can lecture people; you can encourage people; you can do whatever you want. But there has to be something at the end of the road for people who work hard and play by the rules. Work is the best social program this country ever devised. It gives hope and structure and meaning to our lives. All of us here who have our jobs would be lost without them.

Just stop for a moment sometime today and think about how much of your life is organized around your work, how much of your family life, how much of your social life, not to mention your work life. Think about the extent to which you are defined by the friends you have at work, by the sense that you do a good job, by the regularity of the paycheck.

One of these fine women who's agreed to come here today said that one of the best things about being off welfare was getting the check and being able to go buy her own groceries every 2 weeks. That's a big deal.

So I say to you, we propose to offer people on welfare a simple contract. We will help you get the skills you need, but after 2 years, anyone who can go to work must go to work, in the private sector if possible, in a subsidized job if necessary. But work is preferable to welfare. And it must be enforced.

Now, this plan will let communities do what's best for them. States can design their own programs; communities can design their own programs. This will support initiatives like the WEN program here, not take things away from them and substitute Government programs.

We want to give communities a chance to put their people to work in child care, home care, and other fields that are desperately needed. We want every community to do what you've done here in Kansas City, to bring together business and civic and church leaders, together to find out how you can make lasting jobs and lasting independence.

Let me say just a couple of other things. If you wish people to go to work, you also have to reward them for doing so. Now, a popular misconception is that a lot of people stay on welfare because the welfare check is so big. In fact, when you adjust it for inflation—[*laughter*]—right? When you adjust it for inflation, welfare checks are smaller than they were 20 years ago.

But there are things that do keep people on welfare. One is the tax burden of low wage work; another is the cost of child care; another is the cost of medical care. Now, a few years ago, I was active as a Governor in helping to rewrite the welfare laws so that States were given the opportunity to offer some people the chance to get child care and medical care continued when they got off welfare and went to work for a period of transition. Several of these women have taken advantage of that, and they talked about it.

But we must do more. Last year when the Congress passed our economic program, they expanded the earned-income tax credit dramatically, which lowered taxes on one in six working Americans working for modest wages so that there would never again be an incentive to stay on welfare instead of going to work. Instead of using the tax system to hold people in poverty, we want to use the tax system to lift workers out of poverty.

That was one of the least known aspects of the economic program last year, but more than 10 times as many Missourians, for example, got an income tax cut as the 1.2 percent of the wealthiest people got an income tax increase. Why? Because you want to reward people who are out there working who are hovering just above the poverty line.

What's the next issue? In our bill, we provide some more transitional funds for child support to help people deal with that. That's important.

But thirdly, one of the most important reasons we should pass a health care reform bill that makes America join the ranks of every other advanced country in the world that provides health insurance to all its people is that today you have this bizarre situation where people on welfare, if they take a job in a place which doesn't offer health insurance, are asked to give up their children's health care and go to work, earning money, paying taxes to pay for the health care of the children of people who didn't make the decision to go to work and stayed on welfare, while they made the decision to go to work and gave up their children's health care coverage. That does not make any sense.

And until we fix that, we will never close the circle and have a truly work-based system.

If we do the things we propose in this welfare reform program, even by the most conservative estimates, these changes together will move one million adults who would otherwise be on welfare into work or off welfare altogether by the year 2000.

And if we can change the whole value system, which has got us into the fix we're in today, the full savings over the long haul are more than we will ever be able to imagine, because the true issue on welfare, as Senator Moynihan said so many years ago, is not what it cost the taxpayers; it's what it cost the recipients. We should be worried about that.

And let me say, one of the most rewarding things that happened today in our little meeting before I came down was I asked all these fine ladies who are here, I said, "Now, if we were able to provide these services, do you believe that it should be mandatory to participate in this program?" Every one of them said, "Absolutely! Absolutely!"

So I ask you all here—let us be honest, none of this will be easy to accomplish. We know what the problems are. And we know they did not develop overnight. But we have to make a beginning. We owe it to the next generation. We cannot permit millions and millions and millions of American children to be trapped in a cycle of dependency with people who are not responsible for bringing them into the world, with parents who are trapped in a system that doesn't develop their human capacity to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities and to succeed as both workers and parents. We must break this cycle.

For this reason, this ought to be a bipartisan issue. Over the last 30 years, poor folks in this country have seen about all the political posturing they can stand, one way or the other. Now, there are serious people in both political parties in Congress who have advanced proposals to change the welfare system. And I really believe that we have a chance finally to replace dependence with independence, welfare with work.

I don't care who gets the credit for this if we can rebuild the American family; if we can strengthen our communities; if we can give every person on welfare the dignity, the pride, the direction, the strength, the sheer person power I felt coming out of these ladies that I spoke with today; if we can give people the pride that I sense from Yolanda's coworkers when she stood up here to introduce me today. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue.

Let me tell you, several years ago when I was a Governor of my State, I brought in Governors from all over the country to a meeting in Washington, and then I brought in people from all over America who had been on welfare to talk to them. We had most of the Governors there, and they were shocked. Most of them had never met anybody who'd been on welfare before. And there was a woman from my State who was asked a question. I had no idea what she was going to answer. She was asked about her job, and she talked about her job and how she got on the job. And then she was asked by a Governor, "Well, do you think enrollment in these programs ought to be mandatory?" She said, "I sure do." And then a Governor said, "Well, can you tell us what the best thing about being in a full-time job is?" She said, "Yes, sir. When my boy goes to school, and they ask him, 'What does your mama do for a living?' he can give an answer."

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for proving today that we can give every child in America a chance to give an answer. Let's go do it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:12 p.m. at the Commerce Bank. In his remarks, he referred to Yolanda Magee, a participant in the Future Now program who introduced the President; Jonathan Kemper, president and CEO, Commerce Bank; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO; and Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee
June 14, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5347(e) of title 5 of the United States Code, I transmit herewith the 1993 annual report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 14, 1994.

Nomination for an Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs
June 14, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Kenneth W. Kizer of Maryland as Under Secretary for Health in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

"Dr. Kizer brings a wide range of clinical and administrative experience to the VA and tested leadership, which will be crucial to the department's success in the framework of national health care reform," the President said.

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

Nomination for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
June 14, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Gilbert F. Casellas as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"Gilbert Casellas' dedication and commitment to providing equal opportunities to all Americans and his skilled ability to build consensus around even the most complex issues make me proud to nominate him to chair this essential commission," the President said.

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

Remarks on North Korea and an Exchange With Reporters
June 15, 1994

The President. Let me say I'm very pleased to have this opportunity for another meeting with the bipartisan leadership. We will be discussing a number of issues today, but let me mention one in particular, North Korea.

Ambassador Albright will be beginning her discussions today at the United Nations about a sanctions resolution which we proposed which would include phased sanctions designed to deal not only with the actions of the North Koreans to date but as a deterrent to future destructive conduct with regard to the IAEA and the NPT. So we're going to be very deliberate, very firm. I feel that we are pursuing the proper course at this time.

In addition to that, of course, we'll be discussing health care, the crime bill, welfare reform, campaign financing, a number of other issues. But I did want to make that statement about Korea.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, what do you hope former President Carter tells the North Koreans in these meetings there?

The President. I think he will reaffirm our position. What I'm more hopeful of is that he will get a better sense from them about where they are, and they will understand that we are very firm in our position, but that there is an alternative path and a very good one for North Korea to take, that they don't have to become more isolated, they could become more engaged in the world in ways that would be much better for their own people.

Q. Do you think they're misreading your resolve in this case?

The President. I don't think that. I think that apparently they're pursuing a course of their own interests, which at least to the rest of us seems self-defeating. I believe that if you look at what—if you imagine where the people of North Korea might be 10 or 20 years from now, they would be far better off and more prosperous, engaged in the world, rather than isolated from it, being rewarded for their work rather than for some——

Q. But you've softened your stand, haven't you, on sanctions? I mean, you're going much easier.

The President. No. We're proceeding ahead. We're consulting with our allies, we're working with—we think that we're doing the right thing.

Q. Are the Chinese on board?

Health Care Reform

Q. Are you willing to accept some kind of a trigger or fast track mechanism to impose universal coverage down the road on health care?

The President. I'm not convinced it would achieve universal coverage, but let me say that when I put my ideas out, I made clear that I was very flexible on how to get there, how to solve this problem, which is a system that costs too much and does too little, and that we ought to find a way to cover the American people just the way every other advanced country has covered all their people. We're the only ones who can't figure out how to do it. Everybody else has already done it, and for a lot less money. And—but that I've been very open on how to do it and very open to anybody else's ideas. I just thought that the rest of the American people ought to be taken care of, just the way the President is, the way that Members of Congress are, the way we all are. And that's still where I am, and I still think that's what we ought to be shooting for. And when I mentioned it in my speech on health care, members of both parties stood up and applauded it and said they were for covering all Americans. So I think that we will proceed in good faith on that; we'll get that done.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:22 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House prior to discussions with congressional leaders. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the NCAA Basketball Champion University of Arkansas Razorbacks

June 15, 1994

The President. Thank you. I want to welcome Coach and Mrs. Richardson and the Razorbacks, all the staff and the friends who came with them from Arkansas. I want to also recognize the presence here in the audience—I see Congressman Thornton, but I think that Congresswoman Lambert and Congressman Dickey and Congressman Hutchinson are here. And Senator Bumpers and Senator Pryor called me and said that they were told they had to stay and vote. And I told them that their priorities might be a little out of order, but—[*laughter*]—they allowed as how you elected them to vote, and

they're voting in the Senate, and they're very sorry they can't be here.

I think one reason I like basketball so much is it's gotten to be a lot like my job. It's more and more physical all the time. [*Laughter*] You get behind, and then you get ahead. You never know whether you're going to win until the end of the game, and people are questioning your judgment calls all the way through. [*Laughter*] I just wish that on every close issue, I had Scotty Thurman there at the end to make the shot.

I also would tell you that since I've been here, I've been crossways with a lot of interest groups, whether it was the NRA or some insurance companies or when we decided that we'd try to help sweep the housing projects in Chicago, we had the ACLU and the NRA mad at us. So people are always questioning how I manage to make so many organized groups mad at me. But I never did anything quite so crazy as to risk the 51 electoral votes of Michigan, Arizona, and North Carolina—[*laughter*]—all in a row by going to those games. And when one of the reporters asked me about it when I got back, I said, "If you'd been waiting for this as long as we have, it would be worth it all, including that." [*Laughter*]

I want to say to the coach and to the team that all of us, I think, were very, very proud, not only of the fact that they won the national championship but the way they won it, with hard, clean, aggressive basketball. That championship game was the way every national championship ought to be decided, aggressive, tough, close to the end, with very, very high standards, and yet a very clean and honorable game. I was very proud of that.

I'd also like to say that Nolan Richardson has done a lot of remarkable things in his life, often against all the odds. But it's a rare thing to be able to put together the chemistry of young people in the way that this team was put together. And so I say to him and to all the players, you did your State proud. You made the President happy. But more importantly, you showed America the best about what college athletics should be. And we are all very, very proud of you.

We have an enormous number of Razorback fans here today, some of whom live in Washington now, including, obviously in addition to the First Lady and myself, our Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, many people who work here in the White House, throughout the Government. I think perhaps Representative Cardiss Collins of Illinois is also here, who has worked with Coach Richardson and other coaches throughout the country. And I just want to say to all of you here in Washington, you're welcome. And to all of you who made the long trip from Arkansas, we are elated to see you. We miss you, and this is a nice extra thing for me.

I'd like to now present, if I might, the Presidential commendation to honor the victory of the Razorbacks, one to the coach and one to the team. And I think that the officer has them. So, Coach Richardson, would you come up here and receive yours.

This says: "The President of the United States awards this commendation to Nolan Richardson for his many years of coaching excellence, his steadfast leadership in guiding the Arkansas Razorback basketball team to the NCAA national championship, for his exceptional contributions to college basketball in Arkansas, and for his relentless commitment to excellence in both education and athletics."

Thank you.

I'd like to ask the two captains to come up here. Who else—or who's going to get it? The seniors, you all come up too. Come on, Roger and Ken. This is the same commendation, which notes the record of the season and the national victory. And I want to give it to you guys. And we're glad to see you walking around and looking so good. [*Laughter*]

Thank you. Congratulations.

[*At this point, Coach Nolan Richardson briefly thanked the President and presented gifts.*]

The President. I asked for somebody to say something on behalf of the team. I'm sorry it's so warm here, but I didn't want you to feel lonesome away from Arkansas, so we—[*laughter*]. I did get to go with these, some of those patented Razorback basketball pants which would, if I could ever figure out how to run in them without tripping over my ankles, would end all those unseemly comments about my legs, because they go down below my knees. [*Laughter*]

Let me say also, I was anxious to see Corliss up here with his cast up close. He's the only guy I know that plays games with broken bones that plays better than he does when he's healed. But nonetheless, we're glad he's on the mend. I got to sign the cast; that was fun.

Mr. Thurman, why don't you come up and say something on behalf of the team—since you didn't——

Scotty Thurman. I kind of feel like a politician up here.

The President. You look like one.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:48 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Rose Richardson, wife of Coach Nolan Richardson, and team members Scotty Thurman, Roger Crawford, Kenneth Biley, and Corliss Williamson.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Iowa Attorney General Bonnie Campbell

June 15, 1994

The President. Welcome. I'm glad to be here with Attorney General Campbell. I've known her for a long time. I was very pleased by her decisive victory, and I'm glad she's here for a visit about the things that we would be working together on in partnership with the State of Iowa.

Iowa Gubernatorial Campaign

Q. What are the big issues in the campaign, Ms. Campbell?

Ms. Campbell. I think they may be the same all over the country. In Iowa, it's the budget and questions of taxes, health care reform, welfare reform, protecting the environment. I have had a special interest in child support recovery, which I think is critical to any discussion of welfare reform, so I'm really happy to have an opportunity to talk today about that.

The President. A lot of people believe the strongest part of the bill that I announced yesterday on welfare reform is the child support provisions, because they're the toughest in the history of the country. They permit tracking across State lines, garnishment of wages, suspension of driver's licenses and other privileges. They require the identification of both parents, or at least they require every hospital to make a real effort to do that whenever there's a birth in a hospital.

And we estimate that we will go from $9 billion a year to $20 billion a year in child support enforcement recoveries if this bill passes. And I know that's something that's been very important to Bonnie for a long time.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—giving Ms. Campbell for the race?

The President. I don't know what she wants me to do, but in the fall, I'll be out trying to help people who share my values and my interests if they want me to do so. I find that most voters in most States are pretty independent. They don't need the President or anyone else to tell them how to vote. But I certainly have admired Bonnie Campbell for a long time. I think a lot of her. And I'm going to be going to an event for her here in Washington tonight.

But what I do depends in part, obviously, on what happens here with the health care debate and how much time it takes and how close it gets to the election, as well as welfare reform and lobby reform and the other things we're trying to do to change the way that Government works and relates to the American people. And, of course, there could be foreign policy issues that require more time.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, Senator Harkin, who supported you quite early in your campaign and has been a loyal supporter up on the Hill, was very critical of your welfare reform package yesterday. He's supporting his own bipartisan with Senator Bond that's based on the Iowa plan. And he says that yours goes back to the Depression and is a make-work, dead-end jobs and all that. How does this fit with——

The President. I don't think so. You can have various—States with low unemployment rates can have absolute cutoffs of welfare benefits once certain training programs have been gone through and people are prepared to enter the work force. You can just say you're not eligible for benefits. And as I understand it, that's what the Harkin-Bond bill does.

But if you live in a country where some of these people on welfare live in areas where the unemployment rates may be as high as 20 percent, then if you want to require them to go

to work after a certain period of time, it seems to me you have to be willing to either say they're going to do a public service job—not make-work, but work for the city or for the county—or that you will help to subsidize their job in the private sector to make it attractive to hire them, because otherwise you'll be cutting people off benefits in areas where they will not be able to get jobs in the private sector.

The other major difference is, Senator Harkin's bill, as I understand it, has a graduated cutoff of benefits after you go through a training program from a low of 6 months to a high of 4 years. And ours just has one set 2-year limit, but if any State wants to go beyond it, they're free to do so. That is, since I've been President, we have granted more flexibility to the States in the area of welfare reform and health care reform in a year and a half than in the previous 12 years. We've really encouraged States to go out and try things on their own. So I wouldn't oppose Iowa or any other State implementing a program like that.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Ms. Campbell, do you have any problem with the welfare plan? You are a supporter of the Iowa plan, aren't you?

Ms. Campbell. I'm a cautious supporter of the Iowa plan. I think the most important thing the President has done is put welfare reform on the agenda. Our plan is being phased in right now. I do think it's progressive and tough, but it remains to be seen. There are some problems with it. One is the availability of day care; one is the availability of jobs. It presumes there are jobs, and we are a low unemployment State.

I want very much for our welfare reform plan to work because the philosophy behind it is investing in people in our society and inculcating the notion of work and reward for work. But we're a long way from knowing whether our own welfare reform will be successful. I hope it is.

The President. Let me also point out that from my point of view, a large part of this national bill is giving the States the power to make welfare reform work. Yesterday I was in Kansas City, and I met with 12 women who had moved from welfare to work. They all agreed that our plan was right to require everybody on welfare to go through one of these job placement programs. But they agreed that to make it work, you would have to provide some transitional aid for people for child care and for medical coverage for the children, that we needed tougher child-support enforcement, and that we ought to have with this a national campaign to try to lower the rate of teenage out-of-wedlock births, because the truth is that the welfare problem in the country—indeed, the poverty problem in the country—is increasingly a problem of young women and their little children.

So, from my point of view, I don't see a necessary conflict between the Iowa plan and what we're trying to do. The States like Iowa would be perfectly free to design their own plans and to be as tough as they wished under our law. And as a matter of fact, for the first time under this bill, if it passes as I have proposed it, we will specifically and clearly authorize States to go beyond the requirements of the Federal framework. But remember, this is a very large, complicated country in which the economic realities are very different from place to place, often within State borders, and certainly across State lines.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Honoring the Praemium Imperiale Arts Award Recipients
June 16, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Sejima, thank you for your fine words and for giving us the history of the Japan Art Association and its relationship to President Grant and his visit to Japan.

I had a sense of the great tradition of the Imperial Family when the Emperor and Empress were here a couple of nights ago with the First Lady and I, and the Emperor was taken upstairs to my office. And we were talking

about American history, and I said, "This desk I use in my office was President Grant's Cabinet table." He said, "Yes, I know. My great-grandfather welcomed him to Japan." I had a desk; he had a family experience. [*Laughter*]

There are many very distinguished Americans here, including our great former Ambassador to Japan, Senator Mike Mansfield, and Maestro Rostropovich, who was just here to play for the Emperor and Empress. I thank you all for coming. I welcome the members of the diplomatic community and other distinguished citizens of the world. I would like to, in particular, recognize the representatives here of the panel of international advisers of the Japan Art Association, a group of truly distinguished citizens of the world: the mayor of Paris, Jacques Chirac, who hosted us recently, welcome, sir; the former Prime Minister of Italy, Amintore Fanfani; the former Prime Minister of Japan, Yasuhiro Nakasone; and the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Edward Heath, welcome to you all; and Mr. David Rockefeller, our representative. David, thank you for coming.

We have all been enriched by the work of the Japan Art Association, but especially by creating this award for artists who would not otherwise be recognized internationally for their outstanding work. Katherine Anne Porter once wrote that "Art outlives governments, creeds, societies, even civilizations. Art," she wrote, "is what we find again when the ruins are cleared away."

Indeed, in this very room we have an example of art that survived even the burning of the White House, this wonderful Gilbert Stuart portrait of George Washington, which was rescued by the then-First Lady Dolley Madison when the White House was burned during the War of 1812. So it endured, and it's just like it was then, but all the walls here are new, just as all the people here are. If we cultivate art, nurture it, and preserve it, then not only art endures but a part of all of us endures as well.

The Praemium Imperiale Prizes were established to mark the second century of work of the Japan Art Association, recognizing international excellence in painting, sculpture, architecture, music, theater, and film. All the winners are artists of unique accomplishment. The recommendations for the prize recipients are made for the Japan Art Association by the distinguished committee of international advisers, whom I have just recognized. I thank those who are here and those who are not able to come, including the former West German Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt.

Yesterday the names of the five award winners were announced. In October they will be honored in ceremonies in Tokyo, but we wanted to salute them here. And four of the five honorees are with us today.

For painting, this year's winner is the French artist Zao Wou-ki. Where is he? Please stand up. Born in China, educated there and in France, his style brings together East and West in a synthesis of drawing, calligraphy, and traditional Chinese painting that is nothing less than lyrical.

For sculpture, the winner is an American, Richard Serra. A Californian who literally broke the mold and shattered ideas about what sculpture is, his work radiates emotional power on a grand scale and has been an inspiration to an entire new generation of artists.

The winner for architecture is Charles Correa of India who has done work of truly historic significance, showing sensitivity in planning communities in poor countries for genuinely civilized living. His pioneering work has sought to improve the quality of housing for the urban poor, as well as providing a more humane way to live.

For music, the winner is the French composer Henri Dutilleux. His distinctive compositions put into beautiful music the notion of diversity within unity, producing from novel arrays of instruments what the composer himself has so aptly called "the joy of sound."

Finally, in the category of theater and film, the winner goes to someone who could not be with us today, the wonderful British actor and director Sir John Gielgud. His career so far has spanned a mere eight decades, reaching new heights in roles as different as Hamlet on the stage and the butler in service to a tipsy millionaire in the movie "Arthur." He sends his regrets that he could not be with us today, and he has our best wishes.

We give our congratulations to all these winners for many more decades of creative energy. We thank them for stirring our imaginations and our souls. The world is better for their efforts. For all of that, we say thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ryuzo Sejima, chairman, Japan Art As-

sociation; Mstislav Rostropovich, music director, National Symphony Orchestra; and author Katherine Anne Porter.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on North Korea
June 16, 1994

The President. Good afternoon.

In recent weeks, we have been consulting with our allies and friends on the imposition of sanctions against North Korea because of its refusal to permit full inspections of its nuclear program. Today there are reports that the North Koreans, in discussions with President Carter, may have offered new steps to resolve the international community's concerns, saying that International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors and monitoring equipment would be left in place and that North Korea desires to replace its present nuclear program with a new light water reactor technology that is more resistant to nuclear proliferation.

If North Korea means by this, also, that it is willing to freeze its nuclear program while talks take place, this could be a promising development. As we review these reports today and in the days ahead, I want to take a moment to explain the extent of our interests and the steps we are taking to protect them.

Our Nation clearly has vital interests on the Korean Peninsula. Four decades after the conflict there that claimed hundreds of thousands of South Korean and American lives, South Korea continues to face a threat of a million troops, most of them massed near its border.

America's commitment to South Korea, our treaty ally, our trading partner, our fellow democracy, is unshakable. We have some 37,000 American troops in Korea to maintain that commitment, and their safety is of vital importance to us.

We also have an interest in preserving the stability of the Asian-Pacific region. And we have a compelling interest in preserving the integrity of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to prevent the spread of global nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

Therefore, in response to North Korea's nuclear activities, we have consistently pursued two goals: a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula and a strong international nonproliferation regime. We've made serious and extensive efforts to resolve the North Korean issue through negotiations and have given North Korea many opportunities to return to compliance with its own nonproliferation commitments, made first 9 years ago when North Korea signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and in 1991, when North Korea agreed with South Korea to pursue a non-nuclear Korean Peninsula.

We've made clear that these negotiations could continue, but only if North Korea cooperated with the International Atomic Energy Agency and did not deepen its violation of international nuclear safeguards. If today's developments mean that North Korea is genuinely and verifiably prepared to freeze its nuclear program while talks go on—and we hope that is the case—then we would be willing to resume high-level talks. In the meantime, we will pursue our consultations on sanctions at the United Nations.

In recent weeks I've consulted—or days, in recent days I've consulted with President Kim of South Korea, Prime Minister Hata of Japan, President Yeltsin of Russia, and others. I will continue to consult closely with them on this matter, with other international leaders and, of course, with Members of Congress of both parties.

Through all appropriate means, I will keep working to ensure the security of South Korea, the safety of our troops, the stability of the Asian-Pacific, and the protection of our Nation, our friends, and our allies from the spread of nuclear weapons.

There is a great deal at stake. We are pursuing our interests with resolve and steadiness. We are hopeful that this development today will be positive, and we are awaiting further evidence.

Q. Is it possible, or probable, that you could know with full confidence that North Korea has

frozen its program? Is time a factor? Are you worried about the clock ticking if they really are bent on a nuclear program?

The President. Well, the answer to the second question is, yes, time is a factor. The answer to the first question is, yes, we believe we would be able to know, based on the representations that were apparently made today whether they have, in fact, frozen their program while talks continue.

Q. How long might that take, sir?

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned that they might be playing for time and trying to weaken your hand with the Chinese and perhaps the Russians and others who might be worried about sanctions?

The President. Well, we'll just have to see. These discussions occurred today; there will be more discussions tomorrow, tomorrow Korean time, which is there now. And we will just have to see. But it depends on what the Koreans actually meant by what they said today, and we will have to see.

So Ambassador Albright continued today pursuing our consultations on sanctions with the nonpermanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations, and we are proceeding and we're just going to watch developments.

Q. But there were some concerns about appearing weak in their eyes.

The President. No. It depends on what they mean. That's why we're being very clear today to say that we want to know what they meant by their representation and whether it represents a change of position. If it is a different position on which we can honorably resume negotiations, knowing, in fact, that there will be no development of the nuclear program while we are having discussions with them, then it is not an inappropriate delay. Then it is a genuine effort to resolve disputes which could lead to a safer world at a much lower cost. It simply depends on what their intentions and actions are.

Q. Mr. President, why have you put so much distance between the White House and President Carter's visit? Your aides have always stressed that, "This is private. No, the President has not talked to President Carter." Why don't you talk to him? I mean, why don't you try to find out what's really going on, and why would you not debrief him when he comes back?

The President. Oh, I intend to debrief him when he comes back. I absolutely do. And I talked to him before he went, personally.

Q. You did?

The President. Absolutely. So——

Q. Well, there seems to be some sense that he's not representing us, and——

The President. No. Well, I think it's been important in this whole development for the way it's unfolded that he was invited there as a citizen, as a representative of the Carter Center, to have a dialog, not as a representative of the Government but as someone who could see Kim Il-song and could have a detailed conversation with him. And I think that the way this has unfolded proves that, at least that some—we have gotten some information there that might not have otherwise been the case. So I don't have any problem with it.

But I think it is important that the United States and its interests can only be stated by people who are ultimately charged with doing that. And I think that President Carter fully agreed with the characterization of his role and his mission. That is the way he wanted it as well as the way we wanted it, and we think that that gives us some possibility that something will come out of this. Whether it will or not, we still don't know.

Q. Mr. President, two things, sir. Will this inevitably take the steam out of your effort to build support for possible sanctions, and second, the Senate today passed by a quite overwhelming vote a sense of the Senate resolution calling on you to bolster force, your forces in South Korea. Your reaction to both of those matters.

The President. First, we will do whatever is necessary to protect our own forces there and to fulfill our commitments to the South Koreans.

I met recently with all the commanders-in-chief, including General Luck, our commander in South Korea. I met today, again, with the Secretary of Defense and General Shalikashvili to discuss this and other issues. And we will take appropriate steps as we should, as we must. So there is nothing to be concerned about.

Now, on the other issue, what happens here depends upon whether this is, in fact, a new development. That is really what is at stake. Will it take the steam out of sanctions? Not if there is nothing new here. If there is a genuine prospect for not only leaving the IAEA monitors and equipment in place and moving away from the present nuclear technology, which is

very susceptible to proliferation, to a light water technology, which is less susceptible, in an environment in which—and I stress—in an environment in which there is a freeze on any nuclear activities, then the international community will be able to pursue its objectives of adherence by North Korea to the NPT, thwarting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, achieving the agreement North Korea made for a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula in an appropriate way.

It depends on the facts. It all depends on the facts, and that is what we will attempt to determine over the next several hours.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks at an Illinois Victory '94 Fundraising Dinner in Chicago, Illinois
June 16, 1994

Thank you. I thought when I got here you'd be saying, "Bill, make it short; we're about to starve." [*Laughter*] I want to thank you for waiting. I want to thank you for your enthusiasm, for your dedication, for your support. You know, I had to stay in Washington a little longer to do my job, the one you elected me to. And I was hoping you'd still be here when I got here tonight, and I was glad to see you.

I want to thank Mayor Daley for his leadership of this city and for his strong support. I thank Chairman Wilhelm for that rousing introduction and his hard work. You know, he's just like a flower at night; when he comes to Chicago, he just blooms and starts talking. I may have to send four or five of you on the road with him everywhere, so you can pump him up like that. [*Laughter*] I thank Senator Simon and Senator Moseley-Braun and Congresswoman Collins and Congressman Bobby Rush. They are in a very real sense my partners for change, and I want to say a little more about that in a moment. I want to thank my former colleague and good friend Governor Evan Bayh, who has done a better job as chairman of the Democratic Governors than anybody in history. And I can say that because I used to have the job, and he's done a better job than anybody in history doing it.

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to one of my Cabinet members who is here tonight, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Henry Cisneros. I want to thank him for the work he's done with the mayor and Vince Lane and everybody else to try to bring safety and sanity to public housing in Chicago and throughout the United States. We're going out to Robert Taylor Homes tomorrow to stick up for the right of people to be safe in their homes and to raise their children in safety.

I am delighted to be here with this entire Democratic ticket and your State chair, Gary LaPaille, and especially with Dawn Clark Netsch. Boy, she's something, isn't she? [*Applause*] I think the Straight Shooter is going to replace the Comeback Kid as the great marquee of 1994. [*Laughter*]

I want to try to tell you a little bit about why I think this race for Governor here is important, and partly in terms of what we're going through in Washington. You heard David talk a little bit about how the odds are stacked against change; they always have been, you know. Back in the Middle Ages, the great political philosopher Machiavelli said, there is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things, because the people who stand to lose know what they're going to lose, and the people who have a hope that things will be better are always afraid that it really won't work out that way. That has always been true.

It is worse in America today because people have been disappointed for so long, because they have been through difficulties, and because we have a political environment in which things are often communicated to us in the most negative possible way. Those of us who are the forces of change and who believe in the prospect of a better tomorrow, therefore, have a heavy responsibility to keep our hearts up, our heads up, and to keep on fighting for what we believe in.

When I first came to Illinois, running for President, I knew two things. One is, I knew that even if I won in the South on Super Tuesday, I had to win in Illinois the next week or I couldn't be nominated for President. The other thing I knew is what Dawn Clark Netsch said, which was even more important, was that I needed to have a reason to want to be President. You need to know why you want these jobs. And when you do and when you work for it and when that drives you every day, then you can fight for change and you can live with the misunderstandings and you can fight through the ups and downs and you can keep on going because you're not doing it for you, you're doing it—for you. [*Laughter*]

And I looked at her up here giving that speech, and I told Mayor Daley, I said, "You know something? She's really got it." She has really got it, because she has a reason that is bigger than herself to be Governor and because she is trying to build, not tear down; to unite, not divide; to talk about something good, not something bad. This matters. And it is what our country desperately needs today.

We are still fighting through this, because every time we win a victory it's a one-day story, and the problems and the process are a one-week story. And we are dealing with an opposition that is deeply skilled at placing blame and claiming credit and running away when the tough decisions have to be made. Sometimes they remind me in Washington of that old sign I tell everybody about that I once saw on a back road in my State. It said, a sign that was waving on a fence, it said, "George Jones, veterinarian/taxidermist—either way, you get your dog back." [*Laughter*] They don't really care as long as they can put blame and escape responsibility. Well, I ran for President to end blame-placing and to assume responsibility. And I relish in the controversy change causes as long as we are moving.

We were told last year by several nonpartisan surveys that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States working together in 1993 accomplished more in the first year of a Presidency than had been done in any time since World War II, except President Eisenhower and President Johnson's first year. We had to fight partisan gridlock, special interests, and deeply embedded cynicism to do the things I ran for President to do: to try to restore the economy, to try to empower ordinary citizens and ask of them more responsibility in their citizenship, to try to rebuild the American community across the lines of race and income and region, and to try to make Government work for ordinary people again. And we're off to an awful good start.

Look what's happened to this economy. After years and years and years in which the deficit got bigger every year because nobody had the guts to make the tough decisions to bring it down, thanks to the people standing behind me in the Congress and the work we did together—with no help, not a single solitary vote, not one, not one from the other side—we reversed 12 years of favoritism for the wealthiest Americans, explosion of the debt, mortgaging our children's future, to turn that around.

And what has happened? You know, they hate to admit it, they just scream, "Tax and spend." They're like a broken old record; they can't think of anything else to say. But the truth is, the deficit began to come down; interest rates went down last year; the economy began to move. And look what the record is: We've had 3.4 million new jobs in this economy in 17 months, 90 percent of them in the private sector, not Government jobs. The deficit is going down. And when the Congress passes this bill, this budget, we will have 3 years of consecutive reduction in the Government deficit, not under a Republican but with a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States; 3 years in a row the deficit will go down. And this Congress did it while increasing spending on education, increasing spending on Head Start, increasing spending on women's health research, increasing spending on new technologies for the 21st century to give us a better economy. That's the record that we have established. I will gladly run on it and defend it.

They call it tax and spend. They believe they can just keep on saying the same old thing and somebody will believe it even if there are no facts to support it. I'll tell you what tax and spend was in this last budget: 1.2 percent of the American people paid higher income taxes, and one in six working American families got an income tax cut so they could keep working and stay off welfare and raise their children. That is what we did. More than 10 times as many Americans got a tax cut as got a tax increase.

They talk about big Government all the time. You know what the Democrats did? In 6 years we're going to reduce the size of the Federal Government by 252,000. In 1997, the Federal Government will be smaller than it has been at any time since John Kennedy was the President of the United States. And we are going to spend all that money—we are going to spend all that money to finance the most important anticrime bill in the history of this country and put 100,000 police back on the streets of the United States of America.

Oh, I know all about gridlock, and you may still think it's alive and well. But I'm telling you, it took 7 years to pass the Brady bill, but we passed it last year. Seven years, family and medical leave languished, but we passed it last year. Six years for the crime bill. Seven years for the worldwide trade agreement. We are breaking gridlock.

And now we are facing the biggest gridlock of all: We're going to try to see if we can reverse 60 years of failed attempts to bring America into the ranks of every other advanced country in the world and provide affordable health care to every American citizen.

My fellow Americans, it won't be easy. We have achieved some remarkable successes, passing the national service bill that will enable us—3 years from now there will be 100,000 young people in America working their way through college by revolutionizing America at the grassroots level. We reorganized the student loan program. We are revolutionizing the unemployment system. We're going to pass important welfare reform.

But it's very hard to change the health care system. Why? Because we are spending more money than any other country in the world and doing less with it. And why? Why? Because a lot of that money is going for things that have nothing to do with health care. And the $40 million or so that's been spent to convince the American people that our plan is bad for small business, is going to take something away from you and cost you more, is a pittance compared to what they are making out of it.

But let me ask you this: If our system is so good, why are we spending $60 to $80 billion a year more on paperwork than any other system in the world? Why can't we figure out how to cover everybody? Why do we have so many children born into this world who don't have primary and preventive health care? Why do we have 81 million Americans living in families where, because somebody has been sick in that family, they can't get health insurance or they can't afford what they're being asked to pay or they can never change a job? Why do we have tens of millions of Americans knowing at any time the hammer could come down and they would lose it?

I'll tell you why. I'll tell you why. Because every time we get close to doing it, the interest groups that are so entrenched in the way things are doing scare the living daylights out of good, honest small business people and other people and tell them, "Oh, this is going to be a terrible thing."

Let me tell you something, folks. Before we got into this, before we ever asked Congress to pass a bill, we spent months and months and months, and I had already worked for years on this issue. We consulted thousands of doctors and nurses and business people, and we constructed a plan that would be good for small business, good for jobs, and most important, good for American families.

So I want you to help us pass health care and welfare reform and the crime bill and keep the change going and prove that we can break gridlock. Yes, we'll take on a lot of special interests. And yes, in the process we'll be misunderstood. And yes, there will be good days and bad days and good weeks and bad weeks. Why? Because when you are doing something, you don't have time to spend all your time trying to maneuver how you look. All I want to know is, when it's all said and done, what we did—what we did.

Now, the reason Dawn Clark Netsch ought to be Governor of Illinois is because if you hire her, she'll do something, sure as the world. She will do something.

With our adversaries all over America increasingly in the grip of extremists on the right, increasingly willing to say or do anything to demean and defame their opponents, increasingly willing to try to frighten the voters and obscure the facts and make politics about something other than bringing out the best in us and working together, we better stick with the doers and the fighters.

The people that cut and run are going to be vanquished. The people who stand and fight for what's best in this country are going to be rewarded. You stick with us, and we'll have a victory in November.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:16 p.m. at the Chicago Hilton and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago; David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee; and Vince Lane, chairman, Chicago Housing Authority.

Exchange With Reporters at a Chicago Housing Authority Police Substation

June 17, 1994

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, has the U.S. stopped the pursuit of sanctions against North Korea at the U.N.?

The President. No, I gave my position yesterday; that hasn't changed. The position I stated yesterday has not changed.

Q. But Jimmy Carter has told——

Q. What is President Carter talking about?

Q. ——that he thinks you're willing to put sanctions off for a while, sir,

The President. I made my statement yesterday. You have to rely on my statement. I was very clear, very unambiguous. None of us have talked directly with President Carter. We don't know what he said. And I don't think—I don't think you should—[*inaudible*].

[*At this point, the President took a tour of the police substation.*]

Weapons and Anticrime Legislation

The President. Now, all these assault weapons, these tech-knives, and these weapons with the big magazines, will all be banned under the crime bill. They started the conference yesterday, and since both Houses have adopted the assault weapons ban, if they reach agreement, send it back, and both Houses pass it, and the assault weapons that are here, those with multiple magazines and—I mean, multiple ammunition in the magazine—and that otherwise qualify would be banned.

We just left, in the next room over here—this is a representative sample, but we left—in this one police station, there are 1,500 of these weapons that were confiscated from public housing units, of all these different kind of weapons. This is a huge problem. The police don't have a chance. And these people can't live in safety unless we give them some means at least to get the most dangerous weapons out of here and then provide more police officers so they'll be able to deal with the other problems.

Q. Mr. President, the 1,500 weapons in the other room, do you have some sense of how many would be covered by the assault weapons ban?

The President. No, I didn't disaggregate it. But the largest number in the other room that I saw were these tech-knives. They have them just stacked up row after row after row of four and five of them. They sort of—these little weapons have kind of become the weapons of choice, haven't they?

Q. Do you think that the crime bill would get—the gun ban would get gang members from—keep them from getting these anyway? If they want them, aren't they going to get them?

The President. Well, I think that it will make a significant difference. I think there will be fewer of them in circulation. I think you're going to see a lot of gun buy-back programs in every major area in the country. We want to support those. And I think over a couple of years it can make a significant difference.

I think that the percentage of weapons which are assault weapons, automatic and semi-automatic assault weapons, will go down dramatically over the next few years. Now, this problem didn't develop overnight, and it's going to take us some time to deal with it. But the ban needs to pass. It's a very important thing.

Q. Mr. President, you've supported sweeps in the past as a method to get guns and stop crime in public housing. Do you still support the sweeps?

The President. Absolutely. I support this policy here very strongly. We got a court decision which said there were some things wrong with it. So Secretary Cisneros, as you know came

here, spent the night, worked with Mr. Lane and others here and put in a sweeps policy that I strongly support.

Q. But you think——

The President. People have a right to live in a place without being subject to this. There are children here. There are working people. There are mothers. There are fathers. They deserve a chance to live in safety. The right of the community to live in safety and wholeness is the first and most important right of any civilized society.

Q. But should people have to choose between the right to privacy and the right to live in safety and security?

The President. No, but we all are willing to give up some of our privacy rights from time to time. For example, no American complains anymore about going through a metal detector at an airport. And no one even considers it an invasion of privacy anymore. At least I don't. I'm more than happy to do it for the security I have when I get on an airplane that I'll get to my destination, other things being equal.

Q. Sir, were you urged to deal on the racial justice amendment in order to get the crime bill through?

The President. Well, they just started the conference yesterday. We're going to have to wait and see where the people are. Give the conferees a chance to work through it. I'll say this: The most important thing of all in my opinion is to get the 100,000 police out; to get the assault weapons ban out; to get the programs out on crime prevention, drug treatment, giving these kids things to do, you know, some activities after school and jobs in the summer and things that will really give our young people a chance to say yes to something and not just to say no to something, the things that will really hammer down the crime rate. And I think that—the one thing I will say is that the Congress cannot walk away from this. This is an enormous opportunity. This will be the most major piece of anticrime legislation ever passed by the United States Congress, beyond question. It must pass, and it ought to pass now.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, could we try one more time for a clarification on the difference between what President Carter——

The President. I don't know what he said, and I don't know that you know what he said. All I know is what I said, and what I said is the policy of the United States of America.

Q. And the pursuit of sanctions will continue at the present time?

The President. I explained yesterday what the conditions for resuming negotiations and suspending the pursuit of sanctions were. Nothing has changed. That is the policy of the United States.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:45 a.m. in the police substation at Robert Taylor Homes.

Remarks to the Community at Robert Taylor Homes in Chicago
June 17, 1994

Just give her another hand. She did a good job, didn't she? [*Applause.*]

Ladies and gentlemen and boys and girls, I am glad to be here today, glad to be back here today, glad to be here with Tiffany, who represents our best hope for the future and our obligation to do the right thing here in Robert Taylor Homes and throughout the United States.

I'm glad to be here with Secretary Cisneros. You can tell by listening to him talk that he really cares about you and what happens to you. And I hope you can tell that he didn't just appear when he became the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He was a mayor for many years in San Antonio, Texas. And I believe he'll go down in history as perhaps the most gifted Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development we ever had for trying to deal with problems like this.

I want to thank Senator Simon; Senator Moseley-Braun; Congressman Rush; Congresswoman Collins; Vince Lane; the mayor, who's not here, but I saw him earlier this morning; your State senator; your members—your alder-

man; your United States Attorney who's here; and my good friend Bishop Ford, thank you, sir, for being here. God bless you.

Hillary and I are delighted to be here. Vince Lane brought me here 3 years ago before I even started running for President, because I had heard that there was an effort here by citizens to engage in tenant patrols, to give our young people something to say yes to, to try to make these housing units safer, and I asked if I could come and see it.

When I first came here, I was just the Governor of another State, an interested American, a person who couldn't tolerate the thought that young people would be raised in the kind of danger and deprived of the kind of hope that I was seeing, not just here but throughout the United States. And I will never forget as long as I live the first impression I had going into the units where there had been a real effort to clean them up and make them safe, going into others where people still plainly felt at risk, and then, most important of all to me 3 years ago, talking to the young people about their lives and what they wanted for the future.

And I come back here today; I want you to know that I am very honored as President to have the chance to work with you to prove that we can make life better here, that we can have more opportunity for our children, more safety for our streets, more responsibility from all of our people; that we can, in short, do what we ought to do to give everybody a better future, thanks to you and our partnership.

You know, I have to say this just for a moment. I was a little late coming to Illinois yesterday because I spent most of the day working on our differences with North Korea over their nuclear program. A major part of my job is dealing with the security of this country, the national security. But it's also important to recognize that this Nation's security also depends upon whether the children who live here in Robert Taylor Homes can go to sleep at night safe and get up and go to school in the morning safe. That is a big part of our national security as well.

And everything we have tried to do in the last 18 months, from creating more jobs to training our people to take them, to trying to provide health care for all Americans, to working on empowering our communities through welfare reform and the crime bill and the family leave bill, everything is designed to achieve some pretty simple objectives: to give every American without regard to race or gender or region or income a chance to live up to the fullest of his or her God-given capacities; to challenge every American to assume the responsibilities of good citizenship and good conduct; and to rebuild the strength of our national community at the grassroots level where the people live and to do it by having our Government work for ordinary people again, not just for the most powerful and the most organized.

Well, that involves people like you. There are plenty of people, I think, who just want to live in peace and have a chance. I look out here and see these kids and I heard Tiffany's classmates cheering for her when she got up, and I thought to myself, this would happen in any town in America. In any little small town in America if the President showed up, well, if a student introduced him, the classmates would cheer. There's no real difference here—except that you have been asked to live in circumstances where there is too much violence, too many drugs, and not enough things for our young people to say yes to. You just can't tell people to say no all the time; they have to have something to say yes to as well.

That's why I want to thank these men and the others who are here with the midnight basketball program. I love that program. And it's going to make a difference. I want to thank the young people there with their "Peer Power" T-shirts on. I want to thank the people who are in the City Year project here—I've got one of their T-shirts—in community service. I want to thank the people here who work in the tenant patrols. I want to thank people, in other words, who are doing something to seize your own destiny.

You know, I like to think, and I believe with all my heart, that as President I can make a positive difference for America, that I can make this a better country. But you know and I know that if what we're really trying to do is to change the lives of the American people for the better, all I can ever do is to be your partner. You still have to do your part. And the power that I see in the hearts and the eyes of the people with these "Midnight Basketball" shirts on or the people with the "Peer Power" shirts on or the people who engage in the tenant patrol or who are involved in the drug-free program here that I see—this "Phillips Academy" shirt—the power there is the most important power in

the United States of America. When the people of this country make up their mind to do something, there is no stopping them.

I do want to say this—Secretary Cisneros mentioned it—after the dispute in the courts involving the sweeps policy here, I asked the Secretary to come here, along with the Attorney General, and come up with a plan that would enable us to continue to try to work with you to make these communities safer. And we did put some more money, as he said, into law enforcement here. But I want you to know that when we go back to work in Washington next week, Senator Simon, Senator Moseley-Braun, Congressman Rush, and Congresswoman Collins and I, we're going to be facing the responsibility of resolving the most important anticrime measure that has ever come before the United States Congress. And in that bill are 100,000 more police officers for our streets and our cities. In that bill is a ban on semi-automatic assault weapons. And I just saw hundreds of them here in the police station.

It's interesting, when I was there, one of the reporters asked me about the policy here of the sweeps and about the assault weapons, and he said, "Mr. President, are we going to have to be willing to give up some of our personal freedom to live in safety?" And I said that I thought the most important freedom we have in this country is the freedom from fear. And if people aren't free from fear, they are not free.

This bill has harsher punishments for people who are serious criminals, but it also has more opportunities for young people to stay out of crime in the first place: more money for programs like the midnight basketball, more money for after school programs, more money for summer jobs, more money for drug treatment, more money to give our people something to say yes to as well as to say no to.

This is a big deal, folks. It will make a difference here in Chicago and throughout the United States of America. And it is imperative that we pass that crime bill and pass it now, so we can go about the work of making you even safer and helping you to take responsibility for your future. And I hope you will support that.

I want to thank Tiffany because she testified for the crime bill, didn't you? And she made an impression on the Members of the Congress. This is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It's not an African-American, Hispanic, or a white issue. It's about our children and our future and what kind of people we are and whether we're going to behave like civilized human beings, or whether we're just going to take every little old quick advantage we can get, even if we have to kill people to do it. We cannot survive as a people if our children cannot grow up safe and free from fear in good schools, on safe streets, doing wholesome, constructive things.

I will say again, that's why we worked so hard to try to find a way to continue the sweeps policy that Vince Lane developed, not because we want to take anybody's freedom away from them but because we want our children to be free from fear.

Let me just say one last thing. We talk a lot in this country about our rights. And our rights as Americans are the most important things to us. We have rights written into our Constitution that other people all around the world would still give their lives for: the right to free speech, say what's on our mind; the right to worship God as we choose; the right to assemble with people who agree with us and say whatever we want in groups, even if it offends everybody else; the right to be free from arbitrary conduct by our Government; the right to a trial by jury. We have a lot of rights in this country. But the thing that makes our rights work is the right of the community to exist and the responsibilities of citizens to help them exist.

And the thing I take away from this today, the thing I took away from my last visit to Robert Taylor Homes, is that deep inside the spirit of you, all of you who live here, is the overwhelming desire not only to exercise your rights but to see this community be full of responsible citizens, to make the community work again. And I will take that back to Washington when we fight for the crime bill, when we fight to reform the welfare system, when we fight for the empowerment zones to get investment and jobs into these communities, when we fight to give you a chance, because I know that here in this place there are people like you and there are thousands more like you all across America who really believe, who really believe, that we can solve these problems, that we can live together as brothers and sisters, that we can exercise the responsibility required of any great nation. And I will always remember that.

And I want you to believe, every time you put on one of these midnight basketball shirts, every time you participate in a tenant patrol, every time a student joins a drug-free program, every time one of these kids goes into a community service program like City Year, every time you do that, you are saying, "I not only claim my rights as an American, I recognize I have responsibilities as an American. I'm going to do my part to give this country back to the kids and take it away from the drug dealers and the gun-toters." That's what we've got to do together. And I know we can do it.

God bless you, and thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. on the basketball court outside the community center. In his remarks, he referred to community resident Tiffany Hudson, U.S. Attorney James B. Burns, and Bishop Louis Henry Ford, pastor, St. Paul Church of God in Christ, Chicago, IL.

Remarks at the Opening Day Ceremonies for World Cup Soccer in Chicago

June 17, 1994

Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, citizens of the world, the United States is honored to play host to this magnificent celebration. The World Cup has captured the imagination of our country, as has the game itself in the last few years. The love of soccer is now a universal language that binds us all together. So I welcome all who have come from all countries and all continents and all who will watch these games in the United States for the next 30 days.

We will reward with our cheers the courage and skill of all the players. Let us, in the process, come to appreciate the unity of people throughout the world that this game represents. I say especially to President Sanchez and the people of Bolivia, *buena suerte* today. To Chancellor Kohl and the people of Deutschland, *Viel Gluck*. Good luck to you all, and welcome to the United States.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. at Soldier Field. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Long Island Rail Road Strike

June 17, 1994

For commuters who depend on the Long Island Rail Road to commute to work, it is regrettable that the talks between the Rail Road and the United Transportation Union have not been successful in averting a strike. In an effort to bring the parties together I appointed two Presidential Emergency Boards and, late Wednesday night, Secretaries Reich and Pena helped persuade both sides to stay at the bargaining table for another 24 hours.

It is important now that the parties get back to the table, with the continued assistance of the National Mediation Board, and engage in serious round-the-clock negotiations to end the strike. I have instructed the Secretaries of Labor and Transportation to closely monitor the situation and report back to me.

In addition, I have directed the Department of Transportation to assist local authorities in providing appropriate assistance to the traveling public.

I understand that members of the New York congressional delegation are drafting legislation to deal with this situation which I have asked the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Transportation to review. I will continue to confer with Governor Cuomo, the congressional leadership, and the New York congressional del-

egation over the weekend to ensure that we are doing everything possible to help end this dispute. While important issues are at stake, the economic health of the region and the interests of the rail passengers must be protected.

Nomination for the National Council on the Humanities
June 17, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate 10 scholars and civic leaders, including 2 winners of MacArthur Foundation fellowships, the so-called genius awards, to the National Council on the Humanities.

"Over the past three decades, our Nation's cultural life has become immensely richer because of the work of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The scholars and distinguished citizens I am naming today will help that tradition of excellence to continue to flourish," the President said.

The nominees are: Ramon Gutierrez, Darryl Gless, Charles Patrick Henry, Nicolas Kanellos, Bev Lindsey, Robert Rotberg, John D'Arms, Thomas Holt, Martha Howell, and Harold Skramstad.

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

Nomination for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation
June 17, 1994

The President today announced his intention to nominate Delaware Governor Thomas R. Carper to serve on the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak). Governor Carper will assume the seat on the Board being vacated by Gov. Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin.

In announcing the nomination, the President said, "Governor Carper's leadership, financial expertise, and strong commitment to providing America with quality passenger rail service will be of great service to the Board as well as to the millions of customers who rely on Amtrak's service each year."

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

The President's Radio Address
June 18, 1994

Good morning. For a year and a half now, I and my administration have worked very hard to do the right thing by ordinary Americans, to restore the values of community, opportunity, and responsibility that have always strengthened our country. Thanks to you, we're getting the job done on many fronts.

We've reduced the deficit dramatically. We're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We've expanded trade and increased investment in our people's education and training and in new technologies. All of this has produced steady growth in our economy. There are now 3.4 million new jobs in the economy in

the last 16, 17 months, more than in the previous 4 years combined.

Meanwhile, we've worked hard to give more of our children a better education, more of our workers a chance to meet the changing demands of the job market. This week we offered a plan to end welfare as we know it, a plan that will encourage personal responsibility and help strengthen our families through tougher child support, more education and training, and an absolute requirement to go to work after a period of time.

We've broken 7 years of gridlock to pass the family and medical leave law to give working families the security of knowing they won't lose their jobs if they have to take time off from work for a child's birth or a sick parent; 7 years of gridlock to pass the Brady bill to help keep more of our citizens and police officers alive by keeping guns out of the hands of people with dangerous criminal or mental health records. And then our efforts to reform health care, to provide health care to all Americans: For the first time ever, a committee of Congress has recommended private health insurance for every American family. We're trying to break 60 years of gridlock and stranglehold by special interests on health care.

Now, each of these accomplishments is important in its own right. But all of them take on an even greater meaning when we see them as part of our larger mission. That mission is to make it possible for all Americans, without regard to their race, their gender, their income, the region of the country from which they come, to be able to make better lives for themselves, to face the future with all of its changes with the enthusiasm and confidence that they should have. Our goal is not to hand anyone anything but to improve the economy, offer opportunities, strengthen families and communities so that people can assume the responsibility to make a better life for themselves.

No issue poses the need to come together more to deal with the problems that we face than does the cancer of crime and violence that is eating away at the bonds that unite us as a people. I saw it again this week when I visited a housing project in Chicago called Robert Taylor Homes.

I went there once 3 years ago, so I'm pretty familiar with all the wonderful people who live there, the good things they're trying to do, and the terrible problems they face from violence and guns and drugs. I went there because it's a good place to emphasize to all Americans that we have begun a nationwide effort to drive the guns, the gangs, and the drugs from public housing and from all neighborhoods where Americans feel terrorized. I wanted to underscore how important it is to empower our people to take back their homes, their streets, and their schools wherever they live. Unless we do something about crime, we can't be really free in this country, we can't exercise the opportunities that are there for us, and our children can't inherit the American dream.

Now, our administration and the Congress must do our job on crime so that the American people can do their job in the communities where they live. We have waited 5 long years, through partisan and political gridlock, for a crime bill that will address the growing crisis. That's long enough. The crime bill, which has now passed both Houses of Congress, but which must be reconciled into one bill and passed one more time, does provide us with the tools we need to help prevent and punish crime.

Congress is on the verge of adopting this crime bill. It contains almost all the elements of the anticrime plan I've been promoting ever since I started running for President. Now it's time to pass the bill, to stop talking, to stop posturing, and pass the bill.

The crime bill will put 100,000 more police officers on the street. They'll be visible. They'll know the children and the neighbors. They'll give our communities the power to keep themselves safer. Properly trained and properly deployed, 100,000 more police officers on our street will lower the crime rate and increase security.

The bill will enforce our sense of safety in many other ways. We did what many said couldn't be done, including in this bill a ban on assault weapons. I saw hundreds, I mean hundreds, of those assault weapons in one little police cubicle in the office in Robert Taylor Homes just on Friday. We have got to take these weapons of killing away from people who are putting the police at a disadvantage and terrorizing our children and our neighborhoods.

This bill will provide for capital punishment for anyone who kills a law enforcement officer. It will give serious repeat offenders what they have earned, a life sentence, by making "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. It will make it illegal for teenagers to possess

handguns unless they're under the supervision of a responsible adult. It will make our schools safer by giving the most dangerous school neighborhoods in the country more resources to provide for safe schools.

But providing more police and tougher punishment isn't enough. We have to deter crime where it starts. This proposal also gives people something to say yes to. It provides jobs for thousands of young people from high-crime neighborhoods, particularly those who stay in school, off drugs, and out of trouble. It gives funds to keep schools open after hours. It adds support for boys and girls clubs, for community activities like midnight basketball. It builds better partnerships between our police and our young people.

An investment in a child is not only a contribution to America's future, it's a real stroke in the war against crime. Those on the frontlines of crime, our police officers, have witnessed firsthand the explosion in youth crime and violence, and they know this is true. A coalition representing more than half a million law enforcement officers nationwide has just written to me and said, "We support the inclusion in the crime bill of substantial funds for prevention programs. They can help make a difference."

Here at the Robert Taylor Homes on Friday I saw young people wearing T-shirts for peer groups, for adopt-a-grandparent's program, for antidrug programs, for midnight basketball programs. I met adults working in tenant patrols. All these prevention programs are unleashing the grassroots energy of responsible residents who understand that they, too, have a duty to try to do something about crime. They're young, they're old, they're middle-aged; they want to take their streets, their neighborhoods, their communities back. And we owe it to them to support them. We can only do it if we keep the prevention component of the crime bill.

Now is the most crucial time to make sure your Congressmen know you want action on the crime bill. There has been enough talk. We have broken years of gridlock to get the bill through both Houses of Congress. But unless it comes to my desk and I sign it, all this effort will have been for nothing. We can give the families of this country the chance to control their own neighborhoods, to raise their children in safety and security. That's what real freedom requires. We can't give up until we've got it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:07 p.m. on June 17 at the Robert Taylor Homes community center in Chicago, IL, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 18.

Interview With Katie Couric and Bryant Gumbel on "Today"

June 20, 1994

Q. Forty years ago, Harry Truman, who was staying at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel here in New York City, decided to take a morning stroll down West 49th Street. There, the story goes, he noticed a group of onlookers watching the "Today" show through its street-level glass window. He decided to join the crowd, and thus this unusual picture.

Today, minus the stroll, we are pleased to welcome another President to our street-level digs. Mr. President, good morning. Welcome to Studio 1A.

The President. Good morning, Bryant. I wish I were with Harry Truman today, out there on the street, looking in.

North Korea

Q. Well, Katie and I are very grateful that you're allowing us the opportunity to interview you this morning. Thank you for taking the time.

Let's start with North Korea, if we might. Former President Jimmy Carter, just back from the Korean Peninsula and meetings with Kim Il-song, has said that he believes the crisis has been defused and at this point any sanctions would be counterproductive. Do his opinions reflect the views of your administration in any way? And if not, could you detail the extent to which his views and his trip may have changed your approach?

The President. Well, the North Koreans asked President Carter to come as a private citizen.

He called me, and we agreed that the trip might be productive, that he would go, he would listen, he would faithfully state the views of our administration and reaffirm that our interest is in seeing that North Korea honor its commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its commitment to a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula.

While there, when he notified us about what they were saying, we put out a statement, which he reaffirmed, which simply said that if North Korea wishes to talk and is willing to freeze their nuclear program, that is, not continue reprocessing or refueling while they talk, then that would be a step forward. He says that Kim Il-song made that commitment to him. Now we have to verify that. So that's the question.

We have, surely, something to gain by talking with the North Koreans, by avoiding further steps toward a crisis. But we have to know there's been a change. So we'll be looking to verify that. And that's really the question. This is a question of fact now.

There are some hopeful signs, the willingness to meet between North and South. But the critical question is, are they willing to freeze this nuclear program while we try to work these differences out?

Q. You say there are hopeful signs. Are you prepared to respond with positive signs of your own, or have you reason to believe that Kim Il-song's history suggests there's a wide divergence between what he says and what he does?

The President. Well, I think what we have to do is to look to the present and the future and say we will evaluate words in terms of actions. We have the capacity, if the international inspectors and the equipment are going to be left there, to evaluate whether, in fact, the nuclear program has been frozen. If it's going to be frozen, then clearly that is grounds for talking. But we have to know what the facts are, and we'll be attempting to determine that.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, moving to matters closer at home now, yesterday on "Meet the Press" Senator Moynihan, chairman of the Finance Committee, said that there was no chance that Congress will pass a health care plan that will give all Americans immediate insurance coverage. If that, in fact, is the case, will you accept a plan that will provide universal coverage somewhere down the road?

The President. Well, Katie, our plan required a phase-in. It's going to take some time for the States and for others who would have to provide the insurance who don't now to phase it in. But I think the important thing is that we should not walk away from this Congress without a commitment to cover everyone. The so-called 91 percent solution, if it's a permanent solution, essentially would guarantee what we have now. The poor would get health care; the wealthy would get health care; the middle class would be at risk of losing it. One in ten Americans would not have any health care all the time, and others would be losing it.

Keep in mind, we now have 3 million more Americans without health insurance than we had 3 years ago. The situation in terms of coverage is getting worse, more and more middle class Americans at risk.

All I want to do is to give the American people what the President and the Congress and the Federal Government employees have. And my proposal would cost small businesses much, much less than the last minimum wage increase that President Bush signed.

Now, I admit that we needed to make some changes in our original proposal. I always said we would. We want it now to be less bureaucratic and less regulatory, and the proposals are. They reflect some changes that we have agreed to. But we have to cover all Americans. And that's the real issue.

Q. So you're saying some of the bills that are being discussed in Senate Finance which will provide insurance coverage for 91 percent, that if those bills, or a bill like that comes to your desk, you'll veto it?

The President. What I'm saying is I don't think it will come to my desk for the simple reason that if you look at what the bill does, the bill that covers 91 percent of Americans, the proposal would cost middle class taxpayers more tax money, essentially subsidize low-income people, and leave middle class workers either without health insurance or at risk of losing it because of all the problems we have in the system today. So I really don't believe it is a solution.

I know that there had been tens of millions of dollars in special interest money spent to convince the American people that our plan is wrong. I know that we needed to make some changes in our plan. But I also know that the right thing for America is to do what every

other advanced country has done in guaranteeing middle class working people health care that can't be taken away.

When Harry Truman stopped by the "Today" show 40 years ago and looked in at Dave Garroway—who, by the way, was the first fellow I ever saw that wore a bow tie, so I remember this very well—he knew that. And they beat him to pieces over health care. And they drove the popularity of his proposal down. And he was never able to pass it. But Harry Truman was right then, and we're right now.

The right thing for America's values, for work, for family, is to provide health care for all Americans. It doesn't have to be done tomorrow. It ought to be phased in over a period of just a few years. But we ought not to walk away without a bill that provides health care to all Americans.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, let's turn to Haiti, if we could for a moment. It's being reported in this morning's paper that your administration is trying to induce Haiti's three top military leaders to leave Haiti for a comfortable life in exile, perhaps by managing somehow to pay them off. Is that something that's being pursued? And if you can get them to leave Haiti, are you at all interested in bringing them to justice after that?

The President. We have always said, if you go back to the beginning of this administration, that we had no interest in trying to persecute anybody. President Aristide himself agreed on an amnesty proclamation as part of the agreement we had last year. The military leaders broke that agreement. We are still looking at any number of options to try to restore democracy to Haiti so that that troubled country can begin to have some economic growth and the people who have been so oppressed by the military dictators can escape their oppression. So we have a number of options under consideration.

What happens to those who violate the law, I think, depends in part on what the democratic government decides to do. But President Aristide all along has said that he was interested in honoring the original conditions of the Governors Island Agreement. It was the other side which broke them.

Health Care Reform

[*Following a commercial break, it was announced that the President would take questions from persons outside the studio. A participant then asked if an additional tax would be used to help small businesses pay for health care.*]

The President. Well, we propose to make up that difference in two ways: first of all, by raising the cigarette tax and, secondly, by achieving other savings in Government programs. Then we ask the very biggest businesses in the country, who are going to get a big reduction, most of them, from our health care plan because we're going to spread the cost more evenly throughout the country, to pay a small amount of money into a program that will support the subsidies for small business and continuing medical research.

This will work because of the competitive pressures to hold health care costs down if we get everybody in the system. That is, I think that it's hard for most Americans to realize this, but we're already spending about 40 percent more of our income, as a percentage of our income, than any other country on Earth. And yet we're the only country that doesn't require everybody to have some health coverage.

So it seems to me that the simplest way to do it is to just take the system we have, which is an employer-based system that over 80 percent of the Americans are covered by, and just extend it to everybody. But in order to do it, because we have so many small employers, you've got to give them a discount. And I wouldn't do this in this way if I weren't convinced that it would help the economy in the medium term and over the long term. We can't do anything that will run unemployment up. This will balance out the scales, in my judgment, and help more small businesses create jobs.

Keep in mind, most small businesses are giving health insurance now and paying 35 percent or 40 percent more than bigger business and Government. And as a consequence, that undermines their ability to compete. They can't get fair rates. And the proposal we have, I will say again, will cost small business considerably less than the minimum wage increase that President Bush signed a couple of years before I became President.

High School Reunion

[*A participant from Park Ridge, IL, was introduced.*]

The President. That's a great town.

[*The participant, who had graduated from high school with Hillary Clinton, asked if their 30th reunion could be held at the White House.*]

The President. That's a decision for her to make. But I'll bet you she would like to welcome you here at the White House. I'm trying to work out an opportunity to welcome my 30th high school reunion class to the White House as well. I think both of us would like that very much. And I will tell her that you asked. I'm sure—I hope she's watching this morning, but I'll tell her. And I'll bet she would love that.

O.J. Simpson

Q. Mr. President, let me close, if I could, with one that isn't a national issue but one I'm sure you have some feelings on. The entire country, as you know, watched the O.J. Simpson drama unfold last week. What are your own personal thoughts about the fall from grace of such an American hero?

The President. Well, it's a genuine tragedy. In some ways it's a story as old as time; in some ways it's a modern story. It's of course the biggest tragedy because two people were killed. Children were robbed of a mother, a family's lost loved ones, and a man widely admired in this country is now caught in the web of a terrible tragedy. But I have to say that, after we all watched it in excruciating detail last weekend, the time has now come for the legal process to take its course. I think the less the rest of us say from now on in until the legal process takes its course, the better.

Q. Mr. President, we thank you very much for taking the time to be with us——

The President. Thank you.

Q. ——helping to christen our new studio. We appreciate it and hope you'll come back.

Q. Next time President Clinton, come here to New York and see us.

The President. Oh, I'd like that. I'd like to be looking—I'd like to be on the outside looking in, asking you questions. [*Laughter*]

Q. For a change, I guess, right?

The President. That's right.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:09 a.m. The President spoke via satellite from the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dave Garroway, original host of "Today." A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Nomination for a United States Court of Appeals Judge
June 20, 1994

The President today nominated David S. Tatel to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

"David Tatel has an extraordinary record of dedication and achievement in the legal profession," the President said today. "He has set an example for lawyers both in the private sector and in public service with his lifelong commitment to protecting and preserving the rights of all Americans."

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

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Arpad Goncz of Hungary and President Michal Kovac of Slovakia
June 21, 1994

The President. May I first just make an opening comment here. The United States is very honored to have the Hungarian President, Mr. Goncz, and the Slovak President, Mr. Kovac,

here. They are on their way to New York to receive a well-deserved award for their common commitment to democracy and reform. They have supported both, steadfastly and with great courage and consistency. And I have personally enjoyed very much the relationship that we have had working together on the Partnership For Peace concept and in many other areas, and I look forward to their progress.

And I congratulate the people of Hungary and the Slovak Republic for their steadfastness, even in the face of great difficulty, and their leaders for their genuine leadership ability. So, it's a great honor for us to have them here in the White House. And we will be talking about the role the United States will be playing with them and the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, now and in the years ahead, in this meeting.

Partnership For Peace

Q. Mr. President, is Russia going to sign the Partnership For Peace tomorrow in Brussels, that you know of?

The President. We hope so. We hope they will be doing it in the next few days. I'm not sure exactly whether all the details have been worked out. But when President Yeltsin and I spoke a couple of days ago about the Korean matter, we talked a bit about that. And I expect them to join the Partnership For Peace sometime in the next few days.

North Korea

Q. And have you opened up a channel to North Korea in the aftermath of former President Carter's——

The President. Well, we have a channel of communications to them. And we have followed up President Carter's statements to me and his letter of understanding with a communication to the North Koreans, and we will be waiting to hear back. And we expect and hope to hear back within a couple of days about whether President Carter's understanding of what they said is correct.

Legal Defense Fund

Q. President Clinton, have you decided whether to launch a legal defense fund?

The President. I have nothing to say about that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:44 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the Business Roundtable
June 21, 1994

Thank you very much, John. I'm trying to fix this lectern, if you're wondering what I'm doing up here. I'm proving that I don't have sufficient mechanical skills. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank John for his leadership as the chairman of this distinguished group and welcome the incoming chair, John Snow, with whom I just shared a few words about some of our common interests in Europe. I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to two of your members for working on issues that we share a common concern about, Joe Gorman, who's chairing your session on education, and Larry Perlman, who's chairing the work force development section and discussing the reemployment act that he's helping us to work on and about which I wish to talk today. I want to thank the Business Roundtable for sharing a belief with me and with our administration that we have to move aggressively to embrace the challenges of the global economy. That, after all, is why we worked hard on the North American Free Trade Agreement and why we are working together to pass the GATT agreement.

I also want to thank you for our common understanding of a simple but powerful truth, which is that even as we lower barriers to trade around the world, we must work hard to lift our people up here at home so that they can compete and win and carry on their work and build their lives. Investing in our people's God-given potential is good economics. You know that, and I do. It pays off in higher productivity, more incomes, a competitive edge for our com-

panies and our country in the global marketplace. We talk about this all the time in the White House. I see my Chief of Staff, Mr. McLarty, and our Economic Adviser, Mr. Rubin; the Deputy Treasury Secretary, Mr. Altman, is here. There may be others here from the administration. These are things that we say all the time in our meetings. I appreciate the work that you did in helping us to pass the Goals 2000 legislation, one of the most important education reforms in a generation in this country. When we work together, we can do things that help America prepare for the future.

I think today is an especially appropriate day for me to be here, speaking with you about how we can better prepare our country for change. Fifty years ago tomorrow, as the Allied armies advanced from the beaches of Normandy, President Roosevelt signed a bill that was called the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, better known as the GI bill of rights. Just as D-Day was the greatest military action in history, the GI bill arguably was the greatest investment in our people in American history. Its legacy is the world's largest middle class, the world's strongest economy. Its lesson is, in large measure, the mission of our administration: If you give people a chance to help themselves, they'll do it and they'll do extraordinary things.

Before World War II, our country often failed to prepare returning veterans after wars. We gave them pensions and bonuses, but they had nothing left to build their future with. That's why jobless and despairing veterans of World War I actually marched on Washington in 1932, why President Roosevelt declared that the GI bill, quote, "gave emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

We know why the GI bill didn't let them down. It relied on American values of work and responsibility. It offered a hand up, not a handout. The veterans of World War I, by contrast, got a handout. To be sure, one they earned and one the country was grateful for, but they got cash and a train ticket home. But the veterans of World War II got a ticket to the future instead. Uncle Sam helped them to go to college, to get job training, to finance homes and businesses of their own. But it was up to them to seize the opportunities. They did, and all of us are the better.

The GI bill helped 8 million returning veterans begin that journey. They flooded colleges and trade schools: 450,000 veterans became engineers; 360,000 became school teachers; 240,000 became accountants; 180,000 became doctors and nurses; 150,000 became scientists. Millions more bought homes or built businesses. Maybe some of them are among you who invited me here to be with you today.

We really can't even begin to calculate how much our Nation was enriched by the GI bill, how many communities sprung up, how many companies prospered, how many families earned their share of the American dream. This much we do know: Together all those people built the American middle class that has been the bulwark of our prosperity since World War II.

Fifty years after the signing of the GI bill, the world's changed a lot. Our economy has clearly changed. But what it takes for our people to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow has not changed. Now as then, we stand at a pivot point in history. In the five decades between, our country mustered another great international commitment, the commitment to stand strong in the cold war. That succeeded. Now we see a world economy taking shape where investment and information flow rapidly across national borders. Competition for jobs and incomes is international and highly intense. And once again, we are being called upon to decide our future.

I have a vision, a mission, a strategy for how I believe all this should take place; how we can move forward in the 21st century; what the partnership between Government and business ought to be; what the whole atmospherics in this country, the feeling about our mission ought to be. I must say, it doesn't fit very well into the established categories of left and right and liberal and conservative and Democratic and Republican. And I feel frustrated sometimes at my ability to pierce the atmosphere that prevails here. But it is clear to me that if we are going to make a future that is consistent with our values, we're going to have to do it with a different approach.

Still, it has to be built on the spirit that animated the GI bill: Give Americans the chance to make their own lives in this fast-changing world so the changes can be their friends and not their enemies. To do it we have to move on many fronts. We have to create an environment where business can create new jobs and new growth. We have to open markets for our goods and services, for our companies and our

workers. We have to invest in our people's work and security.

When I assumed this office, the deficit had been increasing exponentially for 12 years; trade agreements were stalled; job growth was agonizingly slow; consumer confidence was shaky. We were actually facing the prospect that, for the first time, a generation of Americans would grow up to a future that was more limited than that which their parents enjoyed.

I adopted a strategy to, first, work on expanding the economy and getting our own economic house in order; second, to make Government work for ordinary citizens and end gridlock; third, to empower people and strengthen communities; and fourth, to secure our role in the world, defending our fundamental security interests, expanding our economic interests, promoting democracy, human rights, and limiting the spread of destructive chaos arising out of ethnic and other hatreds.

The atmosphere, frankly, here has been more hostile to change than I had imagined it would be. The American people desperately wanted change but were often unwilling to listen to the complex debates and make the difficult decisions that are inherent in it. And this town still is, in my judgment, too partisan, too negative, too obsessed with process and conflict instead of results and progress, too interested in blame, and too little interested in responsibility.

Nonetheless, we have been able to put together an economic strategy for putting our house in order, making hard decisions that will make it possible next year, for the first time since Truman was President, to have 3 years in a row of deficit reduction, eliminating over 100 Government programs outright, cutting 200 others, cutting domestic discretionary spending—that's everything besides Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, the other entitlements—cutting discretionary spending on the domestic side, not just defense, for the first time in 25 years.

All of that will enable us to reduce the deficit 3 years in a row for the first time since the Truman Presidency. It means we've had to slash the Federal Government, to bring more responsibility into the budgeting process. We completed the budget by the May 15 deadline for 2 years in a row for the first time in 17 years.

We are making progress. We've adopted a very aggressive attitude on trade, which you've been a part of, as all of you know: NAFTA, GATT, the APEC meetings—I'm going to a second one in Indonesia this fall—a hemispheric summit at the end of the year with all the leaders of the Latin American democracies. And 33 of the 35 countries in Latin America, along with the United States, are now headed by elected governmental officials.

We've now got the first investment-led, low-inflation-based economic recovery since the early 1960's. In addition to that, we have worked hard to make Government work. With the reinventing Government program that the Vice President has spearheaded, at the end of 5 years, we will have a Federal bureaucracy that has 250,000 fewer Federal employees and is under 2 million in civilian workers for the first time since the Kennedy Presidency.

We have Federal agencies that are working again in fundamental ways to engage the business community in the growth of the economy all around the world. The Export-Import Bank—I see Mr. Brody over there. I don't know how many businessmen have come up to me and said, "For the first time in my life, I travel overseas and I see the State Department and the Commerce Department actually working together trying to promote American business interests. And I appreciate it."

The Small Business Administration has been virtually revolutionized in the way it works with small businesses. You can now apply for a loan on a one-page form. People talk to me everywhere I go in America about the emergency management agency, FEMA, of the Federal Government, saying it finally has become the shining light of what a Government ought to be when people are in trouble instead of just a pain in the neck that has to be dealt with. We are trying to make Government work.

The Congress has before it major campaign finance reform and lobby reform legislation that has passed both Houses of the Congress, awaiting now a conference that will iron out the differences and send that to me for signature.

Maybe most important of all, in spite of everything, gridlock is being dealt with. Last year, the Congress passed the Brady bill and the family leave bill after 7 years of gridlock. We got agreement among the great nations on GATT after 7 years of debate. This year the Congress is going to pass a crime bill after 6 years of gridlock, one that will be the most sweeping anticrime legislation ever adopted by the Congress: 100,000 more police officers on our

streets, tougher punishment, innovative prevention programs, a ban on assault weapons that people said could never be passed over the opposition of the NRA.

And at the end of last year, according to nonpartisan sources, we had the best first year in working with Congress of any Presidency since the end of World War II, except the Eisenhower first year and President Johnson's first year, which were about the same. And if I may be forgiven a little bit of bragging rights, I think the things we tried to do and the atmosphere in which we tried to do them were far more difficult.

So we are trying to make Government work. I say that to say that, yes, there have been some good results. And a lot of them are because you did a lot of work in the 1980's and the early nineties to become more productive and to be more competitive. And in the first 16 months of this administration, over 3 million new jobs in the private sector came into this economy, 2½ times as many than in the previous 4 years alone. We had, the first quarter of this year, the first time in well over a decade when there was no bank failure in a quarter. There were more incorporations of new businesses than at any time since World War II in 1993.

But I will say again, we can do these things, and unless we also empower our people to deal with the challenges of the global economy, as we did with the GI bill, we're going to have a tough time.

With your help and support, a lot of things have already been done. A bigger and better Head Start program will improve the quality of the program and serve 40,000 more children this year and 90,000 more children next year than were being served previously. Goals 2000 will link grassroots reform with world-class standards for our public schools, the first time we have ever had any national standards for achievement.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act will help high school students learn real skills and provide America with better trained, higher skilled workers. Student loan reforms, which the Secretary of Education, who's here, has done so much to administer, will make it possible for 20 million American students to repay their loans—some $50 billion of them—on more favorable terms and make it possible for students in the future to borrow money to go to college at lower interest rates and better repayment terms. But it will make it harder for them to avoid paying their bills.

These things are very hopeful signs. The national service program, AmeriCorps, will make it possible for 20,000 young people to serve their country at the grassroots level and earn money to go to college this year; the year after next, 100,000 young Americans doing that. The Peace Corps in its largest year had 16,000 Americans serving. This national service program literally has the potential to change the way our young people think about themselves, their country, and their role as citizens.

So many of you have helped us on all these issues. And this summer, we're going to have two or three more things that I want to ask you to help us on. First of all, as I go to the G–7 conference, there will be a lot of discussion about GATT. Everybody that I know sort of treats GATT as if it's already done. But as you know, the Congress has not yet passed the enabling legislation. I will submit that legislation implementing the agreement this summer. We have worked very, very hard on meeting the strict budget rules to find a way to pay for GATT. You and I know GATT will make the Government money, but under our budget rules, we have to pretend that it's going to cost us money because we're getting rid of tariffs.

I want to urge you in the strongest possible terms: Do everything you can to persuade the Congress to give this high priority, to pass it with as little controversy and as little delay as possible, and to move on it this year. Only the United States, of all our trading partners, has to go through the budget hoops we do to pass GATT. All of our trading partners look at me and say, "You're the person that got us all together and made us do this last year. How can you not ratify it?" We need your help, and we must do it this year, not next year.

Secondly, I ask for your help to pass the reemployment act which will change the whole way our unemployment system works. It will turn a bewildering array of training programs into a system where workers who lose their jobs can present themselves at a one-stop service center and get the guidance, the training opportunities, and the information they need for real jobs in the private sector. The boards that supervise these programs will be controlled by people who know most about the opportunities, the pri-

vate sector. And I want Congress to enact that this year. This is very, very important.

The average person does not go back to the job from which he or she is laid off, but the unemployment system is still built on the premise that they do. The consequence of that is that employers pay too much in unemployment for people to just hang around on the system instead of prepare to take new jobs, and employees spend too much time doing just that instead of moving more quickly into a new economy. We can change this, but we need to do it this year.

Let me finally say that, on this issue, a lot of you have expressed support to me personally for the welfare reform efforts. Whether that can pass this year or not depends upon how much fire it catches in Congress and how much controversy we can avoid in how to fund it. But we have to change the culture of welfare. And this program that I have presented to Congress, along with the others that have been presented, go right at the heart of parents who don't pay child support they owe, to the heart of the teen pregnancy problem, to the heart of requiring people to work once they have the skills to do so. And I hope you will continue to support that.

Now, despite all these efforts, I have to tell you that I do not believe that the American people, as individuals, will be able to embrace the changes of the global economy as successful workers unless and until we address the health care crisis.

This goes to the heart of our debate on all of the other things in the strategy I outlined. It goes to the heart of whether we can get our own economic house in order. It goes to the heart of whether we can make Government work for ordinary people. It goes to the heart of whether we can empower people to view change as a friend instead of an enemy. Unless we can provide coverage for every American in a reform system which focuses on both quality and control of costs, the deficit will grow, your costs will continue to grow and undermine productivity, and more and more Americans will lose their coverage or be at risk.

Let me briefly discuss this whole thing from my point of view, from your point of view, and from the American citizen's point of view, from a worker's point of view.

From my point of view, as the President in charge of the budget, I've worked hard to get this deficit down for 3 years in a row for the first time since Truman was President. I have done things that people who say they're more conservative than me talk about but don't do. We're eliminating over 100 Government programs. We're cutting 200 others. We're reducing discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years and still with the discipline to increase investment in education and new technologies and training. We have reduced defense all we can reduce it. And I think we are right at the margin, and we should not reduce it any more, given the challenges we face in this economy.

A lot of you will probably be called to testify or to support the work of Senator Kerrey, Senator Danforth, and others in this entitlements commission, because you know that the only thing that is increasing our deficit now is entitlements. But keep in mind, when you strip all that away, some of the entitlements are going down; Social Security is going up only with the rate of inflation and is roughly the same percentage of our GDP it was 20 years ago. The only part of the entitlements going up much more rapidly than inflation are Medicare and Medicaid, the Government's programs for the elderly and the poor.

And I can tell you that unless we can bring them in line with inflation, we will be forced to either let the deficit go up again, raise taxes more than we should, or cut our investment in public investment, in things you support, to a dangerously low level in a global economy. So that's what it looks like from my point of view, just from a budget perspective.

From your point of view, you know already that the Government does not reimburse Medicare and Medicaid providers at 100 percent of cost, so the costs are being shifted to you. The other people who are shifting costs to you are businesses and employers who do not have health insurance but who get health care. They are shifting the cost to you.

Now, if our deficit goes up, and we have to bring the deficit down, and we cut Medicare and Medicaid without fundamental reform, we're going to shift more cost to you. And you will be put in the position of paying more or covering less. And keep in mind, in the last 3 years, 3 million American workers have lost their health insurance. There are 3 million more Americans without health coverage today than there were 3 years ago. You are also paying for them in cost shifting.

So unless we have comprehensive reform, you will be put in the position of someday coming to the end of how much you can do managing your health care costs on your own—which you've done a very good job of, almost all of you. And you will be facing the cost shift coming at you from the Federal Government and from the increasing numbers of employers who don't provide any coverage.

Now, the third and the most important thing of all: What does this look like if you're out there working in this country, and you hadn't had much of a pay increase in the last 10 years, but you know that your country's becoming more competitive, and you're excited about the 21st century, and you know that you're raising children who will have to change jobs eight times in a lifetime? What are you going to do?

If you're a man and you have a premature heart attack, or your wife gets breast cancer, your kid develops some strange disease, and you have a preexisting condition, and you're being told, "It's a brave new world out there. Don't worry if you have to change jobs. Just get some new retraining. You'll do fine." And then it turns out nobody wants to hire you because you've got a preexisting condition.

Oh, I know there are those who say we can just legislate these things. We'll just legislate the insurance reforms, say you can't discriminate against anybody, and it will be fixed. Look at the study that many of my adversaries in the Congress on this issue keep citing, the Lewin VHI study. They say that all you can get out of insurance reforms is coverage in the short run for 2.2 million more people. You look at the experience of New York that tried to mandate insurance reforms alone. What happens? A lot of people's insurance goes up, and a lot more people opt out of the system.

I say, if you look at the rest of the world and you look at us, we have 81 million Americans out of a population of only 255 million, 81 million of us live in families with people who have preexisting conditions. But they all still need to be able to change work seven times in a lifetime.

Thirty-nine million of us do not have health insurance. There is no compelling evidence that we can both have quality and cost control and stop cost-shifting in the absence of covering everyone. There is no compelling evidence. The Lewin VHI study, so often cited by those who say, "Well, we could get 91 percent coverage in America, up from 83 percent, covering 97 percent of the cost of health care if only we did this stuff, which doesn't require employer mandates or of some other universal coverage"—that's being talked about. But if you notice, there's not been a bill really pushing that. Why? Because when you strip it away, you see that it costs literally hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 5 or 6 years to finance that in massive subsidies which basically benefit poor people, most of whom are not working, some of whom are working, and does nothing for middle-class workers. Which means to do that instead of an employer mandate, we would have to go back and raise the heck out of everybody's taxes, which we are not about to do. At that level it would not be fair.

Now, how is it that every other advanced country in the world and all of our competitors—we're only too happy to learn from our competitors in every other way, and we're very proud when we beat our competitors. And I don't know how many of you have told me personally, "We're better now than anybody else in the world at what we do. And we went through all kinds of agonies in the eighties, and we faced all these challenges, and now we're better than our competitors."

Well, our competitors, not a single, solitary one of them spends more than 10 percent of GDP on health care. We spend 14, and we're the only people that can't figure out how to cover everybody. Now, I refuse to declare defeat. Why should we jump in the tank?

I heard the messages about what people didn't like about our original proposal: Don't put restrictions on experimental drugs; don't make businesses go into alliances if they don't want to, let it be voluntary, people know their own interests; let multistate businesses have an approach which makes sense for all their employers. We're making the changes that we heard people complain about. Those changes are being made. We know we needed to make some changes. But if you remember, when I offered my health care plan, I said, "This is not the end-all and be-all. It's the beginning of a debate." But what we need to decide is whether we're going to walk away from this session of Congress without the debate.

Harry Truman said 50 years ago, Americans will never be secure unless we did something about health care. Everybody thinks of Harry Truman now as the fount of all wisdom. I come

from a family that liked him when he was unpopular. [*Laughter*] But most Americans didn't like him too much at the time. He kept telling them uncomfortable truths. He was right 50 years ago, and it's still true. So, yes, we need to make some changes in the original proposal I made. We put them out there. But what we need is a quick, honest, forthright debate. We need to deal with this issue this year because until we do, we will continue to spend a higher percentage on health care than our competitors; you will continue to have costs shifted to you; your Government will continue to face the agonizing choice of continuing to spend more and more of your tax money on entitlements, less on investment, and still increasing the deficit and still shifting costs to you.

So, I ask you, enter the debate and just tell people what you have to do every day in your own businesses. You get a real hard decision; if you don't want the thing to collapse, you can't walk away. And almost always, you make a decision that is less than perfect but is better than making no decision.

So I ask you, help me pass the reemployment bill. Help us pass GATT. Help us pass welfare reform. But don't walk away from health care. The numbers are big; they're enormous. And we can't tell an average American, can't tell a mother on welfare, "Get off of welfare and take a job so you can lose your children's health insurance and start paying taxes for people to pay for their kids' health care who stayed on welfare." We can't tell a worker, "Give up your job security and find a new security in your mind, in your ability to learn and change," if your illness or the illness of someone in your family will put you out of the job market. We must not ask people to choose between being good parents and good workers. We cannot ask people to risk their children's health to participate in the global economy. And most importantly, we can't just keep working with a system that is fundamentally flawed that we can fix. We can look around the world; we know there are all kinds of fixes here. We may have to do more for small business; I'm willing to do that. We may have to do more, and we should, to make the thing less regulatory; I've already made a lot of those changes. But let us not walk away.

When I spoke at Normandy a couple of weeks ago, in the greatest honor of my Presidency, to represent our country in commemorating the 50th anniversary of D-Day, the thing that overwhelmed me about that was that people did what they had to do because there was no option, and they measured up and literally saved the world. And that in that moment, there was no option to be cynical. There was no luxury available for people to avoid the decisions before them, and they did not have the option to be cynical.

Today, I tell you, we have fundamental decisions to make about what kind of people we are going to be into the future. Walking away is an option that's not really there. Being cynical or negative is always an option that's there, but it's something we pay a terrible price for. This country can do what we have to do. We have to be what the people that led the D-Day invasion were; they were called Pathfinders, the people that went first. That's what we're being asked to do.

You live in an age which glorifies commerce and success and international trade more than any other in the lifetime of anybody in this room. Therefore, you have enormous responsibilities. And you have to light the path to the future in the way that the GI bill did 50 years ago. We can do it. We can do it if we make the right choices.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:55 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the J.W. Marriott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to John Ong, outgoing chair, and John Snow, incoming chair, Business Roundtable.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Sanctions Against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

June 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 30, 1992, in Executive Order No. 12808, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States arising from actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, acting under the name of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in their involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize territory in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence utilizing, in part, the forces of the so-called Yugoslav National Army (57 *FR* 23299, June 2, 1992). The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c). It discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order No. 12808 and to expanded sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (the "FRY (S/M)") contained in Executive Order No. 12810 of June 5, 1992 (57 *FR* 24347, June 9, 1992), Executive Order No. 12831 of January 15, 1993 (58 *FR* 5253, January 21, 1993), and Executive Order No. 12846 of April 26, 1993 (58 *FR* 25771, April 27, 1993).

1. Executive Order No. 12808 blocked all property and interests in property of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, or held in the name of the former Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches.

Subsequently, Executive Order No. 12810 expanded U.S. actions to implement in the United States the United Nations sanctions against the FRY (S/M) adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution 757 of May 30, 1992. In addition to reaffirming the blocking of FRY (S/M) Government property, this order prohibits transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) involving imports, exports, dealing in FRY-origin property, air and sea transportation, contract performance, funds transfers, activity promoting importation or exportation or dealings in property, and official sports, scientific, technical, or other cultural representation of, or sponsorship by, the FRY (S/M) in the United States.

Executive Order No. 12810 exempted from trade restrictions (1) transshipments through the FRY (S/M), and (2) activities related to the United Nations Protection Force ("UNPROFOR"), the Conference on Yugoslavia, or the European Community Monitor Mission.

On January 15, 1993, the President issued Executive Order No. 12831 to implement new sanctions contained in United Nations Security Council Resolution 787 of November 16, 1992. The order revoked the exemption for transshipments through the FRY (S/M) contained in Executive Order No. 12810, prohibited transactions within the United States or by a United States person relating to FRY (S/M) vessels and vessels in which a majority or controlling interest is held by a person or entity in, or operating from, the FRY (S/M), and stated that all such vessels shall be considered as vessels of the FRY (S/M), regardless of the flag under which they sail.

On April 26, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12846 to implement in the United States the sanctions adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution 820 of April 17, 1993. That resolution called on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen peace plan for Bosnia-Herzegovina and, if they failed to do so by April 26, called on member states to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against the FRY (S/M) and Serbian-controlled areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia. Effective April 26, 1993, the order blocked all property and interests in property of commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the FRY (S/M), including property and interests in property of entities (wherever organized or located) owned or controlled by such undertakings or entities, that are or thereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons.

2. The declaration of the national emergency on May 30, 1992, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency declaration was reported to the Congress on May 30, 1992, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). The additional sanctions set forth in Executive Orders Nos. 12810, 12831, and 12846 were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287c).

3. There have been no amendments to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations"), 31 C.F.R. Part 585, since the last report. Of the two court cases in which the blocking authority was challenged as applied to FRY (S/M) subsidiaries and vessels in the United States, the government's position in the case involving the blocked vessels was upheld by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court declined to review the decision. *Milena Ship Management Co. v. Newcomb,* 804 F. Supp. 859 (E.D. La. 1992), *aff'd,* 995 F.2nd 620 (5th Cir. 1993), *cert. denied* _____ U.S. _____, 114 S.Ct. 877 (1994). The case involving a blocked subsidiary is pending a decision by the court on the government's motion for summary judgment.

4. Over the past 6 months, the Departments of State and Treasury have worked closely with European Community (the "EC") member states and other U.N. member nations to coordinate implementation of the sanctions against the FRY (S/M). This has included visits by assessment teams formed under the auspices of the United States, the EC, and the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (the "CSCE") to states bordering on Serbia and Montenegro; deployment of CSCE sanctions assistance missions ("SAMs") to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine to assist in monitoring land and Danube River traffic; bilateral contacts between the United States and other countries for the purpose of tightening financial and trade restrictions on the FRY (S/M); and establishment of a mechanism to coordinate enforcement efforts and to exchange technical information.

5. In accordance with licensing policy and the Regulations, FAC has exercised its authority to license certain specific transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) that are consistent with the Security Council sanctions. During the reporting period, FAC has issued 114 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to the FRY (S/M) or assets it owns or controls, bringing the total as of April 15, 1994, to 677. Specific licenses have been issued (1) for payment to U.S. or third-country secured creditors, under certain narrowly defined circumstances, for pre-embargo import and export transactions; (2) for legal representation or advice to the Government of the FRY (S/M) or FRY (S/M)-controlled clients; (3) for the liquidation or protection of tangible assets of subsidiaries of FRY (S/M)-controlled firms located in the United States; (4) for limited FRY (S/M) diplomatic representation in Washington and New York; (5) for patent, trademark and copyright protection and maintenance transactions in the FRY (S/M) not involving payment to the FRY (S/M) Government; (6) for certain communications, news media, and travel-related transactions; (7) for the payment of crews' wages, vessel maintenance, and emergency supplies for FRY (S/M)-controlled ships blocked in the United States; (8) for the removal from the FRY (S/M) of certain property owned and controlled by U.S. entities; and (9) to assist the United Nations in its relief operations and the activities of the U.N. Protection Forces. Pursuant to regulations implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 757, specific licenses have also been issued to authorize exportation of food, medicine, and supplies intended for humanitarian purposes in the FRY (S/M).

During the past 6 months, FAC has continued to oversee the liquidation of tangible assets of the 15 U.S. subsidiaries of entities organized in the FRY (S/M). Subsequent to the issuance of Executive Order No. 12846, all operating licenses issued for these U.S.-located Serbian or Montenegrin subsidiaries or joint ventures were revoked, and the net proceeds of the liquidation of their assets placed in blocked accounts.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and the New York State Banking

Department again worked closely with FAC with regard to two Serbian banking institutions in New York that were not permitted to conduct normal business after June 1, 1992. The banks had been issued licenses to maintain a limited staff for audit purposes while full-time bank examiners were posted in their offices to ensure that banking records are appropriately safeguarded. Subsequent to the issuance of Executive Order No. 12846, all licenses previously issued were revoked. FAC is currently working with the Federal Reserve Board and the New York State Banking Department of resolve outstanding issues regarding the banks.

During the past 6 months, U.S. financial institutions have continued to block funds transfers in which there is an interest of the Government of the FRY (S/M) or an entity or undertaking located in or controlled from the FRY (S/M). Such transfers have accounted for $58.6 million in Yugoslav assets blocked since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12808, with some $22 million in funds transfers frozen during the past 6 months.

To ensure compliance with the terms of the licenses that have been issued under the program, stringent reporting requirements are imposed. More than 380 submissions were reviewed since the last report and more than 194 compliance cases are currently open. In addition, licensed bank accounts are regularly audited by FAC compliance personnel and by cooperating auditors from bank regulatory agencies.

6. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12810, FAC has worked closely with the U.S. Customs Service to ensure both that prohibited imports and exports (including those in which the Government of the FRY (S/M) has an interest) are identified and interdicted, and that permitted imports and exports move to their intended destination without undue delay. Violations and suspected violations of the embargo are being investigated and appropriate enforcement actions are being taken. There are currently 50 cases under active investigation. Since the last report, FAC has collected 20 civil penalties totaling nearly $75,000 from 17 financial institutions for violations involving transfers of funds in which the Government of the FRY (S/M) has an interest. Two U.S. companies and one law firm have also paid penalties related to exports and unlicensed payments to the Government of the FRY (S/M) for trademark registration.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from November 30, 1993, through May 29, 1994, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to the FRY (S/M) are estimated at about $3 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC and its Chief Counsel's Office, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, the National Security Council, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

8. The actions and policies of the Government of the FRY (S/M), in its involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize and hold territory in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The United States remains committed to a multilateral resolution of this crisis through its actions implementing the binding resolutions of the United Nations Security Council with respect to the FRY (S/M).

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against the FRY (S/M) as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 21, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Proposed Welfare Reform Legislation
June 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Work and Responsibility Act of 1994."

It is time to end welfare as we know it and replace it with a system that is based on work and responsibility—a system that will help people help themselves. This legislation reinforces the fundamental values of work, responsibility, family, and community. It rewards work over welfare. It signals that people should not have children until they are ready to support them, and that parents—both parents—who bring children into the world must take responsibility for supporting them. It gives people access to the skills they need and expects work in return. Most important, it will give people back the dignity that comes from work and independence. The cost of the proposal to the Federal Government is estimated at $9.3 billion over 5 years and is fully offset, primarily through reductions in entitlements and without new tax increases.

The Work and Responsibility Act of 1994 will replace welfare with work. Under this legislation, welfare will be about a paycheck, not a welfare check. Our approach is based on a simple compact designed to reinforce and reward work. Each recipient will be required to develop a personal employability plan designed to move that individual into the work force as quickly as possible. Support, job training, and child care will be provided to help people move from dependence to independence. Time limits will ensure that anyone who can work, must work—in the private sector if possible, in a temporary subsidized job if necessary.

This legislation includes several provisions aimed at creating a new culture of mutual responsibility. It includes provisions to promote parental responsibility and ensure that both parents contribute to their children's well-being. This legislation establishes the toughest child support enforcement program ever. It also includes: incentives directly tied to the performance of the welfare office; extensive efforts to detect and prevent welfare fraud; sanctions to prevent gaming of the welfare system; and a broad array of incentives that States can use to encourage responsible behavior.

Preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births is a critical part of welfare reform. To prevent welfare dependency, teenagers must get the message that staying in school, postponing pregnancy, and preparing to work are the right things to do. Our prevention approach includes a national campaign against teen pregnancy and a national clearinghouse on teen pregnancy prevention. Roughly 1,000 middle and high schools in disadvantaged areas will receive grants to develop innovative teen pregnancy prevention programs.

The Work and Responsibility Act of 1994 proposes dramatic changes in our welfare system, changes so bold that they cannot be accomplished overnight. We can phase in these changes by focusing on young people, to send a clear message to the next generation that we are ending welfare as we know it. The bill targets resources on welfare beneficiaries born after December 31, 1971. This means that over time, more and more welfare beneficiaries will be affected by the new rules: about a third of the caseload in 1997, and half by the year 2000. States that want to phase in faster will have the option of doing so.

The results of these changes will be far-reaching. In the year 2000, 2.4 million adults will be subject to the new rules under welfare reform, including time limits and work requirements. Almost 1 million people will be either off welfare or working.

But the impact of welfare reform cannot be measured in these numbers alone. This legislation is aimed at strengthening families and instilling personal responsibility by helping people help themselves. We owe every child in America the chance to watch their parents assume the responsibility and dignity of a real job. This bill is designed to make that possible.

I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 21, 1994.

Nomination for United States District Court Judges
June 21, 1994

The President today announced the nominations of three individuals to serve on the Federal district bench: Mark W. Bennett for the Northern District of Iowa; and Salvador E. Casellas and Daniel R. Dominguez for the District of Puerto Rico.

"These three nominees have impressive records of achievement in both the law and public service," the President said. "I am confident that they will serve with excellence and distinction."

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

Message to the Congress on Additional Economic Sanctions Against Haiti
June 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779, blocking certain property of and prohibiting certain transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA"), (2 U.S.C. 287c), I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 of June 16, 1993.

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised by statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. On May 7, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised by statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12914, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. On May 21, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12917, to impose those economic measures required by Resolution 917 that became effective May 21, 1994. These latter actions were taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

On June 10, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12920, prohibiting additional transactions with Haiti.

On June 21, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12922.

This new Executive order:

—blocks all property in the United States, or within the possession or control of United States persons, of any Haitian national resident in Haiti, or any other person subject to the blocking provisions of Executive Order Nos. 12775, 12779, 12853, 12872, or 12914 or a Haitian citizen who is a member of the immediate family of such a person, as identified by the Secretary of the Treasury; and makes limited exceptions for certain payments and transfers, and for the

property of nongovernmental organizations engaged in the provision of essential humanitarian assistance or the conduct of refugee and migration operations in Haiti, that are identified by the Secretary of the Treasury;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of the order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the order.

The new Executive order is necessary to tighten the embargo against Haiti with the goal of the restoration of democracy in that nation and the prompt return of the legitimately elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, under the framework of the Governors Island Agreement.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 21, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 22. The Executive order of June 21 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan

June 22, 1994

Middle East Peace Process

The President. First, I would like to welcome King Hussein back to the White House and to say how very much I support his courage and vision in renewing his efforts to make peace with Israel. I want to reaffirm the support of the United States for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, including the Syrian track, and we will do whatever we can to keep those things going.

This remains a very important priority for me and for our administration. And I am very encouraged by where we are now in the whole process and especially by the efforts that King Hussein has made. And I'm looking forward to having the chance to discuss that with him.

So, sir.

Q. What are the chances, Mr. President and King Hussein, of a trilateral settlement between you two and Prime Minister Rabin? Your Majesty.

King Hussein. I don't think it is something that has been discussed as yet, but in the future, I suppose anything and everything is possible.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. Mr. President, are you at all concerned with the dollar's fall? Your administration is not intervening as it has in the past.

The President. Well, I talked to—I spent some time yesterday on it. I talked to Secretary Bentsen again today about it. And I think that I would let him speak for us today on it. We have agreed today on what he will say and what our course will be.

Let me just emphasize that the dollar, as you know, is traded in big multinational markets with other currencies, and they go up and down. But the fundamental economic realities in this country are very strong. This is the first time in 30 years when we have had a growth in the economy, with no inflation, led by investment that will create jobs. The unemployment rate has dropped dramatically in the last year and a half; we've just passed in the first quarter of this year—the first quarter in over 15 years when there was no bank failure.

So our fundamentals are quite good. We had a record number of new business incorporations, the largest number since World War II, in 1993. I think we just have to keep working on our fundamentals and know that, in the end, the

markets will have to respond to the economic realities of the American economy.

Q. Well, what do you think is wrong?

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. Mr. President, speaking about dollars, Common Cause has accused you and your administration of betraying your campaign commitments on soft money for the DNC, raising a lot more over these past 18 months than the Republicans did when they were in office. How do you respond to Common Cause's accusations?

The President. First of all, my campaign commitment is to seek campaign finance reform legislation which will put both parties on an equal footing and will give the Government of this country back more to ordinary Americans. I have supported that legislation strongly from the beginning. I still believe we're going to get a good campaign finance reform bill out of the committee and onto my desk in this session of Congress.

In the meanwhile, as I have said all along, I don't believe in unilateral disarmament. And I believe, if you will look, I've had a lot more advertising and attacks against our administration and our policy than we have had the financial wherewithal to respond to.

So, we've done our best to defend ourselves in the system that now exists. But I agree with Common Cause, we need a campaign finance reform bill. I'm going to work hard for it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the GI Bill of Rights
June 22, 1994

Thank you so much, Mr. Shropshire, for that introduction and for your service to your country and for making the most of the GI bill. And thank you, Mr. Mendoza, for your service to your country and for reminding us of the future of the GI bill.

Thank you, Secretary Brown, leaders of veteran service organizations, and staff of the department of veterans administration who are here; to all the Members of Congress, Senator Robb, Senator Thurmond, Senator Jeffords, Congressman Price, Congresswoman Byrne, Congressman Sangmeister, Congresswoman Brown, Congressman Bishop; and thank you especially, Congressman Sonny Montgomery, for a lifetime of devotion to this cause. I'd like to also acknowledge three of Congressman Montgomery's colleagues in the Senate and House on the relevant committee who could not be with us today: Senator Rockefeller, Senator Murkowski, and Congressman Stump.

Before I begin, if I might, I'd like to say a brief word about a development in Brussels this morning that is in so many ways a tribute to the men and women who have worn the uniform of this country over the last 50 years. Today Russia took an important step to help shape a safer and more peaceful post-cold-war world.

As all of you know, it wasn't very many days ago that we and the Russians were able to announce that, for the first time since both of us had nuclear weapons, our nuclear weapons were no longer pointed at each other. Today Russia made a decision to join 20 other nations of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and Western Europe in NATO's Partnership For Peace, to work together on joint planning and exercises, and to commit themselves to a common future, to a unified Europe where neighbors respect their borders and do not invade them but, instead, work together for mutual security and progress.

I want to join with the Secretary of State, who was on hand for the signing in Brussels, in commending the Russian people and their leaders on this farsighted choice. And I think that all of us will join them in saying this is another step on our long road in man's everlasting quest for peace. We thank them today.

As Secretary Brown and Mr. Shropshire said in their eloquent remarks, I had the opportunity not long ago of commemorating the service of our veterans at Normandy and in the Italian

campaign. Joined by some of the veterans who are here today, including General Mick Kicklighter, who did such a wonderful job in heading the committee that planned all those magnificent events, we remembered the sacrifices of the brave Americans and their Allies who freed a continent from tyranny.

Their legacy is plain to see today in the wave of democracy sweeping across a united Europe. But their legacy is also clear here at home. Fortunately, in spite of the terrible losses, most of them did come home. And with a helping hand from Uncle Sam, they sparked an explosion of American energy and industry. They built the great American middle class, the powerful example which, more than anything else, helped us over the last 50 years to win the war for freedom and democracy and enterprise, because people could look at the American veterans, the legacy they made here at home and see that our system, our values, and our ideals worked.

As all of you know, it was 50 years ago today that President Roosevelt signed the GI bill of rights. It was actually known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Just as D-Day was the greatest military action in our history, so the GI bill arguably was the greatest investment in our people in American history. It provided the undergirding for what has clearly been the most successful middle class in all of history. That lesson, in many respects, is one I have tried to make the lesson of our administration: If you give the American people, ordinary Americans, a chance to help themselves, they will do extraordinary things.

Before World War II, our country typically gave veterans pensions and bonuses, but they had nothing to build a future with. That's why despairing veterans of World War I actually marched on this city in 1932, and why President Roosevelt, learning the lesson of World War I, declared that the GI bill gave "emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

We know why the GI bill didn't let them down. It relied on the American values of work and responsibility. It offered not a handout, but a hand up. The veterans of World War I got a handout, and they deserved it. But it was $60 and a train ticket home. The veterans of World War II got a ticket to the American dream.

The GI bill helped over 15 million returning veterans begin that journey. It helped all of them, black or white, Asian or Latino, rich or poor. But it was up to them to seize the opportunities. And look what they did. They built countless new homes and businesses. They flooded colleges and trade schools. Out of the World War II class, 450,000 became engineers; 360,000 became schoolteachers; 240,000 became accountants. That's before we needed them all in Washington. [*Laughter*] One hundred and eighty thousand became doctors and nurses; 150,000 became scientists, paving our way to the next century. All of us are better off for their determination.

We cannot even calculate how much our Nation has been enriched by the GI bill, how many communities have sprung up, how many companies have prospered, how many families have earned their share of the American dream. This much we do know, that the GI bill began the process of building the middle class that has been the bulwark of our prosperity ever since the end of World War II.

And it's still working today. For 50 years now, soldiers like Hugo Mendoza have stood sentry around the globe, securing our freedom, and knowing that on their return they would find also a stepping stone of opportunity. Today, as we face yet a new era of change and challenge, we have new choices to make. Almost everything I am trying to do as President is to ensure that we make the right choices so that we can secure our liberty and our prosperity and expand those great virtues across the world as we move into the next century.

Almost everything we are trying to do is animated by the spirit and the ideas behind the GI bill. Give Americans a chance to make their own lives in the fast-changing world; they will secure the American dream. They will secure our freedom. They will expand its reach if you give them the power to do it.

At Normandy I was able to pay special tribute to the first paratroopers to land in the D-Day operation, called the Pathfinders, because they lighted the way for those who followed. Today, it is up to us to be the pathfinders of the 21st century. The powerful idea behind the bill of rights for the GI's is still the best light to find that path.

Our job now is to do everything we can to help Americans to have the chance to build those better lives for themselves. That is the

best way to prove ourselves worthy of the legacy handed down by those who sacrificed in the Second World War, those who have worn our uniform since, and those who have been given their just chance at the brass ring through the bill of rights for the GI's.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:25 p.m. at the Department of Veterans Affairs. In his remarks, he referred to Garnett G. Shropshire, World War II veteran, who introduced the President, and Hugo Mendoza, Persian Gulf war veteran. The proclamation of June 21 on the 50th anniversary of the GI bill of rights is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on North Korea
June 22, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. Today I want to announce an important step forward in the situation in North Korea. This afternoon we have received formal confirmation from North Korea that it will freeze the major elements of its nuclear program while a new round of talks between our nations proceeds.

In response, we are informing the North Koreans that we are ready to go forward with a new round of talks in Geneva early next month. North Korea has assured us that while we go forward with these talks it will not reload its 5-megawatt reactor with new fuel or reprocess spent fuel. We have also been assured that the IAEA will be allowed to keep its inspectors and monitoring equipment in place at the Yongbyon nuclear facility, thus allowing verification of North Korea's agreement. We welcome this very positive development which restores the basis for talks between North Korea and the United States.

In addition to addressing the nuclear issue, we are prepared to discuss the full range of security, political, and economic issues that affects North Korea's relationship with the international community. During these discussions we will suspend our efforts to pursue a sanctions resolution in the United Nations Security Council. We also welcome the agreement between South Korea and North Korea to pursue a meeting between their Presidents.

I would like to thank President Carter for the important role he played in helping to achieve this step. These developments mark not a solution to the problem, but they do mark a new opportunity to find a solution. It is the beginning of a new stage in our efforts to pursue a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. We hope this will lead to the resolution of all the issues that divide Korea from the international community.

In close consultation with our allies, we will continue as we have over the past year and more to pursue our interests and our goals with steadiness, realism, and resolve. This approach is paying off, and we will continue it. This is good news. Our task now is to transform this news into a lasting agreement.

Q. Mr. President, are you going to try to insist on finding out whether or not they have already built a bomb and getting the facts on any past violations as part of these talks?

The President. Well, let me say that, first of all, we have been in touch with the North Koreans in New York almost at this moment. We will set up these talks, and we will have ample opportunity to discuss the range of issues that will be discussed in the talks. And we expect to discuss, obviously, all the issues that have divided us.

Yes, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. Mr. President, what concessions did we make to bring this about? And why is it that you did not meet with President Carter face to face? Here's a man who actually met Kim Il-song, one of the few; our profiles may not jive and so forth. You would have had a great chance to debrief him, and instead you talked to him on the telephone.

The President. We talked to him for a long time on the telephone. The only reason we didn't is because I didn't want to ask him to come all the way up to Camp David, and we had planned to go up there for the weekend. And he decided and I decided there was—we know each other very well; we've known each

other for 20 years—we decided we didn't need to do it; we could just have a long talk on the phone, and that's what we did.

Q. Did we make any concessions——

The President. No.

Q. ——to the North Koreans to bring this about?

The President. No. The only thing that we said was that we would suspend our efforts to pursue sanctions if there was a verifiable freeze on the nuclear program while the talks continued, which included no refueling of the reactor and no reprocessing.

When President Carter came back he said—this was the cautionary note, you know, I raised in Chicago last Friday when I was asked to comment on this statement—he said that he believed that Kim Il-song had made that statement to him. We said that we would wait for official confirmation. We received it today. That confirmation gives us the basis for resuming the talks.

Yes, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. President Clinton, some of your aides are saying, "We got everything we want here." Is this one of those cases where the other guy blinked?

The President. I don't think it's useful for me to characterize it in that way. We know what the facts are. If you look at what we've done over the last year and a half, we have followed basically a two-pronged policy. We have worked as hard as we could to be firm, to be resolute, to bring our allies closer and closer together. And when I say our allies on this issue, I consider not just South Korea and Japan but Russia and China to be our allies. All of us have the same interests and the same desires.

We also always kept the door open. I always said I did not seek a confrontation, I sought to give North Korea a way to become a part of the international community.

When President Carter was invited and expressed a willingness to go to North Korea, I thought it gave us one opportunity that we would not otherwise have, with a private citizen, but a distinguished American private citizen, to communicate the position of our administration and to do it—the very fact that he went, I think, was a gesture of the importance that we placed on resolving this matter and not just for ourselves but for the world.

And so I think that we know what the facts are. We know we pursued a firm course. We know that President Carter went and made a very persuasive case, and we know what the North Koreans did. I don't think it's useful to characterize this in terms of winners and losers. I think the world will be the winner if we can resolve this. But we've not done it yet.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Q. Mr. President, it would appear that President Carter may have either seen something that perhaps you and others may not have seen as clearly as he did, or that perhaps this was a more closely coordinated effort between you and Mr. Carter than it may have appeared at the time. Is either of those things correct?

The President. Well, I don't know that I would characterize it in that way. He called me; we talked about it. I wanted to make sure he had adequate briefings. I have always—I have, as you probably know, I have—and I've said this I believe publicly—I have sought other means of personally communicating to Kim Il-song that the desires of the United States and the interests of the United States and the policy of the United States was to pursue a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula and to give North Korea a way of moving with dignity into the international community and away from an isolated path, which we found quite disturbing for all the reasons that I've already said.

It seemed to me that when President Carter expressed a willingness to go and they had given him an invitation of some longstanding to come, that that gave us the opportunity to give North Korea a direct message to their leader from a distinguished American citizen, without in any way undermining the necessary and correct government-to-government contacts that we had going on at other levels.

President Carter, I think, was very faithful in articulating the policy of our Government. And I think that that provided a forum in which the North Korean leader, Kim Il-song, could respond as he did. And I'm very pleased about it.

When we were called last Thursday and this whole issue was discussed and we said what we said about we hope that their message meant that they were willing to freeze their nuclear program, then they said they were. Then we got formal confirmation today of the definition of "freeze." Their definition was the same as

ours. We had the basis to go forward. I'm very happy about it.

Yes, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN]. Go ahead.

Q. There will be critics, as you well know, who will argue that once again the North Koreans have succeeded in stalling, and clandestinely, this will give them an opportunity while their negotiators talk to U.S. negotiators in Geneva to pursue their nuclear ambitions, which they're not about to give up. How do you verify that they are sincere in this effort?

The President. Well, that was a big part of the statement, of course, of the letter that we got, not just that there would be an agreement to freeze the program but that the agreement be verifiable. The IAEA inspectors and the monitoring equipment on the ground can be and will be used to verify the commitment not to reprocess and not to refuel.

If we didn't have some way of verifying it, you and I wouldn't be having this conversation at this moment.

Yes, one last question.

Q. Mr. President, could you tell us, beyond just the focus of the talks, could you tell us what your longer range view is? Do you see the Koreas being reunified? What do you see happening, coming out of all this?

The President. Well, I think, first of all, that is a decision for the peoples and their leaders in South and North Korea to resolve. What the United States wants is for the agreement that the Koreas made in 1991 to make the Peninsula nonnuclear to be carried through.

The United States wants the NPT to be a success with regard to North Korea. The United States wants North Korea, in whatever relationship it pursues with South Korea—that is up to them—to move toward becoming an integral and responsible member of the international community. That will auger well for the peace and prosperity of the peoples of north Asia as well as for the security interest of the United States. That is what we have pursued with great diligence, and I'm very hopeful that these talks will bring us closer to that.

As I said, this does not solve the problem, but it certainly gives us the basis for seeking a solution. And I'm quite pleased.

Thank you very much.

Q. Have you called Jimmy Carter?

The President. Oh, I have. I called him, talked to him about the letter. We had a very good talk, told him again I was glad he went, and I thought it was a trip worth taking, a risk worth taking, and I was very pleased.

Q. You didn't mind his criticism of your sanctions policy? He was pretty blunt, wasn't he?

The President. No. No, as long as the agreement—like I said, we've been friends a long time. The agreement was that he would faithfully communicate our position. I am absolutely convinced he did it, and I'm absolutely convinced now that they have met the agreement. And I feel good about it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:34 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Statement on the White House Conference on Africa
June 22, 1994

The challenges facing Africa and American policy towards the continent will draw on the participation and combined efforts of all Americans. This meeting is an important opportunity for leaders who care deeply about Africa to share ideas and experiences.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary announcing that the White House will host a Conference on Africa June 26–27.

Nomination for a United States Court of Appeals Judge
June 22, 1994

The President today nominated William C. Bryson to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

"I am pleased to nominate William Bryson, who has devoted his career to serving the public," the President said today. "He will bring a wealth of experience from the Justice Department to the Federal bench, and the American people will continue to enjoy the great benefits of his legal talent and personal dedication."

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

Remarks at the Democratic National Committee Dinner
June 22, 1994

Thank you very much. Chairman Wilhelm, my good friend Vernon Jordan, between the two of you there's nothing left for me to say. [*Laughter*] I thank you for your leadership of our party. I congratulate you and DeGee on the upcoming birth of your first child. I thank Vernon and Ann Jordan and all those others who worked on this dinner and made it so successful tonight. I want to thank Terry McAuliffe and all the cochairs of this dinner, the Members of the Congress, the members of the Cabinet, members of the administration who are here, and my fellow Americans.

I have two pieces of good news tonight. The first is that with about a half an hour left to go, the United States is ahead in the World Cup, 2 to nothing, over Colombia. I kind of like this World Cup. It reminds me of my campaign. We're the underdog in this deal; I like it. [*Laughter*] The second is far more important, and perhaps most of you have already heard, but this afternoon, the United States received official confirmation that North Korea is prepared to freeze its nuclear program in return for talking to us about those issues. This event, of course, is important to all of us, to our children, and if we're successful, even to our children's children. It does not solve our problems, but it gives us a chance to begin to solve them. It came about because of the steadfastness and resolve of our administration and working with our allies. In this case, we had an interesting set of allies from the very beginning, of course our friends in South Korea and Japan, but also in Russia and China. There was a sense that we had to do something here.

It came about because of the deft putting of our case and the case for North Korea's coming into the community of nations by another great Democrat, former President Jimmy Carter. And tonight, I mentioned it not only because it is so important to all of us and to our future but because in addition to this being a party gala, it is an American celebration.

When I heard on the way in the themes of the little film you saw on our administration, I thought to myself that most of those things we have done benefit people without regard to their party and that Democrats in 1992 promised a new direction for our country, one rooted in the real problems and the real promise of this Nation. I had some fairly basic ideas. I thought that we could not be strong abroad unless we were strong at home, that we could never be strong at home if we tried to withdraw from the world, but that we had to rebuild ourselves from the grassroots, based on the real conditions in our country.

I'll never forget when David Wilhelm suggested that we get on that bus. It was easy for him to say; he didn't have to ride on it as long as we did. [*Laughter*] But I think Hillary and Al and Tipper would admit that that bus and those trips not only became the symbol of our campaign but kept us firmly rooted to the American people. We saw individually the people that had been beaten down and had often given up on their National Government, Maybe collectively they were cynical and be-

lieved gridlock was inevitable, but individually, they were full of hope and concern. They wanted so much for the promise of America to be alive for their children, and they knew that some tough things would have to be done.

There's no way that TV ads could convey what we saw in the eyes of a woman on the side of the road in the Middle West one night who told us that her husband and she had been married for 35 years and he had been having increasing difficulty holding on to jobs because of the decline of the economy. And finally, he had taken a job paying just over $5 an hour, and they had lost their health insurance, and she was ill. And she did not know what to do, but she was absolutely sure that they had worked hard and played by the rules.

There's no way a poll or a commercial could recapture the face of the woman I saw in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, one day at a Quaker Oats plant, holding a child of another race while we were being demonstrated against by people who disagreed with my pro-choice position. This woman had a pro-choice sticker on, and she had a baby in her arms of another race. And I said, "Where did you get that baby?" And she said, "This is my baby." And I said, "Well, where did you get this baby?" She said, "I got this baby from Florida, and she has AIDS. But somebody's got to take care of all these babies with AIDS." This woman had been divorced, was living in an apartment with her own two children, struggling to make ends meet, and she had adopted another child. She said, "I'm for you, and I wish you'd tell those people back there with their signs if they feel so strongly about it, come help me adopt these babies and stand up for their right to grow up and live a good life."

I met a sheriff in east Texas who's got to be the only east Texas sheriff in America that subscribed to Rolling Stone—[*laughter*]—who told me he wanted me to pass a real tough crime bill, but not to forget that the kids needed something to say yes to as well.

I wish I could just tell you all these stories. But when I showed up here, I knew that, as my Granddaddy used to say, "There would be a lot of slips between the cup and the lip," but if I could just keep remembering all those people, in the end it would come out all right.

And what we have tried to do is exactly what I said I would try to in the campaign. We've tried to restore the economy, to restore the link between the people and the Government, to make it work for ordinary people again, to rebuild a sense of work and family and community and empowerment of individual citizens, and to move this country into the 21st century still the greatest country in the world with the most hopes for our children.

If you look at what has happened in the last 18 months, I think you can make a pretty compelling case that we're doing the right things. Our economy is growing steadily: over 3.4 million new jobs in 16 months, more than in the previous 4 years combined; a point-and-a-half-plus drop in the unemployment rate; in 1993, more new business incorporations than in any year since World War II; the first quarter of this year, the first quarter in over 15 years when there was not a bank failure.

Our Republican friends always talk about how they deplored the deficit and they deplored Government spending. But it just kept getting bigger when they were in office. And they blamed the Congress. But when you look at the facts, the truth is that, in spite of the exploding deficits, Congress actually appropriated slightly less money in the previous 12 years than the administrations asked for. [*Applause*] And all that about—there's the Congressmen clapping out there, tell you the truth. [*Laughter*] But they were very skilled at saying one thing and doing another. And I'm not very good at that, and it embarrasses me, so we decided we'd actually try to bring the deficit down.

Last year, by the narrowest of margins, because we got no help and a lot of hot rhetoric, our economic plan passed. And it began a system of disciplined budgeting, which will be accompanied by this year's budget, the first time in 17 years two President's budgets have been adopted on time by the United States Congress. That will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States of America.

And I want you to know, working with this Congress, this budget, the Congress will eliminate over 100 Government programs outright, will cut 200 more, will not only be reducing defense but will reduce domestic discretionary spending for the first time since 1969, in 25 years. And still we will spend more money on Head Start, more money on Women, Infant and Children, more money on school-to-work opportunities, more money on education and new technologies for the future. We will invest more in people and still cut Government spending,

because we hired on to get things done not to just talk about them, and that is what the Democrats are doing in this town today.

When you put that with the initiatives in trade that this administration has taken—more in 18 months than had been done in a generation—we have the basis for the first growth in America in 30 years that is led by investment and that has no inflation, in 30 years. That is what I asked for a chance to work on and what you helped to give me. And no amount of rhetoric to the contrary can take away those facts.

The second thing I said I would try to do is to make Government work for ordinary people. And I think we've made a pretty good stab at that. With the support of the public employee unions, we have passed budgets which will reduce the size of the National Government by a quarter of a million by attrition over 5 years and leave us at the end of a 5-year period with the smallest Federal work force since John Kennedy was the President of the United States. And the money will be used to pay for the crime bill to make our streets safer. That is a matter of record.

We've also begun to make the Government work again. Terry McAuliffe told me yesterday that a reporter for a newspaper that is not exactly a house organ of the Democratic Party called him and said, "How did you get all these business people to contribute to the Democratic Party?" He said, "Well, the President's got a good pro-business position." And the reporter starting laughing. One of the real problems here, you know, you're always in the most trouble when you think you have nothing to learn. [*Laughter*]

The Small Business Administration, under the leadership of Erskine Bowles, will now let you apply for a loan on a one-page form, something small business people have been begging for for years. The Emergency Management Agency, which was the source of ridicule and anger and frustration and revulsion for years because it was dominated by political appointees, now has a Director from my home State who did it for a living. And he's the most popular Federal bureaucrat in the United States because FEMA has been there in earthquakes and fires and tornadoes, when people needed it. Nobody worries about whether the Federal Government is going to be there to do its job anymore. Rice farmers in northern California, a few weeks ago, for the first time ever, shipped their rice out of ports in northern California to sell in Japan, because the Government is working for ordinary people again.

I don't know how many business people I've had come up to me in the last year and say, "You know, I'm a Republican, but you have the only administration where the Commerce Department and the State Department work together to try to help me do business overseas, and I appreciate that."

I wanted to break gridlock. For 7 years, the world trade agreement was tied up. It was ratified last year by the nations, and we're going to implement it this year. For 7 years, 7 years, even after the attempt on President Reagan's life, with his fine Press Secretary, Jim Brady, surviving by a miracle and campaigning like crazy for the Brady bill, for 7 years the NRA and others tied it up in Congress. But we passed it last year. For 7 years, even though it had some bipartisan support, the Family and Medical Leave Act could not pass the Congress, but we passed it last year. No Presidential vetoes—support for families in the workplace. For 6 years now, politics has kept the crime bill from passing, but we are on the verge of passing the most important piece of anticrime legislation in the history of the United States, more punishment but more prevention, more police. And the ban on assault weapons, which lost just 2 years ago by 70 votes in the House of Representatives, passed. We have brought an end to the gridlock in this country, and we should not let it go back the other way at election time.

Now we're working on health care. First, the other side said there was no crisis; then there was a crisis but we needed a bipartisan solution. I said, "Fine, here's my plan. You tell me how we are going to change it, but we've got to cover everybody." Then they started running ads saying I was trying to give health care to the Government, which wasn't true. But I went out and listened to people, and I said, well, maybe it is too bureaucratic. So we changed it some more and took out some of the mandatory provisions and made it more flexible to try to make it more responsive. And then a Republican Congressman from Iowa named Fred Grandy stood up and told the awful truth, that he and his colleagues had been given marching orders to do nothing to cooperate to try to solve the health care problems in this country.

The Governor of Florida was in here today, talking about how he had a bill in Florida that was not mandatory but would make the situation better, that had the support of every organization in his State. And it still died in the senate of the State of Florida because there's a 20–20 split between Republicans and Democrats. And with all the interest groups saying, please do something about health care, every last Republican senator still voted against it so they couldn't say he did anything on health care.

Now, in the Senate Finance Committee, there are a couple of Republicans who have worked on health care for years, who are trying to come together and reach some accommodation. And I can tell you they are under withering pressure. But folks, those people who say, "Let's just cover 90 percent and forget about it," it won't work. It won't work. Three million working Americans have lost their health insurance in the last 3 years. We are going backwards. We are the only country in the world with an advanced economy that has not figured out how to cover everybody.

Read the article in the Washington Post today about the German health care system. The German health care system today takes up a smaller percentage of the income of Germany than it did 2 years ago. It's about 8.5 percent. Our health care system costs us 14.5 percent of our income, and we still can't figure out how to cover—we're not even at 85 percent anymore.

And all the solutions that say, "Well, let's just not make any tough decisions, go up to 90 percent," cost you a double ton of money in taxes, subsidize the poor, most of whom already can at least get Medicare, and not do one single solitary thing for the working middle class, 80 percent of whom are those who don't have insurance and who are terribly insecure. I'm telling you, we have got to face this problem and face it now. Harry Truman tried to get us to do it 50 years ago, and we didn't do it, and we've been paying for it ever since.

Let me say that any time you quote Harry Truman now, the Republicans stand up and clap, and everybody says, "Gosh, I wish we had him around; it's too bad we don't have anybody like Truman anymore." Let me tell you something, folks, I came from one of those families that was for him when he was living. [*Laughter*] And a lot of the people that brag on him today wouldn't have walked across the street to shake his hand when he was in office because he stood up for ordinary people and he told extraordinary truths and he tried to get us to face the problems of our time. Now, in retrospect, we can see that he did a good job.

Every midterm election in the 20th century except one, when President Roosevelt could not pass Social Security in 1934, every other one has seen a loss in both Houses, or at least one House, for the President in power, his party. Why? Because there is always a disappointment from the bright promise of the Inauguration to the hard reality of governing. Governor Cuomo used to say, "We campaign in poetry, and we govern in prose." [*Laughter*]

But there is a special problem this year. What is it? It is that there is so much accumulated cynicism in this country and people are always told about the process, the conflict, the ups, the downs, the differences, that a lot of people don't even know what I have just told you. And our adversaries are banking on two things. Number one, they believe the cynicism of the electorate will (a) cause them to say, "I don't believe it," if they hear what we have done and (b) cause them to blame those of us who are in if we fail to change because they bring back gridlock. And so they think they can be rewarded if they stop anything from happening.

And the second thing that they hope is that they can divert the attention of a significant number of our voters from the crying issues that unite us as a people by trying to launch another cultural war. And this is not just my opinion. There's a new book out by David Frum, a conservative and former editorial writer of the Wall Street Journal, that you can find adapted in Harper's this week. He says that conservatives failed to control the size and cost of the Government and they've basically given that up. That's true; we've done a better job of that than they did. So instead, he predicts politics in the future will become a lot nastier and that the only way to mobilize and excite voters will be to trade on our differences on moral and ethnic and racial issues.

I can tell you, folks, we have not survived over 200 years as the strongest and oldest democracy in this country by fighting out our differences on moral and racial and ethnic issues. And we did not get where we are by becoming mired in the luxury, and I use the word clearly, the luxury of cynicism.

You know, the biggest honor I think I've had as your President was going to represent us at

the D-Day ceremonies. It was one of the most extraordinary events of Hillary's and my life, going first to Italy and seeing what our soldiers endured there, being shelled and killed on those beaches week after week, not able to get off; going to England and seeing the 3,800 graves of people who fought in the air war for 2 years before the D-Day invasion and the list of 5,000 names of people who never came back, including Joe Kennedy, Jr., and the great American band leader, Glenn Miller; and then going to the beaches at Normandy. And the thing that struck me overwhelmingly was that these people who saved the world, who laid their lives on the line, they didn't have an option. They knew what was at stake. And it makes a mockery of their sacrifice for us to be cynical about fulfilling our own legacy.

This whole atmosphere that permeates this town now—nothing makes any difference, and it's all who's up and down and in and out and all that, this obsession with process and conflict over product—it makes a mockery of what has gotten us here for 200 years.

I'm going to tell you something: Most of the people I've known in politics for 20 years, both parties, have been honest. Most of them have worked hard. Most of them have done what they thought was right. Most of the time we fought over things that were honest differences, worth arguing and fighting over. And we're about to get ourselves in a fix on the dawn of the 21st century. We've got the strongest economy in the world. We are the envy of the world. Our diversity is a source of great strength and the great, great mother lode of wealth for us in the 21st century in the global economy, if we've got sense enough to rescue these kids out of these cities, whose lives are being squandered. And the only thing that can mess it up for us is if we permitted ourselves to have the wrong fights, to believe that we were immoral because we had differences over certain issues, and if we permitted ourselves to become so cynical that we wouldn't even listen to the truth.

And I am here tonight to tell you that what you need to do is to go out of this room tonight and not just be glad that you gave money to this party and to our administration and to our continued efforts but to think of your words as a knife that can cut through stone. And every time you hear one of your fellow Americans say some cynical and nonsensical thing implying that we're all up here just trying to feather our nest and it doesn't make any difference what's done and everything's in trouble, you tell them the truth, not to benefit me and the Democrats in Congress—although, to be sure, we'll be benefited for it because we have broken gridlock and we are moving forward—but to give Americans their citizenship back. We did not get here by being cynics, we got here by being believers.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:09 p.m. at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee, and his wife, DeGee; dinner chairman Vernon Jordan, and his wife, Ann; and DNC finance chairman Terry McAuliffe.

Remarks at the Democratic National Committee Saxophone Club Reception

June 22, 1994

The President. Thank you, Hillary. Thank you, Chairman Wilhelm and DeGee and Vernon and Ann Jordan. And thank you especially, Sean Foley and Jessica Wasserman, for leading the Saxophone Club. I want to thank, too, Sean Burton and Jonathan Mantz, for helping to hold the Saxophone Club together, and the Home Builders and Occidental Petroleum, that helped to support this event tonight. I also want to thank the entertainers. I'm kind of sorry I didn't see Hootie and the Blowfish. [*Laughter*] And I know Paula Poundstone was funny, because she always is. And I'm hoping I get to hear a little bit of Chaka Khan and the St. Augustine Church Choir. Thank you all for being here.

We just came, as you know, from another event for the Democratic Party, and one that was immensely successful. But it struck me in

that moment that the people who were there were a stunning answer to those who say that this is a cynical and selfish country and that you are as well.

We had two pieces of good news already today; one's light, and one's not so light. The light one is that the United States won the soccer game tonight. I identify with our soccer team, you know, they start as underdogs in this deal. I like that. [*Laughter*] And they're doing well. And the thing that potentially and, I hope and pray, will ultimately affect your future in a very positive way is the formal notification I received this afternoon that the North Koreans are willing to suspend their nuclear program—[*applause*].

Then it occurred to me that at the event where I just was, there were lots of people there and they weren't all Democrats. Some were independents. Some came up to me and said they were Republicans; they were proud to be there at our party's event. Virtually every one of them, when our economic program passed last year, paid higher taxes so we could bring the deficit down and give a tax break to lower income working people with families. Those people aren't cynical. They did something that they believe is good for their country, good for their children, and good for their future. And I am grateful to them, because they are a rebuke to the cynicism.

And then I look out at all of you and I realize—first of all, I look out at some of you, and a couple of you are my age, which makes me feel good. [*Laughter*] Somebody said some are older. I can tell you, you look good out there with all these young people, but you can't turn it back. Even I can't do that for you. [*Laughter*] But you are a rebuke to this notion that—this whole idea of Generation X. You know, it's a bunch of hooey.

What I want to say to you in brief is this: First, let me thank you for keeping the Saxophone Club together. It means a lot to me. It means more than you could possibly know that there are young people who work in and around this town who believe in this administration, who have stayed together, who were not just in it for the campaign and are not just sunshine soldiers but are actually here for the long haul to make America a better place. I thank you for that. It means so much to me.

The second point I want to say is this: We are doing what you hired us to do, and that's important. When we had all those events in the campaign, I told you I was fighting for your future. And I still am. And when we took office, I said I wanted to get the economy going, to bring the deficit down, to invest more in our people, to make Government work for ordinary people, and to empower people like you to seize your future. And you look—unemployment is down, jobs are up, new businesses are up. We're moving in the right direction. We're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Truman was President. Hardly anybody was here then. We're empowering people, 90,000 more kids in Head Start, 20 million more college students eligible for low interest student loans and better repayment, national service will start this fall, with 20,000 people year after next—100,000 young Americans revolutionizing the problems of this century. So, I tell you, we are fulfilling the mission that you voted for, that you worked for, that you are a part of, and your future is at stake.

And the third thing I want to say to you is this: I'm glad you're here and I'm glad you're happy and I'm glad you're enthusiastic. You've made me happy, and you've given me new energy. But let me tell you, what is at stake this year and next year and the next year is far bigger than Republicans and Democrats and President Clinton. It's about what the attitude of the American people is and what will be the dominant spirit of the American people as we move toward the 21st century.

When we're having this enormously important debate on health care—and let me just say, I put out a plan on health care and Hillary and I worked hard on it, but we said we know it can't be the end-all and be-all. We're happy to change it. But for goodness' sakes, work with us without regard to party or region. Work with us and help to cover all Americans and solve this terrible problem. That's what we said.

And it seems pretty simple to me. This is the only country in the world with an advanced economy hadn't figured out how to cover everybody, but we're spending 14 percent of our income on health care. Today in the Washington Post, there was an article on the German health care system, pointing out they're spending 8.5 percent of their income on health care, and they've got 99 percent coverage. Now, I don't honestly believe that they're that much smarter than we are. And I don't think you do. What is the problem? Well——

Audience members. Republicans!

Audience members. Dole!

The President. Listen, it isn't all Republicans. I've had Republican doctors, Republican nurses, Republican home health operators, Republican business people come up to me and say, "I support what you're doing. We have got to have universal health coverage."

What is the problem? Congressman Grandy from Iowa—wait, wait, Gopher—relieved of the burden of running for office now for Congress, finally came out and said that the Republicans had been given, quote, "marching orders by their leader to not cooperate. Don't offer any amendments; you cannot vote for anything."

Audience member. Boo-o-o! What about the country?

The President. What about the country, yes. Not what about the Democrats, what about the country? And let me tell you what's at stake. This is a big deal. When you leave here, this will still be at stake. They believe that they can win, based on two things, in '94 and beyond: first, the overwhelming cynicism of the American electorate, bombarded every day by negativism, obsessively covered with process and conflict instead of substantive product. They believe that the American people will either not know what we have done or they won't believe it. And then they think they can divide us in a cultural war over moral issues, racial issues, and ethnic issues. They must be proved wrong.

You look around this room and you will see a picture of America. The diversity of this country is our ticket to the future. It will make us rich; it will make us strong; it will make us powerful. It will make your lives more interesting than any generation of America that went before if we can figure out how to go into these cities and into these poor rural areas and lift these children up and if we can figure out how to live together instead of avoiding our problems and dividing ourselves.

But we must not become mired in the cynicism and the negativism that dominates the debate here every day. And you know better, and you can cut through it. And it's your life. You've got more years ahead of you than I do. I've already had more good things happen to me than I ever deserved or I ever could have dreamed of. I'm up here thinking about what's going to happen to my daughter and her children and your future. And I'm telling you, we cannot cut it if we permit an election in 1994 to reward the people who have stopped progress and tried to create gridlock, because there is so much cynicism that either people can't find out what happened good or they don't believe it if they do, and then they're diverted. We cannot let that happen. And so I ask you to leave here thinking that.

Perhaps the biggest honor I've had as your President is to represent this country at the 50th anniversary of the landings in Italy and D-Day. And I just want to—we're having a good time, this is a light night, but I want to tell you one very serious thing. Those people did not put their lives on the line so that their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren should live cynically in America. You couldn't look at row upon row of graves over there and think, "Well, we're just sunk; we're just stuck in gridlock; we just can't make anything good happen."

I want to tell you something. Most of the folks I've known in public life the last 20 years in both parties were honest and decent and worked hard and tried to do right. This thing we're dealing with now is plumb out of hand, if you will forgive me using some Arkansas dialect. All this whole negative business and all this cynicism, it is an indulgence, and you cannot afford it. And it is not you that is doing it. You are not the cynical generation. It is the people that are older than you that are filling the airways full of this stuff that you don't even want to listen to. And you leave here determined not just to help your President and our party but to help your country and your future. This country was not built by cynics, it was built by believers. And it will be continued by believers.

God bless you, and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 p.m. at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Sean Foley and Jessica Wasserman, co-chairs, Sean Burton, director, and Jonathan Mantz, assistant director, Saxophone Club; rock band Hootie and the Blowfish; comedian Paula Poundstone; and singer Chaka Khan.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With California Democratic Gubernatorial Nominee Kathleen Brown

June 23, 1994

The President. Let me say first it's a pleasure for me to have Kathleen Brown here in the White House, to have an opportunity to talk about the many issues and challenges facing California, what we can do to work on them together. I want to congratulate her on her win in the primary, and I look forward to working with her.

California Gubernatorial Campaign

Q. Are you planning to campaign for Ms. Brown?

The President. If she asks me to, I will. That's up to her.

Ms. Brown. I'm asking. I'm asking. [*Laughter*] Come ride our bus.

The President. I'm in California a lot, you know, and I expect to be back a lot. And I'm encouraged by the signs that our economic program is beginning to take hold in California. I'm encouraged by the very rapid work that was done to get the investments into southern California after the quake. I'm encouraged by a lot of the work that's being done in defense conversion in California. And I'm encouraged by the increasing exports coming out of California and going into the rest of the world. But there's still an awful lot to be done, so I expect to be there quite a lot.

World Cup Soccer

Q. What about the World Cup?

The President. I'm elated, aren't you? That's right, the United States won in California. It's great. I'm so excited about it. I went to the opening game in Chicago, you know, between Germany and Bolivia. And my daughter got me interested in soccer years ago, but I'm about to get totally hooked.

I like this American team. You know, it reminds me of my campaign: They're kind of the underdogs, and they're coming on, and I'm really very hopeful for them now.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:15 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Message to the Senate on the Impact of the Chemical Weapons Convention on the Use of Riot Control Agents

June 23, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

Upon transmitting the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) to the Senate November 23, 1993, I indicated that the Administration was reviewing the impact of the Convention on Executive Order No. 11850, of April 8, 1975, which specifies current U.S. policy regarding the use of riot control agents (RCAs) in war, and would submit the results of that review separately to the Senate. The purpose of this letter is to inform the Senate of the outcome of that review.

Article I(5) of the CWC prohibits Parties from using RCAs as a "method of warfare." That phrase is not defined in the CWC. The United States interprets this provision to mean that:

—The CWC applies only to the use of RCAs in international or internal armed conflict. Other peacetime uses of RCAs, such as normal peacekeeping operations, law enforcement operations, humanitarian and disaster relief operations, counter-terrorist and hostage rescue operations, and noncombatant rescue operations conducted outside such conflicts are unaffected by the Convention.

—The CWC does not apply to all uses of RCAs in time of armed conflict. Use of RCAs solely against noncombatants for law enforcement, riot control, or other noncombat purposes would not be considered as a "method of warfare" and there-

fore would not be prohibited. Accordingly, the CWC does not prohibit the use of RCAs in riot control situations in areas under direct U.S. military control, including against rioting prisoners of war, and to protect convoys from civil disturbances, terrorists, and paramilitary organizations in rear areas outside the zone of immediate combat.

—The CWC does prohibit the use of RCAs solely against combatants. In addition, according to the current international understanding, the CWC's prohibition on the use of RCAs as a "method of warfare" also precludes the use of RCAs even for humanitarian purposes in situations where combatants and noncombatants are intermingled, such as the rescue of downed air crews, passengers, and escaping prisoners and situations where civilians are being used to mask or screen attacks. However, were the international understanding of this issue to change, the United States would not consider itself bound by this position.

Upon receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, a new Executive order outlining U.S. policy on the use of RCAs under the Convention will be issued. I will also direct the Office of the Secretary of Defense to accelerate efforts to field non-chemical, non-lethal alternatives to RCAs for use in situations where combatants and noncombatants are intermingled.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 23, 1994.

Statement on Congressional Action on Health Care Reform
June 23, 1994

Under the leadership of Chairman Ford, the decisive action by the members of the House Education and Labor Committee has brought us one step closer to achieving our goal of universal coverage: guaranteed private insurance for every American that can never be taken away.

Chairman Ford has had a long, distinguished career in Congress, and his guidance throughout the health care reform process and his commitment to universal coverage will help us ensure that all Americans have the health security they want and deserve.

With today's action, for the first time ever, a committee in each House of Congress has reported a bill that guarantees universal coverage. They have broken the chokehold of special interests and, by choosing to cover everyone, have stood up instead for millions of hard working middle class Americans.

As we continue to move forward, and as momentum for reform builds, this committee action sends a clear signal to the American people that Congress is well on its way to making health care history this year.

Statement on Assistance to California
June 23, 1994

As earthquake recovery efforts have continued, the President's contingency fund has enabled our administration to respond to unforeseen problems. Most of the funds I am releasing today will help small business people in southern California who have had difficulty obtaining assistance until now.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary announcing additional assistance to California.

Statement on the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism
June 23, 1994

The travel and tourism industry is one of the unsung heroes of our economy. Your businesses employ more than 6 million Americans and, equally important, international tourism is one sector of our economy that consistently generates a trade surplus. The White House Conference on Travel and Tourism will provide you and your colleagues an opportunity to meet with leaders in the executive branch and in Congress and, I hope, to develop a shared vision, both of the industry's future and of the role of the industry in our Nation's future.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the November 1995 conference.

Remarks at the Congressional Barbecue
June 23, 1994

Thank you very much. We want to welcome you back again this year. We want to thank you for braving, first, late votes and then a late rain in all this heat. And finally it's kind of cooling down and getting better.

We're delighted to see you, all of you here tonight. You are welcome here. This is, after all, your house, and we're sort of the temporary tenants, and we're having a good time. We're really looking forward to hearing Trisha Yearwood tonight. And I hope you've enjoyed all the wonderful food. And I'd like to ask that we give a round of applause to the people who provided that. [*Applause*]

Hillary and I have tried to make this event and the one we had last year fun, relaxing, nonpolitical, which is almost impossible in Washington. And only the heat reminds us of the atmosphere in which we must labor during the daylight hours. [*Laughter*] But we have really enjoyed having you here tonight.

I want to thank the Members who came and brought their family members, their friends, their staff members. It really helps us, I think, to get a feel for the human side of what we hope will be a very enjoyable night for you. And I think there's already been enough talking, and I'm ready for the music.

Would you like to say anything? She wants the music, too.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to country music entertainer Trisha Yearwood.

Interview With Kevin Horrigan and Charles Brennan of KMOX Radio, St. Louis, Missouri
June 24, 1994

Representative Richard Gephardt. Hi, Kevin and Charles. We want to welcome the President of the United States today. We're on Air Force One, and we're going to be in St. Louis in a few minutes. And we welcome the President to our great city.

Q. And we welcome you, Mr. Clinton, to the voice of St. Louis, KMOX Radio.

The President. Thank you. It's good to be on KMOX, and it's good to be coming back to St. Louis.

Campaign Finance Reform

[*At this point, an interviewer asked the President to justify raising $40 million in campaign funds*

after having supported campaign finance reform during his Presidential election campaign.]

The President. I justify it because of the opposition policies of the Republican Party and all the special interest groups that have raised and spent far more money against us, attacking me and my policies and spreading disinformation to the American people. Let me say that all this time, ever since I've been in office, I have worked hard to pass a campaign finance reform bill, which would limit these kinds of contributions right across the board to both political parties and restore basically unfettered debate to the central position it ought to have in our political system.

But I don't believe in unilateral disarmament. The money that I have raised will be used to try to make sure that the Democratic parties throughout the country in these fall elections and our candidates will at least have a fighting chance to talk about our record and the facts and what we've done here. If we could change the rules for everybody, that's what we ought to do.

When I ran for President, I didn't even take any PAC money. And I have worked very, very hard to pass campaign finance reform laws and lobby reform laws which will make the system better. But until I do, it would be a mistake for the Democrats to just lay down and not raise any money, letting the Republicans and a lot of their allied groups have all the money in the world when they already have greater access to a lot of things like a lot of other media outlets than we do.

Q. Wouldn't you be setting a leadership example, though, if you were the first one to say, "Look, these $15,000-a-table fundraisers basically are way out of hand. I've got to put an end to this"?

The President. Well, I'm trying to put an end to it. All the Congress has to do is to send me the campaign finance reform bill, and we'll put an end to this so-called soft money. I've been working for a year and a half to do it. But we have enough problems. The Republicans and the far right in this country have their own media networks. We don't have anything like that. They have extra-organized political action groups that we can't match. And they have the Republican Party's fundraising apparatus, which has been strengthened by having had the White House for all but 4 years in the last 20 years.

So we have real problems competing. I am more than happy to stop this. I've been out there fighting to stop it. All they have to do is to send me the campaign finance reform bill, and it'll be done.

[*Representative Gephardt praised administration efforts in that area and said that campaign finance reform and lobby reform bills would be on the President's desk in 3 or 4 weeks.*]

The President. I'd like to emphasize that the things that are within my control, requirements and limits on my administration and what can be done with regard to lobbying, are stricter now than they have ever been in American history because of the things that I've done, that I can do on my own. And I want this campaign finance law to change. But we ought to change it by the law, and we ought to change it for everyone.

Media Criticism

[*An interviewer asked if people were becoming more cynical and less tolerant.*]

The President. Absolutely. I think there's too much cynicism and too much intolerance. But if you look at the information they get, if you look at how much more negative the news reports are, how much more editorial they are, and how much less direct they are, if you look at how much of talk radio is just a constant unremitting drumbeat of negativism and cynicism, you can't—I don't think the American people are cynical, but you can't blame them for responding that way.

We, for example, we had a meeting the other day, and a group of people were told that under our budgets we were going to bring the deficit down 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. And some of them said, "Well, I just don't believe you. We never hear that on the news. I just don't believe you." It's a fact. I've worked hard to do it. And we're going to—we're bringing the deficit down. That's what bothers me.

You know, I just got back from Normandy, celebrating the 50th anniversary of D-Day. And when I stood on Normandy beaches and when I saw all those rows of crosses there, it occurred to me that those people did not die so the American people could indulge themselves in the luxury of cynicism. And frankly, that's just what it is. America now has—we have the

strongest economic performance of any of the advanced countries in the world. We're bringing the deficit down at a very rapid rate. We're increasing our investment in education and training. We're seriously dealing with crime, with welfare reform, with health care for the first time in decades. We have broken gridlock in the Congress; bills that languished around for 6 or 7 years like the Brady bill and the family and medical leave bill have passed. The economy in St. Louis is booming.

There is no reason to be cynical. But the American people keep being told that things are bad and politicians are corrupt and the system's broken. That's just not true.

You look at what we're coming to St. Louis to celebrate today, this Summer of Service. We've got 7,000 young Americans who are going to be earning money for their college education by working and making their communities safer all across this country; in the fall, 20,000 young Americans, doing community service work, earning money for an education, helping to solve problems. These kids aren't cynical. They know that their country is a good place, and they're going to make it better. We've got a lot of serious problems, and frankly, we can't afford this cynicism. But it's all the rage today.

[*An interviewer asked if growing cynicism could not be traced to incidents such as the disappearance of towels and bathrobes from the U.S.S.* George Washington.]

The President. Well, first of all, we're not sure that just the White House staff did that. There were press people. There were lots of other people on that boat who were not members of the White House staff. We think it—I'm not entirely sure it was. And the *George Washington* is very, very upset by the press reports that those towels, which were obviously taken as souvenirs, were taken by all the White House staff. They never said that we stole anything. That's the kind of thing I'm talking about.

But let me just say this: Someone in the White House personally reimbursed the *George Washington* for all of them, because they felt so bad. And the people who were running the aircraft carrier said that they were astonished that the White House staff was charged with taking all those things, that there were members of the press there, there were other people there on that carrier. They weren't at all sure that White House staff had done that. But someone on my staff was so upset that anybody had done it that they reimbursed them entirely so that they didn't lose a thing on it.

But you know, I could give you a lot of examples—a year ago there was a widely reported story that I kept airplane traffic waiting an hour in Los Angeles to get a haircut in an airport. That wasn't true either. It wasn't true at the time. And I told the press it wasn't true. They ran the story anyway. Then 4 weeks later when the FAA filed their official report, they said, "No, there were no planes kept waiting."

Now, I am not responsible for stories that are written that are not fully accurate or untrue, but it feeds into this cynicism.

Last year the Congress and the President, according to all nonpartisan reports, had the most productive year working together, getting things done for America, dealing with difficult issues, of any first year of a President since the end of World War II, except Dwight Eisenhower's first year and President Johnson's first year, which were about the same. And to be frank, we did it under more difficult circumstances, with tougher issues. I'll bet you nobody in America knows that. Now, that's not entirely our fault.

Look at all the things you could have asked me about, and you just asked me that. Did you know that there were other people on that aircraft carrier? Did you know there were press people on the aircraft carrier? Did you know that the carrier had been fully reimbursed out of the private pocket of a White House staff member who was so upset about it?

Q. No, I didn't know that the White House——

The President. No. No. Why didn't you know that? Because the press reporting it didn't say so.

Q. Yes.

The President. I mean, part of the problem in this country today is that—this is a good country with a lot of people working hard to get things done. And the American people are entitled to have some balanced and fair picture of what's going on.

We've had 3.5 million new jobs come into this economy since I've been President, far more than in the previous 4 years combined. Most Americans don't even know it, because that's not the purpose of a lot of what's communicated to them.

And I think that—I have a very high responsibility. I don't mind you asking me whether I should set an example on campaign contributions, but there are a lot of other examples that need to be set in this country. And I think the people who communicate to the American people need to ask themselves, "What are we telling the people? Are we telling them the whole truth? Do they know what's good as well as what's bad in this country?" And when we make a mistake, then we fess up to it.

I think that there is a lot of cynicism in this country. But frankly, I think there are a lot of vested interests that are promoting the cynicism.

Religion and Politics

Q. Mr. President, let's talk about that just a little bit. Today, or yesterday, the Republicans in the Senate asked you to disavow a remark that I believe Representative Fazio made about evangelical Christians. At the same time you've talked about extremists in the other party, the Republicans, that you say may be trying to launch a cultural war. They're attacking you in very personal, derogatory, moralistic terms. Is this the state of political debate in America today, where we call each other names?

The President. Of course it is. Let me say, first of all, you have never found me criticizing evangelical Christians. I have welcomed the involvement in our political system of all people and especially people of faith. I have bent over backwards as a Governor and as a President to respect the religious convictions of all Americans. I have strong religious convictions myself.

But that is very different, that is very different from what is going on when people come into the political system and they say that anybody that doesn't agree with them is godless, anyone who doesn't agree with them is not a good Christian, anyone who doesn't agree with them is fair game for any wild charge, no matter how false, for any kind of personal, demeaning attack.

I don't suppose there's any public figure that's ever been subject to any more violent, personal attacks than I have, at least in modern history, anybody's who's been President. That's fine. I deal with them. But I don't believe that it's the work of God. And I think that's what the issue is. I do not believe that people should be criticized for their religious convictions. But neither do I believe that people can put on the mantle of religion and then justify anything they say or do. I think that's what Mr. Fazio was talking about.

We don't need a cultural war in this country. We've never done very well when our politics has been devoted to dividing us along grounds of race, religion, creed, morality. We haven't done very well. We've got a lot of serious challenges in this country, and we need to pull together and face them. Should we have arguments about moral issues? Of course we should. But they ought to be honest and careful and straightforward and respectful. And frankly, they're not today.

Q. Are you talking about folks like the Reverend Jerry Falwell, who through his infomercials is selling a videotape critical of you?

The President. Absolutely. Look at who he's talking to. Does he make full disclosure to the American people of the backgrounds of the people that he's interviewed that have made these scurrilous and false charges against me? Of course not. Is that in a good Christian spirit? I think it's questionable.

But I think it's very important that the Democrats be careful—let me say this—to make a clear distinction between tactics with which they do not agree and radical positions with which they do not agree, and the whole notion of evangelical Christians being involved in our politics. I think that evangelical Christians should be good citizens, should be involved in our politics. They can be Republicans or Democrats; they can do whatever they want. But remember that Jesus threw the moneychangers out of the temple. He didn't try to take over the job of the moneychangers.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. Mr. President, world financial markets today report a continued slide of the U.S. dollar against other world currencies. What can or should the United States Government do to halt this slide?

The President. Well, the Secretary of Treasury will have an announcement about it today. Let me say, just make one point about it. This is a development that is puzzling a lot of economists because our economy is performing so well. Our job growth is greater than any other of the advanced countries. Our unemployment rate is lower than any of the advanced countries, except Japan.

In a funny way the currency values are running in the opposite direction of economic

strength because Japan has a great trade surplus with us, as you know. If their economy is weak, no matter what they do, they can't lower the trade surplus because they don't have the money to buy more American products if their own economy is weak.

So in a funny way, the perception of a weak economy in Japan has driven the American dollar down against the Japanese yen because their trade surplus has continued to be high. The German economy, thank goodness, is coming back a little bit, and that's a good thing, but it strengthens the German mark. The American dollar is actually stronger against a lot of other currencies in the world than it was a year ago. I think it's important that we not overreact to this. But the Secretary of the Treasury will have a statement today which will demonstrate the course that we're taking. And I think it's a prudent thing to do.

Media Coverage

Q. If I sense anything today, it seems like a frustration on your part about an inability or just—for some reason, you haven't gotten across to the American people the messages that you want to get across. Is that pretty much true?

The President. Well, let me ask you something, I'm coming to St. Louis to inaugurate the Metrolink, a Federal project which is good for St. Louis; to talk about the Summer of Service and the crime bill, the most important crime legislation in the history of the United States and the national service program which is going to have thousands of young people working to make our communities safer, all of those things initiatives under my administration, and you didn't ask me about any of them.

So I'm not frustrated about it exactly, but I tell you, I have determined that I'm going to be aggressive about it. After I get off the radio today with you, Rush Limbaugh will have 3 hours to say whatever he wants. And I won't have any opportunity to respond. And there's no truth detector. You won't get on afterwards and say what was true and what wasn't. So all I'm telling you is, I'm going to be far more aggressive because the American people are entitled to know what's going on good in this country.

When I go overseas—I just got back from Europe, and the European press came up to me on several occasions—members of the press in Europe would say, "What is going on in your country? You've got things going well; you are nothing like they portray you; the things that are happening are positive. We are bewildered." Members of the press in Europe said that to me repeatedly. So I decided instead of being frustrated, I needed to be aggressive, and I'm going to be aggressive from here on in. I'm going to tell what I know the truth to be.

Q. No more Mr. Nice Guy?

The President. I'm going to be very nice about it, but I'm going to be aggressive about it.

Health Care Reform

Q. Well, let me ask you a little something about health care, because I know this has been the number one, or at least in the top three in terms of issues for you. And you promised long ago to veto any bill that crossed your desk that did not promise 100 percent health care coverage in the United States. You said you'd veto that, any bill that did not insure every single living American.

The President. I said universal, we need to have universal coverage. That's what I said.

Q. Are you willing to compromise on this right now if it turns out to be a political reality that Congress cannot go for the full universal health care?

The President. Well, I think Congress will adopt universal health care. There may be some minor debates about exactly how to define that, but the real issue is, will Congress provide health insurance to all working Americans? Will they provide a mechanism to do it? I still think there's a good chance they'll do it.

Now, to go back to the first question you asked, there have been tens of millions of dollars in kind of disinformation spent to falsely characterize the approach that I wanted to take. I am very flexible and always have been about how we do it. But I do believe that it is not rational for the United States to be the only country in the world that can't figure out how to guarantee health care coverage to middle class working Americans. And in fact, we're going in reverse. We're losing ground. We've got a smaller percentage of our people insured than we did 10 years ago. All the other advanced countries insure everybody and yet we spend 40 percent more of our income on health care than anybody else does. It doesn't make any sense to me.

So I think Congress will find a way to do this. I think they'll measure up for the challenge.

And I'm going to keep working with them. I think there's lots of different ways to do it, and I think we'll find a way to do it. I'm very, very hopeful now. And I think Mr. Gephardt's hopeful now.

[*Representative Gephardt stated that Congress was making progress on health care reform.*]

Q. Mr. President, on behalf of everyone listening to KMOX, thank you very much for joining us this morning.

The President. Thank you. Goodbye.

NOTE: The telephone interview began at 11:07 a.m. The President spoke from Air Force One en route to St. Louis. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Jerry Falwell and Rush Limbaugh, conservative radio and television commentators.

Exchange With Reporters on Anticrime Legislation in St. Louis
June 24, 1994

Q. Speaking of the crime bill, Mr. President, do you know where it stands right now? Can you give us a state of play?

The President. Well, I met earlier this week with Senator Biden and Chairman Brooks, and we talked about it. We think that the essential elements are intact. We believe that it will come out with 100,000 police, with "three strikes and you're out," with prevention programs, with summer jobs for the kids and midnight basketball, the after-school programs, with the assault weapons ban. And they're still working on some of the other issues. I expect that the conference committee will come out with it reasonably soon, and I think it will go through both Houses.

Q. One of the hangups, sir, is racial justice. Have you decided where you come down on that position yet?

The President. Wait and see what the conference committee does. They asked me to give them a few more days to work on it, and we're going to see what they——

Q. Would it help if you came out with——

The President. ——know what's going on—the main thing we don't want to do is to change the subject. The subject is how to get the crime rate down, how to get the police out, how to get the assault weapons—the police on the street, the assault weapons ban into law, how to get the prevention funds out here, how to get the "three strikes and you're out" law out. And I think that they're working on it. I believe everybody in the Congress is going to work on it in good faith, and I think we'll have a—[*inaudible*].

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:50 p.m. during a tour of the Fox Park neighborhood. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to Summer of Safety Program Participants in St. Louis
June 24, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you so much, ladies and gentlemen. It's an honor for me to be back in St. Louis and to be with all these fine people who have already spoken. Your mayor was on a roll today, wasn't he? [*Applause*] You gave a great speech. Thank you, Mayor. I want to thank the Lieutenant Governor, the other State officials who are here, the legislators, the aldermen. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to your Congressman, Bill Clay, for his outstanding leadership in the Congress and on this issue of national service. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Dick Gephardt, the majority leader of the House. Without him, we would not have been able to turn this economy around, to break the gridlock in Washington, to get this country moving again. His leadership has been extraordinary. I want to

thank Chief Harmon for the enlightened leadership he's providing to this city and to this police department and to all the officers, the men and women who work with him to try to make this a safer city. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Tim Hager. Didn't he do a good job introducing me? [*Applause*] You know, Martin Luther King once said that everyone can be great because everyone can serve. This young man had a dream to be a United States marine. He fulfilled it. He proved he could make it through basic training. And then he had to leave. But he came home and joined this program. And I think he captured the essence of his service when he said it.

Let me tell you something, folks, all of us breathed a sigh of relief and had a genuine hope when I was able to announce that the North Koreans had agreed to suspend their nuclear program and talk to us about taking a different course into the future. And that was a wonderful thing. But when thousands of people are murdered on our streets every year, when thousands of our children are robbed of their future, a big part of our national security is what happens right here in St. Louis and on the streets of every community of this country. And Tim is helping to protect this Nation's security by participating in this program.

I'm glad to be here in Fox Park. Congressman Clay said he used to play softball here, and he claims he was really good. Does anybody remember? [*Laughter*]

I want you to also know that I hope this day will live in the history of this community as the beginning of a real awareness by everyone in the community that perhaps the most important thing we can do as Americans is to join together at the grassroots and take action to get control of our lives, our communities, and our destinies again. As Eli Segal said, there will be over 7,000 young Americans working in this Summer of Safety program here and at 70 other sites all around our country, reminding us that we can do more than complain about what's wrong; we can actually get together and take action to do something right, to make our people safer and our future more secure.

In a funny way, the national service program, which is the least bureaucratic, least nationally directed program I have been associated with, may have the most lasting legacy of anything I am able to do as your President, because it has the chance to embody all the things I ran for President to do, to get our country moving again, to make Government work for ordinary people again, and to empower individuals and communities to take control of their own destiny.

We are, after all, a nation of citizens. Our political system, just for example, limits the President to two terms. Our destiny is not dependent upon the actions or the success of any one individual. But it is dependent upon the shared values, the shared commitment, the shared determination, and the shared willingness of a majority of the people of this country and a majority of the people in every community in this country to seize our own destiny.

These young people in the national service program—there are 7,000 this summer; there will be 20,000 in the fall; year after next there will be 100,000 of them. And those who work all year long will be working to solve the problems of America at the grassroots and earning a little credit for themselves toward education, in a job-training program or in a college. We're going to help them become better and more successful Americans because they're going to help us to be better Americans as well where we live.

You know, at the very height of the Peace Corps, which did so much to capture the imagination of my generation 30 years ago, the most who ever served were 16,000 in one year. We'll have 20,000 this fall, 100,000 year after next, and I hope I live to see a permanent program with at least a quarter of a million young Americans every year, working to move this country in the right direction.

This all sounds pretty high-flown, but let me tell you, it's really personal. And we started with the Summer of Safety because there is nothing more important than order and peace in a free society. It's a really personal thing. I'll bet you if I ask you to raise your hands, every one of you just about knows someone in your family who's been victimized by some kind of crime in the last 10 or 15 years, maybe in the last 10 or 15 months.

Some of you here may remember Samuel Smith, who used to live in this neighborhood. Last Thursday he was found dead, killed in an attack that may have been drug-related. He was 12 years old, the 23d child killed in St. Louis so far this year. You probably know about Joseph Gray, who stopped to use the phone outside the market at Shenandoah and California in Fox

Park 2 months ago. He was robbed and gunned down with an AK–47. He was 19 years old.

We all know that this problem is out of hand. We know that this is the greatest country in the world with the strongest economy in the world. But we already have more people in jail as a percentage of our population than any country in the world, because we, you and I, have permitted the crime problem to get out of hand. And only we can turn it around. And we must do it.

The Congress has been working—when I came here 2 years ago on my bus trip, after listening to the American people talk about their problems and their hopes, I said we ought to pass the Brady bill and require background checks before we sold guns to people with criminal records. Well, after 7 years of gridlock, the Brady bill is now the Brady law.

I also said that we ought to cut the Federal bureaucracy and make it smaller and use the savings to put more police officers on our streets, to ban assault weapons, to have tougher punishment for repeat offenders, but to provide boot camps and drug education and midnight basketball and summer jobs and things for young people to say yes to, so that we could save them, as many as we could possibly save, from a life of crime and violence and disappointment. And now those ideas and commitments are in a crime bill the Congress is debating. They've been working on it since I became President.

But the time is now to act. People don't have to live in fear. Young people shouldn't have to feel pulled into a life of crime. Gangs shouldn't be better armed than police. Don't let anybody fool you, the crime bill that's about to pass the Congress is the most important effort ever made by the United States Government to help people in their communities fight crime. It means more police on the streets and taking guns and kids off the streets. It means more jail cells for people behind bars and more jobs for kids to avoid getting behind bars. It will ban assault weapons like the AK–47 that killed Joseph Gray. It will give serious repeat offenders what they have earned: "three strikes" and no eligibility for parole, "you're out." It will address the terrible, terrible problem of youth violence. It will be illegal for teenagers to possess handguns. It will be possible for every community in this country to set up drug courts to turn around cases of drug offenders by giving them a chance to do something besides go to jail if they'll take treatment and work in a community. It will provide more help for safe schools, more security, more law enforcement. It will help to reinforce the efforts we're making in public housing projects all around this country to end the cycle of violence preying on our children. This bill will give our young people something to say yes to: midnight basketball, after-school programs, summer job programs, and it will mean more police officers on the street.

You know, the violent crime rate is 7 times higher now in 1994 than it was 30 years ago. But 30 years ago, we had 500,000 police officers, and today we only have 550,000. Our bill will put another 100,000 on the street to walk the streets, to ride the bikes, to know the neighbors, to make contact with the children, to prevent crime as well as to catch criminals.

This bill is paid for not by a tax increase but by a disciplined determination to reduce the size of the Federal work force by 250,000 over a 5-year period. At the end of this 5-year period, we'll have the smallest Federal Government we've had since John Kennedy was the President of the United States. We'll have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman of Missouri was President of the United States. We will cut and totally eliminate over 100 Government programs, cut hundreds of others. But we'll spend more on education, on training, on new technology, and new jobs for the 21st century. And yes, we will spend much, much more for the fight against crime and the fight for our children's future.

This crime bill has been stalled in Congress for 5 years. But the House has passed a crime bill; the Senate has passed a crime bill. There are some differences between them, and they're trying to work it out. What I want to say to you, my friends, is if you believe in the Summer of Safety, if you believe in the actions that Chief Harmon and Mayor Bosley are taking here, tell the Congress that you support the efforts we are all making to pass this bill.

We don't need to wait anymore; 5 years is too long. Too many children are dead; too many futures are gone; too many neighborhoods have been divided. Now we know what to do. Let's get out here and help the volunteers by having the National Government do its part to be partners in the fight against crime.

Let me just make one final point. In order to be in the Summer of Service, in order to wear these T-shirts, in order to put a police uniform on every day, you have to believe that you can make a difference. In order to work with these children in these T-shirts here, you have to believe that you can make a difference. One of the biggest problems we've got in this country today is that we are constantly being told that we can't make a difference, that everybody that's trying is a sucker, that everybody in power is trying to take advantage of you, that nothing good can ever happen. It emanates over and over and over again from every news outlet we have.

If you talk about hope, you're derided as being naive. If you're really good at badmouthing people, you can get a radio talk show. [*Laughter*] Now, I want to tell you something: It may be fun to listen to, but it's tough to live by. It's tough to live by. Tim is going to make more difference than all of the bad things that'll ever be said on the radio talk shows in his life.

These people in these uniforms deserve to have somebody believe in them and stick up for them and stand by them. And these children deserve to have adults who believe in their future and are prepared to fight for it. I'm telling you, we can do this.

The biggest honor I have had, I think, as your President, is the honor of going to represent the entire American people at the 50th anniversary of D-Day and the end of World War II by the most important military action in the 20th century. When I looked at the graves, the thousands of graves of all those people who died for our security when they were so young to save the world and save freedom, I thought to myself, there wasn't a single cynic among them. You couldn't be cynical and make that kind of sacrifice. And all those who lived, who came home, who were fortunate enough to survive, they weren't cynical that day, either, that they put their lives on the line for our freedom. If you look around these streets and you think about the kids that have died, the people that have been on drugs, the old folks that have been terrorized, that is not what those people died for. We did not get to be the oldest and most successful democracy in human history by being cynics and by badmouthing. We got here by being believers and by doing. That is what we celebrate today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:33 p.m. in Fox Park. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Freeman Bosley of St. Louis; Lt. Gov. Roger Wilson of Missouri; Clarence Harmon, St. Louis police chief; and Tim Hager, Summer of Safety worker. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Statement on the Death of Airmen at Fairchild Air Force Base

June 24, 1994

I was profoundly saddened to learn tonight of the tragic aircraft accident at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, that took the lives of four Air Force officers of the 12th Air Combat Command. The deaths of these superb airmen remind us as a nation of the hazardous risks involved in maintaining the readiness and proficiency of our Armed Forces and the debt we owe our military personnel. Hillary joins me in asking all Americans to keep the families of these distinguished Air Force officers and all the personnel of the 12th Air Combat Command in their prayers.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Representative Richard Gephardt in St. Louis
June 24, 1994

Thank you so much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that wonderful welcome. It's great to be back in St. Louis. Thank you, August Busch, for those kind words and for what you have done to support the work of our administration and the people of Missouri. I am delighted to be here with all of you.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Mr. Busch for two things: first of all, for stepping forward last year when it would have been easy to hang back and helping us to build a coalition of business leaders from both parties all across the country for the economic plan that Congress passed to bring the deficit down and get this economy going again; and for the work he did that Congressman Gephardt mentioned, during the great flood last year to help the Red Cross and the Salvation Army to send drinking water to families all across the region. That's the kind of thing that we depend on our great companies to do, but it's something we should never take for granted but, instead, should appreciate.

I see Congressman Costello and Congressman Volkmer here. We were with Congressman Clay earlier today. He may be here, and Congressman Poshard. I know that Mayor Bosley is here and your county executive, Buzz Westfall. And I was with your Lieutenant Governor, Roger Wilson, and your treasurer, Bob Holden, earlier today. I don't know, I'm sure there are many other dignitaries here. But let me say that I always love coming to Missouri. You were good to me in the campaign of 1992. I've been back here often, and I always feel at home.

This afternoon, Dick Gephardt and I were in the Fox Park neighborhood with people in that community who, along with the mayor, the chief of police, and others, are trying to take control of their destiny and fight against crime. We heard things that were heartbreaking, but we saw things that were uplifting. We talked about a drug-related killing of a 12-year-old boy, the 23d child in the city killed this year. We heard about a 19-year-old young man who was gunned down with an AK–47 assault weapon, one of the kinds that Congressman Gephardt and I are trying to ban in this crime bill.

But we were on the platform with a young fellow that really is an American hero to me, a young man named Tim Hager who was severely beaten in that neighborhood by thieves when he was a teenager. He had to have pins inserted in his hips. But he never gave up his dream to join the Marines. And he joined and survived basic training, which is something in itself. And when he completed basic training, he was told after an examination that his hips had deteriorated to the point that he had an arthritic condition and he would have to be mustered out.

So he had to give up this lifetime dream because as a child he was victimized by criminals and by violence. Within one week after leaving the Marines, however, he had joined the community service effort in this community and in his neighborhood. And now he's part of an effort involving almost 8,000 other young people in what we call our Summer of Safety, a national service project growing out of a program that all the Congressmen here present helped me pass last year to give our young people a sense of mission to help rebuild our country at the grassroots level. He's organizing block patrols, turning parks into oases for families and kids instead of places of dangers, escorting senior citizens, working with the police to diminish crime. And I told that young man today, he's doing a lot for our national security right here at home by helping to make us all safer, and I think you should be proud that your city has people like that.

This fall, those 8,000 young people will be replaced by 20,000 more when we launch our national service program, AmeriCorps, fully. The head of our national service program, Eli Segal, is here with me tonight. He's done a brilliant job of creating this program from an idea I had and talked about in the campaign, that we ought to have a domestic Peace Corps. If the Congress will give us the funding, within 2 years we'll have 100,000 young Americans working every year, earning money for a college education or for job training programs, solving the problems of America at the grassroots level, giving power and purpose back to the lives of people to make them safer and to make them fuller.

It represents in some ways the very best of all the reasons I ran for President. I wanted to restore this economy, to make Government work for ordinary people again, to empower individuals and strengthen communities. National service represents all that.

You know, a lot of us in my generation were inspired by the Peace Corps. At its height, the Peace Corps had 16,000 people a year. We're going to start with 20,000. If we can get it funded, we'll be at 100,000 the year after next. And I am absolutely confident if the money is there we could have a quarter of a million young Americans every year within 5 years, from now on, forever, working to deal with our problems and build our country. That is what I think we ought to be about in this country.

Now, I wanted to start with this story to make this point. This is a very great country. And most people get up every day and go to work and try to make something of themselves, help their families, do something to help move forward. And the job of Government is not to give the American people a handout but to give the American people a hand up, to face the challenges of this time, and to forge partnerships that unleash the enormous character and energy and drive of the America people. And that is, more than anything else, what I believe Dick Gephardt has devoted his life to.

I have been in this business now for a good while. I was a Governor for a dozen years, and before that I was an attorney general. And the longer I stay in it, the more I tend to view people not just in terms of their partisan affiliation or even the way they are characterized as liberal or conservative, because that's about words and labels, but about what is really in their hearts and what they do every day.

And an awful lot of people today who are being basically barraged, I think, in this country by words and words and words and words and the rhetoric of combat and positioning. And too often, it seems to me, we wind up evaluating people based on not what they do and what they're really going to stand for but what labels are thrown around.

And it kind of reminds me of a sign that became the source of a great story we used to tell on the stump in Arkansas. On a country road there was a guy that had his business sign up. It said, "George Jones, Veterinarian/ Taxidermist." And then under it, it said, "Either way, you get your dog back." [*Laughter*]

Well, if we ever get to the point, my fellow Americans, when politics in this country is just about words and name-calling, that's what it will amount to. And don't you forget it. It does matter what condition you get your dog back in. And as I told a smaller group of his supporters before I came out here, I appreciate Dick Gephardt for a lot of things, one is because he's a great leader in the House. And if it weren't for him, we'd have never passed that economic program last year. And there are a lot of other things that would not have happened. I respect him because he's a great leader for St. Louis and for his congressional district as I saw as we worked through the problems of the flood last year. He's proved as well as anybody I know that you can be a national leader without giving up your local commitments and your grassroots contacts and your commitment to the specific interests of your district.

But the most important thing about him is that he believes that he's supposed to get up every day and do something. And you may think that's funny, but that's real important in this day and age, in this day and age when we're deluged with information and words fly back and forth and cynicism is so much the order of the day, the idea that a person in a position of national leadership really gets up with a vision of what America ought to be like and a clear path there. And it's made for a wonderful relationship.

Even on the couple of occasions where he and I have had a disagreement, I didn't give it a second thought because I knew it came out of his conviction that he had thought through the issue, and that he really believed he was right, and that he was determined to do something to move our country forward. And if everybody in public life could do that and we could somehow communicate that through the haze of cynicism and hard rhetoric that seems so much in evidence today, this country would be much further ahead. He is a national treasure, and I'm glad you're here to keep him in office tonight.

You know, I'll just give one example. You may never even read about this, but it's the kind of thing that I think is important. Dick is leading cosponsor of our reemployment act. Now, since nobody's dropping bombs on me for proposing it, and there's no controversy, conflict, or scandal, you will probably never hear about it. [*Laughter*]

But let me tell you, it is a big deal. Why is it a big deal? Number one, the average 18-year-old is going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime, even if that person, he or she, stays with the same employer. Number two, when a person loses a job today, unlike in previous decades, they typically are not called back to that job. A lot of big companies are downsizing permanently, which means that the unemployment system is out of position with the modern economy. Why? Because those of you who are employers have been paying that unemployment tax for years on the theory that when someone got unemployed, it was because the economy had temporarily turned down, and then a person could draw the unemployment check and make obviously less than they made when they were working but still enough to live on until the economy came back up and the person was called back to work.

And of course, there were always some people that lost their jobs permanently, and they could go around and find the training programs and then eventually they'd get another job. But, if most people are not being called back to their old job, it obviously is a terrific waste of money and human potential for those of you who pay into the unemployment fund to keep paying people to draw a lower check to do nothing, to wait until the unemployment runs out to find out that they still have to find another job.

So what we want to do is to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system so the minute anybody is laid off, they have the option right then to start a training program, to look about whether they want to start their own business, to go to one place and find out where all the possible opportunities for them are, not to have to go through some bureaucratic maze.

Again, you might not ever hear about it if you hadn't come up here tonight, but this could make a huge difference in the long-term productivity and security of the American middle class. And it could also make a big difference for those of you who pay the unemployment taxes, because it could cut the amount of time people are unemployed and it would increase America's economic growth if we shortened periods of idleness by empowering workers more quickly to learn new skills and take new jobs.

Now, that's the kind of thing a real public servant does, thinking not of today's headlines but of tomorrow's future for our children. And that is why I wanted to be here tonight. I have seen so many times Dick Gephardt—not in public when people were looking and listening, but in private conversation—bring the talk back to the urgent obligation public servants have to deal with, the real problems of real people. And if all of you could see him as I have seen him in private doing his business, you would be even prouder of him than what you have seen in public. Would that we could say that of all of us. That is a very important thing.

When I took office, Government had become more and more about talk and less and less about action. Everybody talked about the deficit while it got bigger. We never could talk it down, you know. And finally, it had gotten so big, the things we had to do about it were not popular. And ironically, the deficit had gotten bigger while middle class taxes had gone up and investments in our future in education and training and new technologies had gone down. Nobody could quite figure out how it had happened.

Well, with Dick Gephardt's help, we made some tough decisions. We cut a lot of spending programs. We raised taxes on the wealthiest Americans, including a lot of you here tonight that are still supporting it, which I appreciate. But all your money went to finance a reduction in the deficit, every red cent of it.

We gave a break to one in six Americans who have children, who work 40 hours a week and are hovering above the poverty line, because we didn't want those people to be taxed into poverty and to quit working and to go on welfare. We wanted them to stay in the work force and be able to raise their children in dignity. And we didn't think people who were working 40 hours a week should be taxed into poverty.

And we brought the deficit down. This year, without a tax increase, we eliminated over 100 other programs in this deficit reduction package, cut 200 others. I presented a budget to the Congress that reduces domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years. And when the budget goes through this year, it will guarantee 3 years of reduction in the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman of Missouri was President of the United States of America.

And a lot of our opponents are out there running television ads saying, "Oh, they passed the biggest tax increase in history." By any rational calculation, that was not true. It was the biggest deficit reduction package in history. Only

1.2 percent of Americans had their tax rates increased; 16 percent got a tax cut because they were in the income category I meant. And now in November we will see a contest between all the rhetoric about what was happening and the fact that, after the other crowd had it for 12 years, you simply couldn't talk the deficit down any more. You actually had to do something to get it down. And the fact that you're here tells me that you know that and you respect Dick Gephardt for having the courage and the vision to take care of our children and our children's children and let somebody else throw the words around. And that's what we need more of.

But the good news is it actually worked the way it was supposed to. There was a big drop in interest rates; millions of people refinanced their homes; the car industry started exploding. It helped St. Louis a lot. After 4 years in which you lost 2,000, jobs in one year you gained 28,000 jobs in the St. Louis area alone; 3.5 million new jobs in this country in a year and a half, far more than in the previous 4 years, because action was substituted for talk. It almost always works. It works in your personal life, too, doesn't it? It's just hard to talk things away. You always have to change what you're doing.

We did a lot of other things, too. We really tried to break gridlock. People talked about doing something about the fact that anybody with a criminal record could buy a gun easily in this country. And the Brady bill hovered around in Washington for 7 years, with all the former Presidents of both parties for it and we couldn't seem to pass it. But after 7 years of gridlock, it finally passed.

After 7 years of gridlock, we finally passed the family and medical leave law. It's really important because it says most parents have to work but the most important work of any society is parenting. So it ought to be possible to take a little time off when you've got a sick child or an ailing parent or when a baby is being born without losing your job, because we live in a country now where we all have to be good workers and good parents. And if we sacrifice one role for the other, we will never become what we ought to be. It took 7 years to get that passed, but we broke gridlock with Dick Gephardt's leadership and passed the family leave law and made our country a stronger country.

Now we're working on a lot of exciting other things. We're working on passing a crime bill we talked about today, a crime bill that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street; a crime bill that will stiffen punishment but will also increase programs for prevention to help young people stay out of trouble, everything from summer jobs to midnight basketball to after-school programs for latchkey children; that will ban the kind of assault weapons that make gangs better armed than police. It is a very important piece of legislation. It's been held up in Congress for over 5 years, nearly 6 years, by political gridlock. We're going to break that gridlock next month and give the American people a bill that will make St. Louis a safer place to live, thanks to Dick Gephardt's leadership.

We're working on political reform, on lobby reform, campaign finance reform. We have a lot of major environmental legislation moving through the Congress with unprecedented support from environmental groups and business groups working together. We're working on opening trade all around the world with a worldwide trade agreement that Congressman Gephardt endorsed just the other day that will add hundreds of thousands of American jobs between now and the end of this decade to our economy. And we are working to try to redeem a pledge and a commitment that Harry Truman made 50 years ago, finally to provide assurance of health care to all working families in this country, something we should have done when he was President of the United States of America.

I want to talk just a moment about this health care issue because it is just like the deficit; you just can't talk it down. And it is a difficult issue; it is not free of difficulty. But here are the facts: Of all the advanced countries in the world, only the United States does not provide health coverage to everybody—"everybody" defined as 98 percent of us or more. Everybody else has done that. In our country, we cover about 83 percent of our people with health insurance or through a Government program like Medicare for the senior citizens.

No other country in the world spends more than 10 percent of their income on health care. In our country, we spend 14 percent—40 percent more of our income than anybody else—but we can't figure out how to cover everybody. Not only that, the burden of paying for health

care is wildly uneven and unfair. The Government does not fully reimburse doctors and clinics and hospitals for health care for the poor and often for health care for senior citizens. Many others aren't insured at all and can't pay, but they get care. And all that cost is then shoved on to companies that do provide for their employees. So big companies like McDonnell-Douglas pay health care not only for their own employees but pay for the extra cost of those that take no care for themselves and make no investment.

Small businesses in this country who are struggling to provide some health insurance for their employees pay rates that are, on average, 35 to 40 percent higher than bigger business or Government does. So they're in the worst of all worlds.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day, and I met a woman who—she and her husband ran a delicatessen where I had lunch. They had 20 full-time employees and 20 part-time employees. And she had had cancer 5 years before. And she said, "I am a living example of what is unfair about this system." She said, "We provide health insurance for our 20 full-time employees. And because I had cancer 5 years ago, we pay higher rates for our whole group. But I pay for them. And I resent the fact that my competitors don't do it. On the other hand, I've got 20 part-time employees that I can't afford to cover, and I feel guilty that I don't do that. I've got it coming and going. But I simply can't afford it. If everybody had to do it, I wouldn't be at a competitive disadvantage. The cost would actually be less than I'm paying now for me to cover my part-time employees if I could be in a big pool so that I could buy insurance on the same competitive basis larger companies do. Won't you please do something so I can do that?"

On the other hand, in America—let's take it the other way—we have a lot of people who are small business people who operate on very narrow profit margins. They're creating most of the jobs in this country, and they don't think they can afford anything else for health care. So what are we going to do? What we've done for 40 years is nothing, except just to sort of add on one little program after another.

In 3 years, in 3 years, because of the rising cost of health care, we've lost 3 million people out of the health insurance system. Three million more people uncovered. In 1980, 87.5 percent of the American people were covered with health insurance. By 1993, only 83 percent of the American people were. We are going in reverse, and we're spending more while fewer are covered.

Now, when I put out my program I went around and I listened to people talk about it. And they said, "Ah, you've got too many rules in there; it's too bureaucratic; you need to make it more flexible; change it some." And I said, fine. The only thing I want to do is find a way to cover everybody and give small business, farmers, and self-employed people a break so they can buy rates—insurance on a competitive basis and we can have some way of holding costs down without sacrificing quality. That's all I want to do. But if we don't do it, it will be just like this deficit or just like a hangnail. It won't get any easier. Sooner or later we're going to have to do this. We ought to do it now. We ought to do it now.

Let me say, I want this to be as grassroots a program as I can. The best, most popular thing we've done, when people know about it, is national service, because the Government provides the money and sets the goals and people at the local level decide how to organize all these young people to solve problems. That's a lot of what we're trying to do with health care. I don't want the Government to take it over. I want to leave the private insurance system in place. I want people at the State and local level to decide how to do it. But you have to have some rules that say how everybody is going to be covered and some way of organizing folks so small business can get a break. You have to do that.

And I say to you, I don't think we'd have a chance to do that if Dick Gephardt weren't so dedicated to it. And if we had about 10 more folks in both parties in both Houses that dedicated, there wouldn't be a chance that we wouldn't do it. And I wouldn't even have to give a speech about it tonight.

But what we have to decide on health care and crime and welfare reform and all these other issues that face us is whether it's going to be a talking deal—either way you get your dog back—or whether it's going to be about doing something, not trying to box our opponents into extreme positions and covering ourselves with labels but looking at the reality.

Back in the Middle Ages, the great Italian political philosopher Machiavelli said that there

is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things. Because, he said, people who will be adversely affected by the change know it, and they'll fight you like crazy. He didn't use those words, but I'm freely translating. [*Laughter*] My Italian is not that bad. But he said, on the other hand, the people who will benefit are always somewhat uncertain about what the change will be, and therefore, they won't bring themselves into the fight with the same gusto as those who are afraid of the change. So it always is difficult to change.

But we know that America is around here after 214 years and more because we always changed when we had to, because we have this capacity to be faithful to our values and our Constitution and our institutions, but to change. And that's what he hired on for, and that's why I ran for President.

I had a good life, and I was as happy as I'd ever been in my life the day I entered the race for President. And everybody told me that my happiest days might be behind me. [*Laughter*] But I did not want to see my child grow up in a country where things were coming apart when they ought to be coming together. I did not want her to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents. And I did not believe that we were incapable of solving these problems.

So I say to you tonight, my fellow Americans, we glorify Harry Truman today because he made us face our problems, and he said what he thought. Everybody talks about how much they miss him. I came from a family that was for him when he was alive. [*Laughter*] And you know what I'm talking about—we all—you know, he's practically a saint now in America. But when he was alive he was usually low in the polls for telling inconvenient truth and trying to get people to face up to their responsibilities at a time when we were tired of it. I mean, it was at the end of the war, and we'd been through all that, and nobody wanted to face all that.

We cannot be tired today. We have a lot to do. At the end of the cold war we're faced with a whole set of challenges and opportunities that are different. And our children's lives will be measured by the extent to which we choose to do and to pull together, instead of to talk and to divide. We got to where we are today by being a nation of believers and doers.

Dick Gephardt, your Congressman, is one of our finest believers and doers. Let the rest of us do as well on health care and all our challenges, and our country will go into the next century in great shape.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:44 p.m. in the St. Louis Ballroom at the Adams Mark Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to August Busch III, chairman and president, Anheuser-Busch, Inc.

The President's Radio Address
June 25, 1994

Good morning. This morning I want to talk about the progress we're making in our drive to provide real health care security to America's working families. But before I do, I'd like to say a brief word about families who provide real national security for the American people.

Earlier this week at Fairchild Air Force Base in Washington State, six people died and more than 20 others were injured when an unhappy former airman brought an assault weapon onto the base and opened fire. And now the men and women at Fairchild grieve again. Yesterday afternoon a B–52 bomber from the 12th Air Combat Command crashed at the base during a training mission. All four airmen aboard were lost. Their deaths remind us again of the hazards and risks involved in maintaining our security and the debt of gratitude we owe each of our military personnel. I want to send my condolences and prayers to the families of the airmen and the good people who will continue doing the hard work of freedom at Fairchild.

After months of debate, health care reform is very much alive. And we have an extraordinary opportunity in the next few weeks to make sure that America joins every other ad-

vanced nation by guaranteeing health coverage to each and every citizen, not through a Government program but through private insurance and real opportunities for small business people and self-employed people to buy good insurance on the same terms that those of us in Government or people who work for big business can. I'm committed to making sure we don't miss this urgent opportunity.

This week we had a historic development. For the first time in American history and after 60 years of reform efforts, committees in both Houses of Congress have approved bills that guarantee universal health coverage, coverage to all American families.

Anyone who doubts the significance of this need only look at the last half century. President Roosevelt first tried to reform health care but couldn't get this far. President Truman tried several times and couldn't do it. President Nixon proposed universal health coverage with an employer-employee joint responsibility to pay for insurance, and he couldn't do it. President Carter also tried without success.

These reform efforts never got to this point. Now that we've come this far, we mustn't turn back. Momentum is building toward a solution for the health care crisis. And as we settle on one, we must make sure we go to the root of the problems in the current system.

Half measures, quick fixes, things that sound better than they actually will work, will only make matters worse. We have to help middle class Americans, whose economic success is the key to America's prosperity, know that they will always have health security, even if they have to change jobs or if they lose their jobs.

The whole purpose of our economic program is to make it possible for hard-working Americans to reap the potential of a vastly changing world economy. We're not proposing to hand anybody anything but to help all Americans get the tools they need to have good jobs and strong families now and in the future.

That's exactly what we have been doing. We've worked hard to get our economic house in order with tough deficit reduction and new investments in education, training, new technologies, the jobs of the 21st century. We've helped to restore the economy, and more than 3 million new jobs have been created since I took office last year. We've made a dramatic proposal to move people from welfare to work. We're creating educational and job training opportunities that will enable people to embrace change. We have a tough crime bill about to pass that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, with tougher punishment, better prevention for our young people, a ban on assault weapons. We'll have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

But unless we address the health care crisis, these other measures will not do all they should for our people. Unless we provide coverage for all Americans, our economy will continue to suffer and more and more Americans will lack the security they need to take advantage of the opportunities that lie ahead.

We've heard a lot about measures lately that wouldn't provide coverage to all families. But make no mistake, measures that are half-hearted would at best, at best, guarantee that things stay only about as good as they are now. The poor would get health care. The wealthy would get health care. The middle class would get it sometimes and not get it sometimes, but they would be either left out into the cold or remain constantly at risk of losing coverage.

Our strength in the world has always been the imaginative ingenuity of our middle class. But the lack of security about health coverage is putting a roadblock in the way of middle class Americans as more and more people have to change jobs more often. Today, 81 million Americans live in families with preexisting conditions that could keep them from taking better jobs or creating new businesses and already mean that millions of them either don't have health insurance or pay too much for it. If middle class Americans are held back by worries about their health care and the health of their families, they often can't do what they must to succeed.

And people on welfare, who ought to become productive members of society, won't take jobs if it means giving up their health benefits. Just yesterday in Missouri, I met a woman who has moved from welfare to work but who says that when she loses her health benefits for her children, she's not sure she can stay working and may go back to welfare. We'll be telling our people that working hard doesn't count anymore when we ask people who leave welfare to go to work to pay taxes so that those who stayed on welfare can have health care for their children while they give it up. I know you believe we can't afford to send that message.

We shouldn't assume that doing nothing will protect what we have today, either. Nothing is what we have done for years. And just this week, a new report showed that the percentage of Americans without insurance has gone from 12 percent to 15 percent of our population in the last 12 years. Now, that's over 12 million Americans who don't have health insurance. In the last 3 years alone, more than 3 million Americans have been added to the rolls of the uninsured. Even those with insurance today can't count on having it tomorrow unless we fix our system and fix it now.

Actually, not all Americans face this kind of risk. Members of Congress, along with the President and all Federal Government employees, we have a great deal right now. We work for you, the taxpayers of America, and you reward us with health coverage that can't be taken away, even if we get sick. Not only that, we have a requirement that employers contribute most of the cost of our health plan—that's you, you're our employers—and we contribute some.

Now, I believe every working American deserves these same benefits and that same guarantee. I think you ought to tell Congress that you believe the same thing.

In the weeks ahead, special interests will again be spending millions of dollars, tens of millions, to block reform. I'm going to do everything I can to make sure that the concerns of hard-working Americans don't get drowned out.

Harry Truman said it best about 50 years ago when he said, "There is no other way to assure that the average American family has a decent chance for adequate medical care. There's no way to assure a strong and healthy nation." I believe 50 years is long enough to wait to make good on that promise. Let's do it this year.

Thanks for listening.

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

Address to the People of the Baltic Nations

June 27, 1994

On July 6th, I will be coming to Riga. On that day, I will have the great honor of being the first American President to visit the Baltic nations. The honor will be even greater because now Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are free democracies once again.

In recent years, the United States observed every June 14th as Baltic Freedom Day, a day that reminded all Americans of the courage and determination of the Baltic peoples in your struggle against Soviet occupation. The American people never recognized that occupation, and we rejoiced with you in August 1991, when your three countries were reborn as independent, sovereign states. We have worked with you to achieve the early and complete withdrawal of foreign troops from your soil. And we look forward to rejoicing with you again this year when the final soldier has departed.

When I come to Riga, I will meet with President Ulmanis, President Meri, and President Brazauskas. Together we will discuss how America can work with the Baltic countries to help bolster your security and prosperity into the next century. One of the most important moments of my trip will come when I speak at an outdoor gathering in Riga to the people of all the Baltic countries. I invite all who can to come and join me for that historic occasion.

I look forward to meeting the people of your countries in a few weeks. And until then, let me leave you with three wishes: Long live the Republic of Estonia! Long live the Republic of Latvia! And long live the Republic of Lithuania!

NOTE: The address was videotaped on June 22 at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the Library at the White House, and it was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 27. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Address to the People of Berlin, Germany
June 27, 1994

On July 11 and the 12th, I will have the honor to be the first American President to visit Berlin as the capital of a free, democratic, and unified Germany.

Berlin has stood for decades as a great symbol of freedom. Hundreds of thousands of Americans in our military and other walks of life have been symbolic citizens of your city during nearly half a century of peace.

Over the past two generations, Berlin's place in history has been the dividing line between East and West. Today Berlin is poised to play an even greater role in history, as a place that can help bring East and West together for all time.

There are few greater points of pride for the American people than the partnership we have enjoyed over these two generations with Germany and with Berlin. Now we are once again joined in partnership as we work together to build a future for the whole of Europe, democratic, united, prosperous, and free.

On July 12th, I look forward to heralding that future when I speak before the Brandenburg Gate to the people of Berlin and of all of Germany. I hope all Berliners who can will join me there on that occasion.

NOTE: The address was videotaped on June 22 at approximately 6:30 p.m. in the Library at the White House, and it was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 27. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Remarks to Medical Educators
June 27, 1994

Thank you very much, Dr. Peck, Dr. Rabkin, Secretary Shalala. I want to thank also Dr. Michael Johns, Dr. Herbert Pardes, and Dr. Charles Epps for the work they did to bring together this very distinguished group of representatives from our academic health centers around America. And I'm sure that the press knows it, but it's not just the people who are up here but all the people who are here in the room have come from all over America, from every region of our country, in very large numbers, with very strong feelings about the central issue in this health care debate, which is whether we are finally going to join the ranks of other advanced countries in the world by providing health care to all Americans and still preserving what is best and what is excellent about our health care system.

The interesting thing is that the point which is being made here today, which I think has not been made with sufficient clarity before, is that over the long run and now increasingly in the short run, the only way to preserve what is best about our health care system is to fix what is wrong with it, to provide basic, decent coverage to all Americans. Otherwise you will see continued incredible financial pressures on the academic health care centers, continued difficulty in providing for the health care of the people who are now in your charge, and eventual difficulty in training and educating the world's finest physicians and other health care professionals. I do not believe that connection has yet been made.

I also want to thank you, particularly Dr. Rabkin, for making the point about rationing. The suggestion that somehow a very important benefit package that includes primary and preventive health care as well as guaranteeing access to the people who need it to America's finest high-tech medicine, is rationing as compared with what we have today: with 39 million Americans or more without any health insurance, with 58 million who don't have any health insurance at sometime during the year, and with 81 million who live in families with preexisting conditions and often worry about accessing the health care system. The suggestion that somehow we don't have rationing today and we will

have it if this passes is, to put it mildly, a stretch of reality.

As front-line providers, you know the truth. You know the health care truth, and you know the financial truth. The significance, again, of this meeting today is this to me. I spent a lot of time in academic health care centers. I know that the people who run them are both Democrats and Republicans and independents. Maybe even some of them voted for the third-party candidate last time. I know that the board members of academic health care centers are both Republicans and Democrats. I know that where they serve, there is almost fanatic support for them among people from all walks of life. In other words, the American people, when they deal with you in your communities and in your States, put politics behind and put health care first and ask, what are the facts? What are the health care facts? What is the state of medical knowledge? What is the financial truth?

If we could just get those three questions asked and answered in the Congress of the United States, we would get a health care bill that covers all Americans. In other words, if we could have people of both parties bring to the deliberations of the law in Congress less politics and more concern for health care, the way you do and the way you force people to deal with you just because of what you do, we would pass a bill in this session of Congress, with bipartisan support, that guarantees health care to all Americans. This surely is not a political issue.

What I want to ask you to do today is—we're all here today preaching to the saved, as we say at home, and hoping that through the magic of the media it will reach others. But I want to ask you to personally, personally, commit that you will speak to the Members of the Congress from your State of both parties and ask them to make these decisions based on what is good for the health of Americans, what is good for the economy of America, and how it will affect your institution in terms of health care and finances. If we can get beyond the politics to the reality, we can prevail here. And I want you to do that. You can do that. You can do that.

As much as any group in America—I don't know—when I started talking to Members of Congress, that's the one thing I found that without regard to their party, their philosophy, or their predisposition on health care reform, they all knew that they had a medical center in their home State they were terribly proud of.

And so I ask you, as we close this ceremony today, to commit to make a personal contact and a personal appeal to every Member of the Congress from your State to put politics aside and put the health care of the American people first. If we can do that, and if people understand that you represent what is best in American health care and we can't preserve what is best unless we fix what is wrong and cover everybody, that central understanding will carry the American people to a victorious result.

We need you. You have done your country a great service today. Please follow it up in talking firstly with the Members of Congress.

Thank you so very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:22 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. William Peck, dean, Washington University Medical Center; Dr. Mitch Rabkin, president, Beth Israel Hospital; Dr. Michael Johns, dean, Johns Hopkins Medical School; Dr. Herbert Pardes, dean, Columbia University Medical School; and Dr. Charles Epps, dean, Howard University Medical School.

Remarks Announcing Changes in the White House Staff and an Exchange With Reporters

June 27, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. Today I want to announce some changes in personnel in the White House that will add strength and vitality to this White House and to our administration.

In the coming months, this White House faces a series of major challenges that are critical to the American people. In Congress, we're seeking to pass the first major health care reform in history, a sweeping crime bill, a signifi-

cant trade bill, a reemployment act, lobbying and campaign finance reform, and welfare reform. We're seeking to pursue our continued efforts in economic reform and deficit reduction, producing now 7,000 jobs a week. Overseas we face serious issues well-known to all of you. We've embraced an agenda that is not only daunting but profoundly important to the American people. To meet those challenges, here at the White House we must use our people as wisely as possible, matching their talents to their responsibilities.

More than a month ago, my Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, started some discussions with me on ideas that he had for a better deployment of our people. These provided the basic framework for the decisions I announce today. I came home from D-Day determined to proceed with these changes. He and I worked with the Vice President and others on these recommendations, which I am pleased to announce today.

Today I'm naming Mack McLarty as Counselor to the President. He has been and will continue to be my closest and most trusted personal adviser. His new role will permit him to spend much more time as my personal representative to the people who are so important to the success of this administration's efforts, Democrats and Republicans in Congress, constituent groups of all kinds, friends who helped to bring me to the White House. In addition, I am asking him to assume greater responsibility in shepherding our legislative program through Congress, including GATT, health care, and welfare reform, and to help lay the groundwork for summits this year with the Latin and Asian leaders.

Mack McLarty has served this country ably and well as Chief of Staff for 18 months. He was reluctant to take the job, and I will always be grateful that he did. He selflessly agreed to serve the country, and I would say he has a record he can be proud of. We had the most productive first year of working with Congress of any administration over three decades; the sparking of an economic recovery; 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since the Truman Presidency; breaking gridlock on the Brady bill, family leave, assault weapons, and other issues; progress in pushing historic plans for health and welfare reform. He's run an open White House, treating others and their ideas with unfailing courtesy. He has, in short, delivered with the decency, integrity, and goodwill that has endeared him to many good people here and throughout the Nation. And I thank him for his service.

I am delighted today to say that Leon Panetta will succeed Mack as White House Chief of Staff. Over the past year and a half, he has been a pillar of strength for our administration. In the early days, he was a prime architect of the economic strategy, an integrated plan that reduced the deficit and laid the foundation for sustained economic growth. Then he took the lead in formulating and gaining passage of that deficit reduction package, the largest in the history of our Republic. He will go down in history as the Budget Director who began to slay the deficit dragon.

In an era of tightening budgets, he also found ways to fund many of my initiatives to put people first: education, job training, and technology. He's worked closely with the Vice President in reinventing the Government. He's been an innovative adviser in drawing up a host of domestic policies. And he has been a skillful manager of the more than 500 people who work under his leadership at OMB. As the good citizens of Rome have learned, he also speaks pretty good Italian. [*Laughter*] No one in Washington has a better understanding of both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue than Leon Panetta. And no one has earned greater respect at both ends.

I am also announcing today that I will nominate Alice Rivlin to be the next Director of the Office of Management and Budget. She has been a superb deputy at OMB. She's played a major role in helping to run that organization and in chairing the President's Management Council and in gaining congressional approval of our budgets.

She brought with her to this administration a long and distinguished record. She was, of course, the founding director of the Congressional Budget Office, serving there for more than 8 years. And she's written pathbreaking studies of fiscal policies while at the Brookings Institution. Economists have recognized her leadership and her brilliance, electing her in the past as president of the American Economic Association. In short, OMB will continue to be in very good hands.

Finally, I want to announce a shorter term assignment. For the past year I have drawn heavily upon the counsel of David Gergen. He has been a wise and steady voice for bipartisanship, for moderation, and for an effective Gov-

ernment. It has been widely understood that he anticipates returning to the private sector in the next few months. I have asked David to stay on for the remainder of the year and to concentrate his full energy in the foreign policy arena.

On several occasions in the past, and more and more in recent months, I have found him helpful in the formulization, conceptualization, and the communication on national security matters. I now want him to play a larger role, joining my team as a principal adviser in this field. Other members of our foreign policy team have expressed their enthusiasm, and David has graciously agreed to serve as a special adviser to both the President and the Secretary of State.

Taken together, I believe these appointments will produce a stronger, more energetic, and a unified team for the administration and for the daunting challenges ahead.

I thank all of them for their willingness to serve. I'd like now to ask them each in turn to make a few remarks, beginning with Mr. McLarty.

[*At this point, Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty, Leon E. Panetta, Alice M. Rivlin, and David R. Gergen made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, despite musical chairs, this may be viewed as a repudiation of your team and what you've had so far in the Presidency.

The President. Well, I long ago gave up trying to determine how it's viewed by other people. All I can tell you is, I think it's a real tribute to Mr. McLarty that he came to me several weeks ago and suggested that we consider this and even mentioned Leon's name to me, and we began to talk about it. I think the job of the President is to make the White House as effective as possible, which means you have to use the people at their highest and best use. I think that's what I'm doing. I also think it's—someone might question the decision in light of the successes that have been chalked up. I think we have done a good job with a huge agenda; I think it's getting bigger and more complex. I think that this is the right thing to do at this time, and I think it will pay off. That's all I can tell you. My job is to do the best I can by the American people and let others do the interpreting.

Q. Mr. President, recently there was documented in Bob Woodward's book a lot of criticism of Mr. Panetta from your political advisers. And I guess one question is, how do you feel about that criticism of Mr. Panetta's economic policies? Will there be a tension now between your political staff? And how do you feel about the decision to have yet another of your close Arkansas friends take a step either out or down? Sideways?

The President. He's not going anywhere. He's my closest friend. And I don't want to get into that. I can win that argument. But I can't comment on Mr. Woodward's book. I don't—"documented" may be too strong a word, but I think that everybody who's worked with Leon Panetta has a great deal of respect for him. I thought that the transition debates we had over economic policy were good, helpful, and appropriate. We were trying to turn a country around after going 12 years in one direction.

He will go down in history as the OMB Director that did, I think, virtually the impossible, not only produced the biggest deficit reduction package in history, the first two budgets to be adopted on time in 17 years, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman, the first reduction in domestic spending, discretionary spending in 25 years but, in spite of all of that, substantial increases in Head Start, job training, other education investments, and new technologies, the things that I ran to do: bring the deficit down, get the economy going, invest in people. So I think—he's clearly done what I wanted to do. I signed off on those decisions, I think he's done well, and I think he's done it with a very effective management style. I feel a high level of confidence in him.

Q. Mr. President, I'm not clear on what you're trying to fix. What wasn't happening——

The President. He is a former Republican, and I'm a Baptist. We set great store in deathbed conversions. [*Laughter*] To me, that makes him even more valuable as a Democrat. I'd like to have more people do the same thing.

Q. Mr. President, what are you trying to fix? What wasn't happening that you want to happen?

The President. I think you should let our words speak for themselves. I was trying to think of how I could characterize this. This is really an attempt to do exactly what I said: find the highest and best use for talented people of good will who just want to serve their country. And this shows you what a sports—I don't like all the time politicians making sports analogies, but

50 years ago, Army had an all-American backfield of Doc Blanchard and Glenn Davis. And one was called Mr. Inside and one was called Mr. Outside, reflecting that they had different skills, but they were both all-Americans. I think that's what we have today, and I think it's the best thing for the country. And I think in the weeks and months ahead, we'll see it proved out.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:16 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks to the White House Conference on Africa
June 27, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. Ladies and gentlemen and distinguished guests, thank you so much for participating, and thank you for your understanding of our tardiness here today and for waiting so that I could at least share a few of my thoughts on this subject.

When I became President, it seemed to me that our country really didn't have a policy toward Africa, that we had policies toward specific countries and very often we tried to do the right thing. We did have a policy toward South Africa that had been the subject of much division and then was the subject of a lot of unity after the election. But it occurred to me that we were really suffering from having paid insufficient attention to the entire continent as well as to various regions and specific countries and specific problems and certain great promise.

And it became crystallized for me in a way in our involvement in Somalia, which I will always believe was a well-motivated and good thing to do that saved hundreds of thousands of lives but which was presented, I think, quite honestly but wrongly to the American people as something that could be done on a purely humanitarian basis, when in fact, unless human tragedy is caused by natural disaster, there is no such thing as a purely humanitarian enterprise.

And as we dealt with that and dealt with the complexities of trying to hand over power to the United Nations mission and the question of how long was long enough and what the U.N. could do and what our responsibilities were as a police force, in effect, after the Pakistani comrades in arms were killed there and dealing with all the various interpretations which could be given to those roles, it struck me again how we needed good intentions in Africa. We needed attention to Africa. But we also needed to bring the best minds in our country and around the world together to try to learn and to grow and to develop a policy that would make some sense and really had a chance to unleash the human potential of the people of the African continent in ways that would lead to a safer and more prosperous world, a better life for them and a better life for us.

I wish very much that I had had the chance to just sit here for the last couple of days and listen to all of you. I never learn anything when I'm talking. And I know I need to learn a lot. I was so jealous when the Vice President told me he actually got to come and sit in on one of the seminar sessions and to listen to your wonderful speech, madam, and we thank you for coming. But I assure you that I will follow the results of this conference very closely.

Africa matters to the United States. It has to matter to us. And the things we want to do, they sound so good, but we know they're hard to do: to have sustainable development, to have reasonable population growth, to stop the environmental decline, to stop the spread of AIDS, to preempt ethnic tensions before they explode into bloodbaths, to protect human rights, to integrate the rich and wonderful spiritual heritage of Islam with the demands of modern states and the conflicts that must be reconciled in peaceful ways. These are not just conceptual, these are practical problems, not just for Africans but also for Americans.

For decades we viewed Africa through a cold war prism and through the fight against apartheid. We often, I think, cared in past years more about how African nations voted in the United Nations than whether their own people had the right to vote. We supported leaders

on the basis of their anti-Communist or anti-apartheid rhetoric perhaps more than their actions. And often the United States, because it was a long way away and we had a lot of other problems, just simply ignored the realities of Africa.

But now the prisms through which we viewed Africa have been shattered. In the post-cold-war and post-apartheid world, our guideposts have disappeared, and it may be a very good thing if we respond in the proper way. We have a new freedom and a new responsibility to see Africa, to see it whole, to see it in specific nations and specific problems and specific promise.

It seems to me that a lot of what we would like to see occur in Africa is what we would like to have happen everywhere. We'd like to see more prosperity and more well-functioning economies and more democracy and genuine security for people in their own borders. We'd like to see sustainable development that promotes the long-term interest of our common environment on this increasingly shrinking globe.

Africa illustrates also a central security challenge of the post-cold-war era, not so much conflicts across national borders but conflicts within them which can then spill over. It's not confined to Africa as you see in Europe and the effort we have made to try to contain the conflict in Bosnia even as we worked to resolve it.

The United States is presently supporting seven peacekeeping efforts in Africa. And I have issued new guidelines to help us do this work more effectively. I've already discussed Somalia, but we've had special envoys to the Sudan and Angola. We supported the Organization of African Unity's attempts to find new ways to resolve conflicts there and elsewhere.

The daily reports from Rwanda, of course, remind us of the obstacles we face. There we have provided material, financial, and statistical support for the U.N. peacekeeping mission, more than $100 million in humanitarian relief. We've insisted that those who are committing genocide be brought to justice. And we supported the French decision to protect Rwandans at risk.

This action will end as soon as the United Nations is ready to deploy peacekeepers. And we will redouble our efforts to make sure we're providing all the support we can for that and to make sure it happens as soon as possible.

I'm not sure that we can fairly view what has happened in Rwanda as an aberration but simply as the most extreme example of tensions that can destroy generations and disrupt progress and delay democracy. It seems to me that in the face of all of the tensions that are now gripping the continent, we need a new American policy based on the idea that we should help the nations of Africa identify and solve problems before they erupt. Reacting is not enough. We must examine these underlying problems.

I know one of the underlying problems—and I've been following this on the television, your meeting—is the enormity of outstanding debt. Last year we announced a policy at the G–7 meeting of writing off 50 percent or more of the debts of selected African nations that carry the heaviest debt burdens, and we will continue that. But we are actively searching for new solutions to that problem as well.

And let me just, among others, challenge all of you here who have to work within the existing Federal guidelines—and I just named our Budget Director the new Chief of Staff, and I don't want to criticize tough budget guidelines, because they help us to get the deficit down—but one of the difficulties the United States has that a lot of our partners don't have in writing off debt is that debt, even if it is not worth very much, is required under our budget rules to be scored with a certain value. And we have to really work on that because we often find ourselves, because of the mechanics of this, in a position that can be quite counterproductive.

This is a problem not just in Africa but elsewhere as well. We are actively searching for new solutions to this problem. And I believe that we have to do something about it. Even though we know lightening the debt load won't solve all the problems, we can't solve a lot of the other problems unless we do it.

The long-term goal has to be sustainable development. And the statistics are pretty grim. Look at what is happening to natural resources, to population, to the gap between rich and poor. Look at what has happened to per capita income in so many countries in the decade of the 1980's.

Africans have a daunting set of challenges before them. And yet we know that they can't do what people are always urging me to do: Just pick out one thing and do it; forget about

all the rest. [*Laughter*] Right? You heard that before, here? The problem is, it gives you something to say you did, but it may not solve the problem. I was very impressed by the writings of Professor Homer Dixon, who argued that all of these fronts must be moved on at once. There is no silver bullet; there is no magic cure. It would be nice if we could just work on one or two issues, but unfortunately it's not possible.

When the representatives from 170 nations meet in Cairo at the population conference in September, they will approve a plan of action that attacks this problem at its heart, one which will eventually bolster families, improve the social and economic status of women, and provide the kinds of family planning and health services that sustainable development requires. The United States is a proud partner in embracing this strategy, which will eventually raise living standards and enable us to raise children better throughout the globe. I hope all of you will be supportive of that endeavor.

As Africans turn away from the failed experiments of the past, they're also embracing new political freedoms. Yes, I know there are too many nations in Africa where tyranny still drowns out opposition in human rights. But as we meet today, more than a dozen African nations are preparing for elections. Opposition voices grow louder. Someday they'll be like me and they'll wish it weren't happening. [*Laughter*] But it's a good sign. And the lights of freedom shine brighter. It's all part of it, right?

I think South Africa has given a great cause for hope not only on the African Continent but throughout the world. President Mandela spoke to you, I know, by videotape, and I thank him for that. I thank Reverend Jackson and others who worked so hard to make those elections work well there. And I think the $35 million we spent there last year in trying to prepare for and help make sure the elections came off all right was about the best expenditure of a modest amount of tax dollars that I have seen in many a year.

But now the hard work begins. Governor Cuomo of New York used to have a wonderful phrase that he quoted all the time. He says, "You know, we campaign in poetry, but alas, we must govern in prose." [*Laughter*] And Nelson Mandela's long travail in prison, for the rest of us who did not have to suffer personally, was an exercise in agonizingly beautiful poetry. But now that those decades of struggle have come to fruition, they must govern in prose, and we must find prosaic, practical, meaningful ways of helping them.

We have launched a 3-year, $600 million trade, investment, and development program, which is a beginning of that but must not be the end. And we have to do a number of other things as well. I want to ask all of you who are Americans at least when you leave here to help us to develop an American constituency for Africa that creates lasting links between our people and their peoples and that will help to drive not only the continent ahead but will help to drive a meaningful, sustained agenda here at home.

We can do this. And maybe the most important thing I can do to work with you in the aftermath of this conference is to do whatever the President can do to develop that constituency, to explain to the American people of whatever race, region, or background, why Africa matters to all of us and to our common future. But all Members here of the Congress who have participated in this, including many who have tried to have more attention drawn to Africa for years and years and years, know that that is the first thing we must do in our democracy.

Let me just say one or two other things. I think it's important as we kind of wrap this up to remember that with all the problems and all the terrible things that are happening and all the economic backsliding which has occurred, there is a lot of hope in Africa, even though, for example, there are problems in Sudan, where division delays development; there is Senegal; there is Mali; there is Namibia; there is Botswana. For every Rwanda, there is Benin, Malawi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, where people are trying to draw together as a society. In spite of our continuing frustrations with Angola, we look at Mozambique reaching out for national reconciliation, looking forward to new elections.

I say this because one of the problems I always find in trying to discuss this with people who are not otherwise engaged is that they read about all these terrible problems, and they think, "Look, we've got all we can say grace over and then some. We're trying to get you to do less, and here you try to get me to think about this." This is a conversation I have now, you know, in the White House and around in town here.

And I think it is very important, as Americans have to choose whether to engage in the future of Africa, that all the things that are happening

which are good and positive be known, because we can never develop a constituency for change in this country until people imagine that it will make a difference. And the level of knowledge, frankly, is pretty low, except when something really horrible happens; then it just cuts through our heart, and it seems so overwhelming that we can't do anything about it. And so that also gives you an excuse to walk away. You get the best of all worlds, "I really care about this, but lamentably there's nothing I can do."

And so I say to all of you, I will do what I can. I will never know as much as those of you who have committed your professional lives to the development of Africa, those of you who have friends and family members there, those of you who have ties of passion and history there. But I do know we need a new policy. I do know we need a policy. I do believe Africa matters to America. I do know there are a lot of good people there leading and making good things happen. I do know there are a lot of visionaries there. And I do know my child and my grandchildren's future depends upon reconstructing the environmental and social fabric of that continent. I know that.

And so I say to you, let's build a constituency. Let's remind people there are things to hope about as well as things to fear. And let's go to work and make this the beginning, just the beginning, of a new American commitment to a better future for all our peoples.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Wangari Muta Maathai, founder of Kenya's Green Belt Movement; President Nelson Mandela of South Africa; and Rev. Jesse Jackson, head of the U.S. delegation to observe the South African elections. The related memorandum on assistance for South Africa is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message on the Observance of Independence Day, 1994

June 27, 1994

As we celebrate July 4, a momentous and magnificent day in our nation's history, we give thanks for the liberties that our courageous Founders struggled to secure. Declaring the American colonies independent and free, these brave patriots risked everything they held dear to ensure a better future for their children and grandchildren. Today, we fiercely defend the once radical notion that each individual possesses rights that our government is obliged to respect and to guarantee. The powerful ideals for which the Founders fought have become standards of citizenship around the world.

Our country's Founders gave of themselves to create a better future. As heirs to their legacy, we can do no less. If we are truly to pay tribute to them, we must rededicate ourselves to using our precious freedoms with renewed responsibility. We must work together to rebuild our neighborhoods and bring healing to our torn families and communities. We must strive to end the violence that plagues our society and to give our children the chance to grow up in safe and supportive environments. On our nation's birthday, let us rededicate ourselves to making those choices in the same way Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots did so many years ago—with a hopeful eye toward the future.

Best wishes to all for a wonderful holiday.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in New York City

June 27, 1994

Thank you very much. Boy, he was hot tonight, wasn't he? [*Laughter*] I think he's great. Thank you, Chairman Wilhelm, for your outstanding leadership and for your extraordinary

work on behalf of our candidates around the country. And thank you, Senator Bradley, for being here with us tonight and for your work on this event and for your steadfast effort to get a health care bill out of the Senate Finance Committee that actually protects the American people's health care. Thank you, Senator Lautenberg, for your friendship, your support, and your leadership. And I want to ask all of you here to help him be reelected to the Senate in New Jersey this year. We need him back there.

In addition to all the dignitaries from New York, I understand that we have two Democratic congressional candidates from New Jersey, and maybe you could raise your hands. They're up front—Frank Herbert. Here you are, Frank. Shine a light on that man; he's running for office. [*Laughter*] And Lou Magazzu, are you here? There you are, Lou, it's good to see you.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I was nominated for President by Governor Cuomo, I thought he gave one of the best speeches I ever heard. And about halfway through it, I looked at Hillary and I said, "Who's he talking about anyway?" [*Laughter*] By the time he got through that speech, I felt like a real President. [*Laughter*] And tonight I am also in his debt for his wonderful words, for his profound way of telling the truth, for his leadership in New York, and for his love for New York.

People ask me sometimes—kind of cynics, who don't know what it's like to really love where you're from—how Mario Cuomo could be doing this again. And I said, I may be the only person in America that understands this, but if I hadn't been just absolutely obsessed with the direction the country was taking in 1992 and convinced it was wrong, I'd still be Governor of my State. It's the best job in the world if you're lucky enough to be in a place where you love. And he loves this State. He loves you, and you ought to keep him doing what he's doing.

I also want to say, I'm glad to see all the musicians here with all their talent. I hope I get to hear a little music before I have to go tonight. But there's really nothing for me to say; Mario said it all. [*Laughter*] Ditto, I could say.

Let me say the stakes this year are very high because they will determine the extent to which and the shape of our continued forward progress. When I was elected President, we'd had 12 years of exploding deficits. And I knew we had to bring the deficit down, we had to bring interest rates down, we had to get investment up in our people, we had to put the American people first again. And we came up with a plan, with the help of a lot of people from New York, including my National Economic Adviser, Bob Rubin, that would do those things.

And when I say—well, maybe it sounds good but it's not human sometimes to say, we had the biggest deficit reduction in history; we're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States; we've had two budgets passed on time for the first time in 17 years; last year we had the first year without a Presidential veto in 60 years. And you say, well, what does all that mean? I'll tell you what it means: 3.4 million of your fellow Americans have jobs that they didn't have. That's what it means.

Sixteen million American taxpayers with children, who work for a living, are going to get an income tax cut out of our economic plan, so they'll be encouraged to stay working and not go on welfare—16 million of them. Twenty million students are eligible, 20 million students are eligible for low-interest-rate loans and better repayment terms under the student loan program because we changed that, so no one will ever have an excuse that "The cost is too much, and I can't go to college" again. Ninety percent of the small businesses in this country, under that economic program, were eligible for a tax cut. All they had to do was invest more money in their business, hire more people, and make this economy grow. Five and a half million Americans refinanced their homes because the interest rates went down. And the automobile industry is now booming. I just came back from St. Louis; in the previous 4 years they lost 2,000 jobs. In the first year of our administration, they gained 28,000 as automobiles in America came back. That's what it means. It's a human deal.

How many million people, we'll never know, under the Family and Medical Leave Act, are now able to take a little time off when their baby's born or when their parents are sick? We'll never know. We know that thousands of lives will be saved because of the Brady bill. We know that; we have evidence of that. We know that because of that assault weapons ban, police will be able to go out on the street with a little more confidence that they won't be

outgunned by the people they're supposed to protect the rest of us from. We know that. These are real things that affect the real lives of real people.

Is it easy? No. It's not easy to break habits of gridlock that, frankly, are the province not just of the other party, which says no a lot of the time, but of the cumbersome procedures which grip Washington. But we've been working on it. The world trade agreement, GATT, hung around for 7 years. We're going to ratify it this year. The family leave law hung around for 7 years and got vetoed twice. It's now the law. The Brady bill took 7 years, but it passed. The assault weapons ban—to give you an idea of how difficult change is, we had for the assault weapons ban, all the living former Presidents, every police organization in the United States of America, and this President working as hard as he could, and we beat the NRA by two votes. It is not easy to change.

But we're doing it. We're breaking gridlock. We're making changes. It's affecting people's lives in ways that are profound and important. And a lot of it involves not just the Government doing something for somebody but empowering people to do something for themselves. That's what a better student loan program is. That's what our national service program is.

Governor Cuomo's son, Andrew, now a leader and Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has been a leader in empowering people, starting with the homeless to the people in public housing, to live safe, constructive lives. We're trying to change the rules. No more Government handouts but Government handups, real partnerships, real community building, really trying to help people take control of their own lives.

These things matter to real people. And the American people are beginning to sense this. And the more they sense it, the more we'll be able to cut through the fog and let the clear sky show and the more we'll be able to run on what we have done for the American people to help them help themselves. It's going to make a real difference in the life of this country.

Oh, there are all kinds of problems. Americans have a well-known cynicism for Government. My senior Senator back home used to say that half the American people are convinced the Government would mess up a one-car parade. [*Laughter*] And that's true. But you know something? We do some things pretty well.

The Republicans talked about bringing down the deficit. We did it. They talked about generating economic growth. We contributed to that. They talked about having less Government. You know, they always complained about that. But when our budgets are implemented, we will reduce over 5 years the National Government by a quarter of a million people, not by firing people but by attrition. We'll use all the savings to pay for that crime bill to put another 100,000 police officers on the streets of New York and the other cities of this country.

We'll have the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President. It'll be producing more work, and the American people will be safer on their streets. That is the kind of thing that we ought to do. We can make Government work for ordinary people in ways that make sense and change lives.

But let me say, everything I have tried to do to empower people to get the economy going, to make Government work for ordinary people again, all of those things are embodied in this struggle to provide health care to all Americans. And it isn't easy. People have been trying to do it for 60 years. Roosevelt wanted to do it; Truman wanted to do it. President Nixon—President Nixon proposed requiring employers and employees to buy health insurance. President Carter tried to do it. I believe we can get it done.

And so we worked. We have worked for months and months and months. We worked for 9 months and involved thousands and thousands of people to put together a proposal. And then I said, okay, here's my proposal; where's yours? It won't be right for everybody. Surely, there's some things that can be improved about it. I went out and listened to the American people. They said, do a little more for small business and make sure you're going to protect small business, and make it a little less regulatory. And trust the American people to take more voluntary actions at work, but make sure you cover everybody. So we made some changes, and we did that.

And there are now bills on the floor of the House and the Senate for the first time ever in the whole history of the Republic that would cover all Americans with health care. There never even was a bill on the floor of the Congress before, ever. And it's there.

But the forces of opposition are very strong. We were talking at dinner how the great Italian

political theorist, Machiavelli, said 500 years ago there was nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things. Why? Because the people that lose know it, and they fight you like crazy. And the people that are going to win are never quite sure you can deliver the goods. And so they're often not there in the trenches.

Today we had over 100 distinguished doctors and medical personnel from all over America, including many from New York City, representing the academic health centers of America. And a brilliant doctor stood up and said, you know, people say they wish to protect what's best about American health care and fix what's wrong, but they're afraid they will mess it up if they try to fix it. He said you can no longer protect what's best unless you fix what's wrong. Unless we finally join the ranks of all other advanced countries and provide health care to everybody, we're not going to be able to afford to keep our finest medical centers going, training the finest doctors and nurses and medical professionals. He said they run ads against the President's program, saying that if you cover everybody you will ration health care. Tell that to the 39 million Americans that don't have any health care. They are rationed.

I say that to make this point. We can pass health care reform this year, but it's going to require everything that all these other things did: breaking gridlock, defeating special interests, arguing for a future, and asking people to work toward that future and making Government work for ordinary people, not to give them anything but to permit them to access a system that will enable people to take care of themselves and their families.

I spend a lot of time talking to laboring groups of people, saying, I'm trying to make change your friend and not your enemy; support my trade policies. Yes, it'll change the economy more and you'll have to change jobs more often, but we'll be more prosperous and we'll provide lifetime training policies for you. And here are all these things I'm trying to do to change our education and training policies to make change your friend.

But I just want to tell you folks, I met two kids today when I came to New York. Whenever I go to a city, I try to let the Make-A-Wish Foundation or some other group bring some children to see me who are sick and who have health problems. And one of these children had a condition that may be fatal, but it's been in remission for a couple years—12-year-old boy, just graduated at the top of his class in elementary school here in New York City. He may have a good, long, healthy life, but I'm telling you, if his parents lost their jobs, what would he do for health care? And if they tried to get another job, could they get health coverage for a child like that? I met a 17-year-old boy—Mayor Dinkins, you can be proud of this—who was wheelchair-bound, has been all his life, has a severe muscular disorder from childhood—very bright young man, computer expert, wanted to write me on the White House E-mail, and I told him I was too dumb to use it, but I'd read it if he sent it. [*Laughter*] And he gave me a letter he prepared about obstacles for handicapped children and what his life was going to be like. And he said, "You know, this wheelchair of mine cost," I think he said, "$15,000." And he said his parents were immigrants, both of them were immigrants. And he said, "Because my mother works for the city of New York, our family has been able to maintain a middle class lifestyle because our health policy pays for 80 percent of my bills. But it's been hard even for us. I had expensive surgery. I have this expensive wheelchair; I'll have to replace it soon." But he said, "So many of my young friends are almost destitute who are physically handicapped because of the conditions that exist."

And if we were getting a good deal, the rest of us, that would be fine, but your country's spending 40 percent more on health care than any other country in the world. And it is only because we have refused to discipline ourselves to provide health care to everybody, like all our competitors do, that these stories are out there. We can do better. But we have to believe. We have to fight those who say we cannot do it. We can turn this economy around. If we can bring this deficit down, when nobody thought we could do it, if we can break gridlock, we can do this too.

I just ask you to look at these people on this stage and remember this, this is the only thing that really counts: I ran for this job because I wanted to do what I could with the power vested by the framers of our Constitution in the Presidency to change the lives of ordinary Americans for the better. There is no other purpose. And anything, anything that diverts, divides, distracts, or destroys the spirit and the

purpose of the American people, when we have so much on our plate here at home and around the world, is not good. And anything that unifies and makes us believe in ourselves and makes us better and gives our children a chance to have a better future is good. That is what we represent. That is why your contributions are well invested tonight. That is why I ask for your help to do everything you can to help us pass health care this year, help us keep reform going, and help the voters reward the forces of change and progress and humanity and unity in the elections this fall.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:37 p.m. in the Imperial Ballroom at the Sheraton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to David Wilhelm, chairman, Democratic National Committee, and Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Eduardo Frei of Chile

June 28, 1994

President Clinton. I would like to begin by welcoming President Frei here. He leads a nation which has made a remarkable transformation to democracy with tremendous economic growth and support for market economics. And we are very much interested in broadening and deepening our economic relationship with Chile.

I also want to congratulate him on the speech he gave recently in the Ibero-American summit in Cartagena, which was a ringing endorsement of democracy, the rule of law, and human rights.

I think that during the course of his term as President of Chile, the United States will be able to work very constructively with Chile, and I believe his leadership throughout our hemisphere will be very significant. And I look forward specifically to discussing with him today what we can do to make the most of the Summit of the Americas that will be held in Miami in December.

Haiti

Q. Will you be talking about Haiti? And Mr. President——

President Clinton. Yes, we will.

Q. ——is there a big increase now in the Haitian refugees, and will you open up Guantanamo Bay?

President Clinton. Yes, we will discuss Haiti. And we are discussing what our response should be. There has been a significant increase in Haitian refugees, I think as a result of political repression in Haiti, perhaps intensified anxiety over the tougher sanctions. And we're going to examine what our options are there.

We do have, as you know, another processing center coming on-line, but we have not gotten it up and going yet. And as I have said all along, we have to calibrate our response based on our capacity to deal with this.

I would also note that the safest and best thing for the Haitians to do is to apply at the in-country processing center. The rate of approval there has gone up as well. And that is the safest and best route to the United States, and I would hope that more Haitians would use it.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Chile

Q. President Clinton, please, why did you invite President Frei to the White House?

President Clinton. Well, I invited him here because of the enormous importance I attach to the relationship between the United States and Chile, because of the remarkable success that his nation has had in moving to democracy and maintaining an enormously impressive rate of economic growth, because there are many issues that we need to consult on and work together on, the upcoming Summit of the Americas in December, and Haiti, just to mention two, as well as our bilateral economic relationships, which are very important. So I wanted to see him, and I'm honored that he was able to make time to come up here and have this meeting.

Q. Mr. President, what is the position of your administration vis-a-vis the U.S. trade agreement with Chile as opposed to entering through NAFTA? Would you favor Chile entering through NAFTA or through a free trade agreement which is bilateral?

President Clinton. I don't really have an opinion on that at this time. I want to discuss it with the President, and I want our advisers to be able to discuss it and just determine the best way.

The most important thing for me now is to get the Congress to approve the fast-track negotiations with Chile so that we can accelerate this economic partnership whichever way we decide to go. That's very important to me to know that the Congress will support that, because I have said all along that I thought we ought to move next with this free trade agreement to Chile, and that that could be a model for all of South America.

So my emphasis now has been getting the Congress to support this. I think they will. The President's met with Members of our Congress in both parties. And in terms of which is the best way, I want to hear his view on that, and then I want to let our people talk it through, because I just want the objective to be achieved. I don't have an opinion about which is the best way to get there.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Senators Jim Sasser and Paul Sarbanes

June 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Senator Graham and Paul and Christine and Jim and Mary. I'm delighted to be here tonight in your behalf with a lot of old friends. I thank all the Members of the Senate for coming.

Senator Graham really is sorry that Paul and Jim didn't bring their charts. When he was Governor of Florida, he spent 80 percent of his time, when he wasn't out doing those work days on television, with charts, showing the people of Florida why they should change whatever it was they were doing at the time. [*Laughter*] And I love charts, too. I was made an honorary member of the Senate's "Wonk Caucus," chaired by Sarbanes and Sasser. Together we put more people to sleep than all the pills designed for that purpose in the history of the country. [*Laughter*]

I want to say seriously, I appreciate what Bob Graham said. You know, I served with I think 150, roughly 150 Governors. Unlike him, I never could get a promotion until this job came along. [*Laughter*] So I kept just struggling to hold on to my job. And I was a Governor for 12 years, over a 14-year period. And I served, literally, with 150 Governors. And if you asked me to go in a private room and write down the five best Governors I served with out of 150, Bob Graham would be on that list. And I say that because he had a quality as Governor which I have seen Paul and Jim bring to their work in the Senate, and of course Bob, and that is that he had this crazy idea when he got elected—really a rather radical idea in today's politics—that his job was to accomplish something, not to position himself, not to blame his opponents, not to divide his State but to actually do something, that he got hired to show up for work every day with an agenda which would be implemented which would change the lives of the people for the better.

Now, you may think that it's self-evident, but the longer I stay here the more I wonder whether that is the real purpose of politics for many people. Senator Mitchell has labored in the Senate, oftentimes to try to put together a majority of votes, when the real issue is, is the purpose here to get something done, or is the purpose to just sort of talk about it, position it, use a lot of rhetoric and spray a lot of blame?

It's interesting because I think, in a State when people get a feel for who you are and what you stand for, they will stick with you through tough times and sometimes unpopular decisions if they know that you hired on to

do what you honestly think is right and you're working as hard as you can to do it.

I am really elated at the prospect of Paul Sarbanes becoming the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee. And I frankly can't imagine what my life would be like if Jim Sasser were not the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. He sort of took all my good lines, but it is true, you know, that the other party spent years and years and years telling us how terrible the Government was and how terrible Government spending was and how terrible the deficits were. And they were able to get away with it, even though the evidence was that in every single year the Congress, whatever you think of its faults, always actually spent a little less money than Republican Presidents asked them to spend. So the thing was out of hand.

Now finally, we got a little partnership. We got in harness. We got two budgets passed on time, the budget resolutions, for the first time in 17 years. We're going to have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States, and they're scurrying around to say, "Well, they must have done it in the wrong way, and it doesn't count."

Well, one of the things I want to say to you today is that when you get in a tight and you have difficult decisions to make, whether it is in public life, business life, or personal life, there is often no painless alternative. Every one of us knows some experience we had as a human being, growing up as a child, in our early adulthood, struggling to help our family, something where we knew we had to make a decision that would determine whether we would go forward, whether we would continue to grow as people, whether we'd be able to be faithful to our commitments and our values. And we looked around, oftentimes for a long time, for the easy way to get that done. But there just was no easy way. And if you take the difficult way, it turns out to be better than walking away and living with the consequence of that. Now, that's what Jim Sasser has done in the Senate. That's what Paul Sarbanes has done in the Senate. That's what we are trying to do in this administration.

I could have written the ads in my head I'm seeing played in all these races about our terrible budget plan and what a terrible tax increase it was. Well, the fact is it raised income taxes on 1.2 percent of the American people, including most of the people in this room—[*laughter*]—which says a lot about your devotion to your country. It says a lot about your devotion to this country. It lowered income taxes on one-sixth of our taxpayers, about 16 million of them, with about 50 million Americans all over—around 20 percent of our total population and their families, working people with families.

It made 90 percent of the small businesses in this country eligible for a tax cut. A lot of those folks are active members of the NFIB, and they may be involved in the Republican Party. And the Democrats gave them a chance to get a tax cut if they reinvested more money in their business. Most of them may not know it, but it's true. It happened. And it happened because of that economic plan.

That economic plan gave 20 million college students the chance to borrow money at lower interest rates with better repayment terms, so they could continue their education. It brought interest rates down. It got investment going. It started this economy up again. We've now had 3.4 million new jobs since January, 3.1 million private sector jobs, more than 3 times as many private sector jobs as were created in the previous 4 years.

Now, I still believe that the purpose of public life is to move our collective ball forward, to advance the interest of our people, to do things that will bring us together and to move us forward. And our system will not work unless there are people in the Congress of the United States willing to make the tough decisions even when it is difficult, at least in the short run, willing to believe that they can still convince their constituents in the old-fashioned way, not withstanding the blizzard of 30-second ads, not withstanding the palaver content of our public discourse, still willing to believe that they can go home and lay it on the line and talk to their folks in the country crossroads, in the small civic clubs, in the union halls, on the factory floors, in the sale barns, and make the sale.

And I cannot begin to tell you how much my respect for and appreciation for the Members of the Congress that are willing to take these kinds of risks and make these kinds of decisions because they know we cannot grow as a country at a time of profound change, just like a person can't grow, without making tough decisions—my respect has grown immeasurably. And Jim and Paul, they don't go around saying, "Look at me; I'm a brave soul." They just sort

of show up for work every day. And they do right by America.

The other party, they talk all the time about how tough they are on crime. And the crime bill won't be like the budget where we got zero votes from the other side. We're going to get some Republican votes. And we've always had some. But that bill languished in gridlock for over 5 years, and now we're on the verge of passing it. And it's profoundly important. We just decided to put aside gridlock and get after it.

This bill does something that I don't think a lot of Americans have focused on. Since 1965 the violent crime rate's increased sevenfold. Now the crime rate is kind of tapering off, but the irrational rate of crime among younger Americans, unfortunately, is still going up. But the crime rate has gone up 7 times, the violent crime rate, sevenfold since 1965. In 1965, America had 500,000 police officers. In 1994, America has 550,000 police officers. So we spent a fortune expanding our courts, a double fortune expanding our prisons, when if we had spent some money expanding our police forces, we not only would catch more criminals, we would prevent more crimes by having police presence out there in the neighborhoods, knowing the kids, knowing the neighbors, understanding what can be done. This Congress, with the leadership of these people, is going to put 100,000 more police officers on the streets. It's very important.

I could go through issue after issue after issue, but if you look at the things that will shape the future for the children of this country, whether it's immunizing millions of more kids, putting tens of thousands more children in Head Start, securing the kind of future that our children need, these two men have been there.

Now, let's face facts. In addition to the extraordinary nature of the public debate today, which so often is completely disconnected with what is actually being done and what will affect the lives of our people, we know that historically, in the 20th century, there's only been one election in which the sitting President's party actually picked up seats in both Houses of the Congress at midterm. Why is that? That's partly because of what Governor Cuomo says, "We always campaign in poetry, but we have to govern in prose." So at midterm people say, "Well, the novel wasn't quite as good as the song was." [*Laughter*] "The movie was better than the book." The hard work sometimes takes some time not only to bear fruit but to be felt.

But I say to you that this year, given the nature of our national politics, that would be a mistake. The people say they want change. We're giving it to them. We had an historic first year last year. Since World War II, our first year was the most productive in partnership between the President and Congress of any except President Eisenhower's and President Johnson's first years, the first year in 60 years when there was no Presidential veto; breaking gridlock—7 years for family leave, 7 years for the Brady bill, 5 years on the crime bill, 7 years on the worldwide trade agreement. No one thought we could get the assault weapons ban passed in the House, even after the Senate passed it.

This thing is rocking along. But we have got to keep people in the Congress who have this old-fashioned notion that the founders were right, that this is not a place where people just position themselves and throw blame grenades across the ramparts of their opponent's defenses. It is a place where people are supposed to show up for work every day and do things which will affect the lives of their constituents. That is really what is at issue.

And I implore all of you—I thank you for giving this money. And I agree with what Jim said about roots: Everybody has got to have them. And they'll need the money for the defense, to rebut some of the grenades. But I ask you to think more deeply about what this election means for the continuation of progress in this country.

We're doing our best to face the health care issue. Why? We had 100 health care professionals in yesterday to the White House from the academic medical centers. We had people from Washington State; we had people from Senator Exon's State of Nebraska; we had people from all over the country. And their spokesperson read an agreed-upon statement calling for health care coverage for all Americans. He said a very profound thing. He said, "Everybody wants to keep what's best about American medicine and fix what's wrong about our health care system. And that's a good thing." He said, "What I don't think people have focused on is we're getting to the point where you can't keep what's best unless you do fix what's wrong."

And he went on to describe the inordinate pressures our great medical schools are facing, keeping their patients and paying for their care and having enough money to train doctors and continue to make progress, because medical schools used to be able to pass along the cost of operation to people who would pay it. If they took poor patients, the Government didn't reimburse them at the full cost, but they got a little extra program from the Government, and they passed the rest of it along to wealthy businesses who had well-insured people coming there. And if people showed up without any insurance, well, they'd do the same thing.

But now all the businesses are becoming much more competitive; they have to lower the cost of health care, so they're not there. And the doctor went on to say, "They say if we give coverage to everybody, well, we'll be rationing health care." He said, "We're rationing health care today. We decided 39 million can't have it. Everybody else figured out how to solve this problem; all these other nations have. But we ration that."

Now, the point I want to make is not to give another speech for my health care program, the point I want to make is this: This is one of those kind of growing pain issues. If there were a simple, easy answer, somebody would have done this before. And I would never have been elected President. The American people took a chance on me because I said I wanted to move beyond the dogmas, the partisan fights, to grow the economy, to break gridlock, to make Government work for ordinary people. This is one of those growing pain issues. We either will decide to do something that is a little difficult today to give ourselves a much better future tomorrow, or we will not.

The chances of America meeting not only this challenge but all the challenges—I'm telling you, for the next 10 or 20 years there are going to be a lot of very tough questions facing this country. The chances of our meeting those challenges in the proper way depend as much as anything else on the ability of the people to sort through the high-temperature rhetoric to the true reality of the spirit, the soul, the mind, and the courage and the real character of their candidates. It depends, in other words, on whether we will have the capacity to reward people like Jim Sasser and Paul Sarbanes for serving well and bravely. I hope we will, and I believe we will.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. in the Crystal Ballroom at the Sheraton Carlton. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Sasser, wife of Senator Sasser, and Christine Sarbanes, wife of Senator Sarbanes.

Remarks to the National Academy of Sciences

June 29, 1994

Thank you. Now, the next time someone asks me—some irate, self-proclaimed expert in these matters asks me, "Why in the wide world did you ever appoint Tim Wirth at the State Department?" I'll say, "Well, I had to get Ted Turner up off the floor." [*Laughter*] "Didn't have much to do with public policy; couldn't stand to see a man with all that energy prone for the rest of his life. Seemed like an incalculable waste of human potential." [*Laughter*]

Thank you. Thank you, Ted, and thank you, Jane. When I was down in Atlanta the other day to do the global press conference—which is one of the most exciting experiences I have had as the President or, indeed, in my entire public life, and I loved meeting all the journalists from around the world and trying to answer their questions and communicating with them—when it was over, I got a handwritten note from Jane Fonda that said, "Well, you did a pretty good job on that, but don't forget about population." [*Laughter*] It was more formal, more polite, but that is the distilled essence of the letter that I got. So for both of them, I thank them for being here, although I do believe being on a stream in Montana is a way of supporting sustainable development that all of us could appreciate.

I want to thank, also, Dr. Bruce Alberts and the staff at the National Academy of Sciences;

the Shorenstein Barone Center of the Kennedy School, and the Pew Global Stewardship Initiative for this event. And I do want to say a special word of thanks to Tim Wirth. All of you who care passionately about this issue know how well he has done, what a great advocate he has been for bringing the world's attention to the kinds of challenges that will command all of us for decades to come. It's not always easy, and it's now almost become trite to say that anyone who wants to truly change things has to be willing to be misunderstood. And sometimes I think Tim is competing with me for first in line on that subject. [*Laughter*] But the country is in your debt, sir, and we thank you very much.

I've been trying to prepare to go to the G–7 meeting in Naples. And I've been working on this organization for the last, well, year and a half—as long as I've been in office—to try to first get them to focus on global growth in the short run, about what we can do within our nations and together, and then to think about what the world will look like in the next century and what we must do. And I must tell you, I am of two minds. I am so happy and proud to be going there, basically to say that what we agreed to do is working; in the near term, it is clearly working.

The United States has 40 percent of the gross domestic product of the G–7. But in the last year, we've had 75 percent of the growth, almost 100 percent of the jobs, twice the investment rate, twice the export increase rate, the highest rate of productivity growth. We've got the second lowest deficit; next year we'll have the lowest deficit of all of the G–7 countries. These things are heartening to me. And as a group, our economy is in the best shape it's been in in 4 years. There is a sense that we're working together and that our Nation is fortunate enough to lead the way.

But when you look at the longrun trends that are going on around the world—you read articles like Robert Kaplan's article in the Atlantic a couple of months ago that some say it's too dour—still, if you really look at what is going on, you could visualize a world in which a few million of us live in such opulence we could all be starring on nighttime soaps and the rest of us look like we're in one of those Mel Gibson "Road Warrior" movies.

And I was so gripped by many things that were in that article and by the more academic treatment of the same subject by Professor Homer Dixon. And I keep trying to imagine what it's going to be like to bring children into this world in this country or that one or the other. That is really what we are forced to come to grips with. And when I think about it, my mind starts bursting in those ways that some people say are undisciplined, but I think are productive. [*Laughter*]

If you look at the landscape of the future and you say, we have to strengthen the families of the globe; we have to encourage equitable and strong growth; we have to provide basic health care; we have to stop AIDS from spreading; we have to develop water supplies and improve agricultural yields and stem the flow of refugees and protect the environment, and on and on and on, it gives you a headache. And of course, on that list, you have to say, if you look at the numbers, you must reduce the rate of population growth.

Tim was talking about Haiti. My daughter and I once were talking about Haiti a few months ago, and I was telling her about how her mother and I had gone to Haiti once many years ago, shortly after we married, and what sadness and hope I had seen there at the same time, and what had happened since then. And she said to me, "I know all that, Dad, because I've seen aerial photographs from in space. And if you look at the island, you can see where the Dominican Republic ends and where Haiti begins. And there couldn't be that environmental destruction without all those other problems you talked about." It was a stunning thing from the perspective of an American schoolchild that sort of wraps all this up.

I say that to make this point: We have to be disciplined in saying, "Well, all right, how much time and how much money and how much energy have we got?" And we have to order our priorities. But we cannot be naive enough to think that it is so easy to isolate one of these issues as opposed to another, that there is some silver bullet that solves the future of the world.

If you look at the rate at which natural resources are disappearing and you look at the rate at which the gap between rich and poor is growing, if you look at the fact that the world's population has doubled since only 74 nations met in Rome 40 years ago, it is clear that we need a comprehensive approach to the world's future. We call it under the buzzword

of "sustainable development," I guess, but there is no way that we can approach tomorrow unless we at least are mindful of our common responsibilities in all these areas.

During the 9 days of the upcoming Cairo conference, more than 2 million people will enter our world. More than 2 million new babies will be born into a world in which one-third of our children are already hungry, 2 of every 5 people on Earth lack basic sanitation, and large parts of the world exist with only one doctor for every 35,000 or 40,000 people. Reversing these policies will require innovation and commitment and a determination to do what can be done over a long period of time, while all of us around the world are busy with our own business within our borders. It will require us to be willing to think anew about the relationship of human development to what is going on in all of these nations, to cast aside a lot of our ideas in the past when it was always tempting to believe that there was one single thing we could do, some silver bullet, that would make everything all right.

To bring about shared prosperity, as Professor Homer Dixon has written, the nations of the world simply must move forward on many fronts at one time. Reducing population growth without providing economic opportunity won't work. Without education, it's hard to imagine how basic health care will ever take hold. Ignored, these challenges will continue to divide people from one another. We simply have to solve these problems together, both the problems together and together as the people of the world.

I'm really proud of the fact that the G–7 has agreed to address some of these issues in a serious way this week in Naples. We're going to talk about what we can do within the G–7 to promote not just growth but more jobs, because a lot of the wealthy countries are finding they can't create jobs even when they grow their economy. And then, when they can't do that, they lose the constituency at home to engage the rest of the world.

We're going to talk about how we build an economic infrastructure for the 21st century. What's this new world trade organization that we create with GATT going to look like? And what should the World Bank and the IMF do? We're also going to talk about how we can help economies in transition, like the states of the former Soviet Union, and what we can do with the economies that are not in transition or, if anything, are going the wrong way, to address our common responsibilities.

This is quite a unique thing, really, for the world's advanced nations. And I'm quite pleased that, with all the economic problems that exist in many of these countries, they are willing to have a serious look at where we should be 10 or 20 years from now, far beyond the election prospects of all the world leaders who will be there.

As we head for the Cairo conference, I think that same approach has to guide us. The policies we promote must be based on enduring values, promoting stronger families, having more responsibility from individual citizens, respecting human rights, deepening the bonds of community. Here at home and around the globe, that's where the future lies, beginning with our families. When they're whole and they function, families nurture and care for us. They provide role models. They communicate values and enable people to live together in peace and to work together for common objectives. Therefore, that is the most important thing we can do.

Since the beginning of this administration, we have worked to promote policies that would permit families to grow in strength at home and abroad. I reversed the so-called Mexico City policy because I thought that doctors and medical workers around the world should be able to really work on family planning and provide a full range of family planning information.

Since then, we have increased by about 50 percent, at a very tough budget time, the Agency for International Development's budget for international family planning and support services. To bolster families here at home, we passed a big increase in the earned-income tax credit to help keep 15 million working families off welfare, out of poverty, and in the work force. We increased Head Start availability and nutrition programs to hundreds of thousands of children, cracked down on delinquent child support payments, increased immunization funds so that we can increase by literally more than a million the number of children who are immunized. We're working to reduce out-of-wedlock and teen births.

Through the Family and Medical Leave Act, we're working to make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents, a big issue everywhere in the world now, where more and more parents must work. In any society which forces people to choose, we are

doomed to failure. If people have no option to work and we all need people to continue to bear children, surely all of our parents must be successful workers, and our workers must be able to succeed as parents.

Our population policy is rooted in the idea that the family should be at the center of all of our objectives. Therefore, there must be a support for the concept of responsibility of parents to their children, of men and women to one another, and of our current generation to future generations.

Progress brings freedom; freedom requires more disciplined responsibility. And we must teach our young people to choose wisely and tell them that their choices must include abstinence. Our policy has always been rooted in the ethical principles of compassion and justice and respect for human rights. We have supported every individual's dignity and worth. And we will continue to oppose and to condemn all forms of coercion in family planning.

Helping to translate these principles into reality is the charge that the Vice President will take to Cairo in September. No one is better suited to this task than he is. He has shown his commitment to these long-term challenges, and he has been thinking in large ways about them long before they were politically popular or even the source of much current discussion.

In Cairo, we'll join the international community in pursuing a new plan of action to attack the population problem as part of the larger issue of sustainable development. At the top of our agenda will be active support for efforts to invest in the women of the world. Maybe over the long run, maybe the most important thing the Cairo policy will call for is that every nation make an effort to educate its children on an equal basis, to put an end to the widespread practice of withdrawing girls from school and forcing them to go to work before boys do. To ensure that nations can develop at a more rapid pace, it will call on each of us to recognize women's work and development and to engage them fully in the work force. It will help to give women the full rights of citizenship and to end discrimination which exists still nearly everywhere and slows progress wherever it exists.

At Cairo, the United States will also join the international community in launching new, high-quality, voluntary family planning and reproductive health programs. Our goal is to make these programs available to every citizen in the world by early in the next century. Parents must have the right to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children.

Now, I want to be clear about this. Contrary to some assertions, we do not support abortion as a method of family planning. We respect, however, the diversity of national laws, except we do oppose coercion wherever it exists. Our own policy in the United States is that this should be a matter of personal choice, not public dictation and, as I have said many times, that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. In other countries where it does exist, we believe safety is an important issue. And if you look at the mortality figures, it is hard to turn away from that issue. We also believe that providing women with the means to prevent unwanted pregnancy will do more than anything else to reduce abortion.

Finally, let me say, we must take to Cairo the same basic commitment to provide health care for every citizen of the world that we have brought to the public debate here in America. I must say that there is less disagreement among the representatives of the 174 countries going to Cairo than there is among the 535 Members of Congress. Maybe we can bring the spirit back home.

Experience shows that investing in maternal health, prenatal services, preventive care for children does not only save lives, it eventually gives people the confidence they need to know that their children will survive. And that changes all kinds of attitudes that affect the way children are raised. Every country has committed itself to improving the health of women and children. And every one that has really done that has seen a decline in population growth and a rise in prosperity.

The Cairo conference, therefore, can do a great deal to advance our vision of sustainable development and stabilized population growth, to help us fulfill a vision of a world of intact families in which every member is cherished; a world that has the wisdom and the strength to tackle challenges head on, instead of to talk about them and use words to divide people so they don't really address them; a world that will lead to equal opportunity and shared prosperity.

When President Roosevelt died in 1945, there was a typed manuscript of his last speech which was found with just a single sentence written

in his own hand. This was the last sentence of the last speech that Franklin Roosevelt had written, one that he never got to give. His handwritten sentence said, "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith." In the face of so many seemingly intractable problems, it is certainly tempting to let those doubts take control. But I think those of you here tonight believe as I do that we can, instead, search for and find solutions that will help generations yet to come. President Roosevelt governed in a time when doubt was a luxury the American people could not afford. I say to you tonight, doubt is a luxury the world can no longer afford.

I commend you for your compassion and your commitment. I urge you to turn this faith into action and to help me to do my job to do the same.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room at the State Department. In his remarks, he referred to Ted Turner, president and chairman of the board, Turner Broadcasting System, Inc., and his wife, actress Jane Fonda; and Bruce Alberts, president, National Academy of Sciences.

Nomination for the Federal Maritime Commission

June 29, 1994

The President announced today his intention to nominate Harold J. Creel, Jr., of Woodville, Virginia, to a 5-year term and Delmond J.H. Won of Honolulu, Hawaii, to fill a 3-year unexpired term on the Federal Maritime Commission.

"Hal Creel and Delmond Won have the education, background, and experience we need to maintain the quality of our Federal Maritime Commission, especially as we work to make essential reforms in the maritime industry," the President said.

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

Remarks to the Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform

June 30, 1994

Thank you so much, Brian McCarthy, for your testimony and your enthusiasm and the incredible work you've done. Thank you, Mike and Micki, for what you have said today. Thank you, Butler Derrick, for sticking your neck out and going through this big fight. I thank Congressman Gephardt, Congressman Bonior, Congressman Fazio, all the Members of the House who are here today.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Erskine Bowles, the Administrator of the SBA. You know, when I asked him to do this job, I pointed out that, even though he was a supporter of mine, his primary qualification was that he was not a political appointment; he was someone who had spent a lifetime helping people to start and to expand small businesses. So when he came to me and said, "The biggest winners in this health reform plan will be small business; I don't understand why the NFIB is campaigning against you," I knew if we could get the truth out, the facts, we could have a day like today. I thank him for that, and I thank all of you for being here, too.

You know, we have established again today that an awful lot of small business people in this country do support universal coverage, are prepared to contribute to the health coverage of their employees, and understand that without a system that requires everybody to be involved in health care, small business will continue to get the short end of the stick.

Now, there are powerful interests in this country and here in Washington who have spent millions and millions of dollars to convince the American people otherwise. Your presence here today is a sharp rebuttal to what they have tried to do. There are about 50 Members of Congress here today who have felt the relentless pressure of all that organized lobbying, but instead of giving in to it, they've been thinking about you and sticking up for you and standing up for you. And I think you ought to stick with them and encourage others to join with you.

I do want to reiterate what Brian has already said. The Small Business Coalition for Health Reform now represents over 620,000 small businesses. That is the most astonishing growth in such a short time. He came up with—he knows I love charts, so he gave me a chart to prove that. [*Laughter*] But what that means is that when 4,700 small businesses a day come on board to an organization like this, those who claim to speak for small business and claim to say it would be good for small business if we continue to have the status quo, do not, in fact, do it.

We know that you're a young organization. You don't have television ads on the air. You don't have mass mailings going out, but you represent more real American businesses and their employees than the NFIB with their intense disinformation campaign about our health care reform efforts.

Now, I want to just try to put this in some perspective for all of you from my point of view as well as yours. I ran for President because I wanted to get the economy going again and I wanted to make Government work for ordinary people again, to actually solve problems, and to be a partner. I'm about to leave, on July 5th, for the so-called G–7 meeting, the meeting of the world's seven big industrial powers. And as I look back on the last year and a half, as I go into this meeting, I feel pretty good.

The United States has 40 percent of the annual income of those seven countries. But in the last year and a half we've had 75 percent of the growth, generated 100 percent of all the new jobs, had 3 times as many private sector jobs come into this economy as in the previous 4 years; 1993 had a record number of new business incorporations in America. Our investment is growing more quickly, our productivity is growing more quickly than all of our major competitors. Our exports are growing at twice the rate of the average of all of our competitors. The economy is moving again.

But as I look down the road and I think about the context in which we operate, I know that the economic plan we passed last year and the budget plan we passed this year had a lot to do with that. We're going to reduce the deficit 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States.

This year's budget eliminates over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, reduces domestic discretionary spending for the first time in 25 years. The other folks talked a lot about cutting spending and the deficit; we are delivering that to you. And still we have increased our investment in education, in training, in new technologies. Last year in the economic plan there was a 70 percent increase in the expensing provision for small business, which made 90 percent of the small businesses in this country eligible for a tax cut if they invested more money in their businesses.

Now, I believe that this is the direction we should take. But let's face it, if we want to see America strong and growing, if you want our deficit to continue to come down, if we want to see every year a record number of small businesses starting, we have got to find a way to deal with this health care problem.

The only thing that's going up in the budget, folks, faster than the rate of inflation, is the cost of Medicare and Medicaid. That's it. We're bringing down everything else. And yet, still, those of you who cover your employees are paying for cost shifting for people who don't cover their own and for inadequate compensation in some of the Government programs. So from my point of view, your long-term financial health and your Nation's and your Government's long-term financial health depend absolutely on dealing with this issue.

Now, let me say one other thing. Every single group of experts who has testified before any committee of Congress has always said you have got to find a way to cover everybody in America, get them in the health care system if you want to control costs, stop cost shifting, and preserve quality. We have 100 members of academic health centers here this week saying the same thing, saying you cannot preserve what is best about American health care, providing the doctors, the nurses, the technology, unless you fix

what is wrong with it, the financing system, and get everybody involved.

Now, we've been at a terrible disadvantage in this fight before right now. Because while 70 percent of the American people or more will say, "We are for coverage for everybody; we believe in shared responsibility; we want small businesses to get a break and be able to organize so they can buy health insurance on competitive terms; we believe people should not be discriminated against because someone in their family has been sick," because they will say that, doesn't mean we've been able to keep up support for our plan. Why? Because we've been the only kid on the block. Everybody else is out there criticizing, looking for an easy answer, and lobbing rockets at our program.

You've seen all those ads. They say, "Well, it's a Government-run program." It isn't, is it? It's a private insurance program. They say we're going to ration health care. Folks, we don't ration health care—we're rationing health care now. There are 39 million Americans without it. There are 3 million people who have lost their coverage in the last 3 years. And every one of you who is providing health insurance on your own is having to ration it because you can't buy it on the same terms as big business and Government.

They say that you will lose benefits if our plan passes. But the truth is our plan doesn't take anything away from anybody; it puts a floor under what you can lose and gives everybody some protection, some real protection for middle class people and for small business people for a change. What's happening is today, as you know, every year people are losing more and more—more benefits, more choices, paying more. It's a myth.

Then they say, well, our cost figures aren't right. The truth is we've got the only plan in town where the costs have been verified, validated, and supported. And for very small businesses in this country, operating on a modest margin, the cost of this plan will be less than the cost of the minimum wage bill passed by Congress and signed in the previous administration. And that is the fact.

So the support for the fundamental principles is strong. I have said to people in the Congress of both parties, if you don't like some detail of our plan, come forward. What we're interested in—cover everybody, have shared responsibility, have a private system, put a floor under it, and give small business a break—that's all I care about. If you've got a better way to do that, come forward, let's talk about it.

Well finally, finally, we're seeing enough action so that there will be alternative plans. Yesterday Senator Dole offered a plan. Well, let's just talk about it. Small business and middle class families are not affected by it, except they lose more under the plan if it passes. It leaves small business at the mercy of insurance companies, who can still discriminate against certain businesses, still charge small business more than big business, still leave millions of workers in small firms uncovered.

Under the proposal there are no discounts for small business, nothing to end the cost shift from big firms to small ones, nothing to guarantee that the buying clout will be evened up. And since millions will remain uncovered—millions and millions—small businesses who do offer insurance will continue to pay higher rates to give others who are competing with them directly a free ride.

Now, I've heard time and time again that we've got to do something about this. That's what small businesses say they want. I've had so many small businesses say what Micki said, "If all my competitors had to do it, and I could buy it on affordable terms, I would be happy to do this."

Now we have an alternative plan. And the alternative plan is really old-style Government, the same thing you used to get really from both parties. It does a little bit for the poor. It leaves all the powerful vested interest groups with everything they've got, and it walks away from the middle class and small business. It is politics as usual. And now we have a choice, so the American people can make up their mind. Do you want everybody covered? Do you want something done about the cost? Do you want a break for small business? Or do you want us to appear to do something and not do anything to change the fundamental problems of this system? I think Americans will vote for the real thing if you will help us lobby for it and you will help us.

Let me say something else. This is not a partisan issue anywhere in America except Washington, DC. You don't have to declare, because I wouldn't want to embarrass you or me, but I know that there's plenty of Republicans in this audience today. I know that. I know there are independents. There may be people in this

audience that voted for Ross Perot. I don't care. I just want you to have a chance to be part of a thriving, growing American economy. It is not a partisan political issue.

My fellow Americans, now that the debate will be shifting into the public arena and votes will be cast and amendments will be offered, let me say again, I want the most flexible possible plan. I want the plan that has the Government doing the least possible. But I know that our objectives must be secured. We have to find a way for full coverage for the American people. We have to find a way for people to bear a fair share of responsibility for providing that coverage. And we have got to find a way to find a break for small business people and not to bankrupt folks just because they've had somebody in their family or because they have been sick.

There are more than one or two ways to do this. But there are difficult decisions involved. And that is the last point I want to make. Hillary and I have often talked about the small businesses we worked in when we were younger and how brave we thought the owners of those businesses were to take out their life savings, to put their necks on the line, to be personally at risk year-in and year-out, often until the business got up and going, and how many small businesses go under every year in the churning, competitive American marketplace.

One thing I know about you is that you have no place to hide. You have to face whatever the realities of your situation are. And you have to make decisions. And you know that when you have a difficult decision to make, making a decision that may not be 100 percent right is better than walking away and letting your whole business go under.

Too often the political system, when the going gets rough and the tension is intense and the pressure is hot, just walks away. And so I say to you this finally: You in this coalition should impress upon the United States Congress that even though this is an election year and even though this has become too partisan an issue in Washington, it is not a partisan issue where you live; it is not a partisan issue when you need a doctor or you're in the hospital; and it is not a partisan issue when you calculate how in the wide world you are going to deal with your health care costs and keep your business going.

And we must not walk away. We need to show the same discipline and maturity in doing the people's business this year in Washington that you have to show simply to survive and certainly to prosper.

That is what I implore you to tell the Members of the Congress. We can do this, folks. Just because we've been trying for decades and have not been able to do it before doesn't mean we can't do it this year. And if it gets done, it will be done in no small measure because there were hundreds of thousands of small business people who said, "This is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue. Do something, do it right, and do it now."

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:39 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Brian McCarthy, owner, McCarthy Flowers, Scranton, PA, and founder of the coalition; Michael Oakley, vice president, Oakley Industries, Clinton Township, MI; Micki Schneider, owner, Spirals, Palo Alto, CA; and Representative Butler Derrick.

Statement on Signing the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994

June 30, 1994

I am pleased to sign into law S. 24, the reauthorization of the Independent Counsel Act. This law, originally passed in 1978, is a foundation stone for the trust between the Government and our citizens. It ensures that no matter what party controls the Congress or the executive branch, an independent, nonpartisan process will be in place to guarantee the integrity of public officials and ensure that no one is above the law.

Regrettably, this statute was permitted to lapse when its reauthorization became mired in a partisan dispute in the Congress. Opponents called it a tool of partisan attack against Republican Presidents and a waste of taxpayer funds. It was neither. In fact, the independent counsel statute has been in the past and is today a force for Government integrity and public confidence.

This new statute enables the great work of Government to go forward—the work of reforming the Nation's health care system, freeing our streets from the grip of crime, restoring investment in the people who make our economy more productive, and the hard work of guaranteeing this Nation's security—with the trust of its citizens assured.

It is my hope that both political parties would stand behind those great objectives. This is a good bill that I sign into law today—good for the American people and good for their confidence in our democracy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 30, 1994.

NOTE: S. 24, approved June 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–270.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of Export Control Regulations
June 30, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report to the Congress that I have today exercised the authority granted by this Act to continue in effect the system of controls contained in 15 C.F.R., Parts 768–799, including restrictions on participation by U.S. persons in certain foreign boycott activities, which heretofore have been maintained under the authority of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.* In addition, I have made provision for the administration of section 38(e) of the Arms Export Control Act, 22 U.S.C. 2778(e).

The exercise of this authority is necessitated by the expiration of the Export Administration Act on June 30, 1994, and the lapse that would result in the system of controls maintained under that Act.

In the absence of control, foreign parties would have unrestricted access to U.S. commercial products, technology, technical data, and assistance, posing an unusual and extraordinary threat to national security, foreign policy, and economic objectives critical to the United States. In addition, U.S. persons would not be prohibited from complying with certain foreign boycott requests. This would seriously harm our foreign policy interests, particularly in the Middle East.

Controls established in 15 C.F.R. 768–799, and continued by this action, include the following:

—National security export controls aimed at restricting the export of goods and technologies, which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of certain other countries and which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States.

—Foreign policy controls that further the foreign policy objectives of the United States or its declared international obligations in such widely recognized areas as human rights, antiterrorism, regional stability, missile technology nonproliferation, and chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation.

—Nuclear nonproliferation controls that are maintained for both national security and foreign policy reasons, and which support the objectives of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

—Short supply controls that protect domestic supplies, and antiboycott regulations that prohibit compliance with foreign boycotts aimed at countries friendly to the United States.

Consequently, I have issued an Executive order (a copy of which is attached) to continue in effect all rules and regulations issued or continued in effect by the Secretary of Commerce under the authority of the Export Administration

Act of 1979, as amended, and all orders, regulations, licenses, and other forms of administrative actions under the Act, except where they are inconsistent with sections 203(b) and 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

The Congress and the Executive have not permitted export controls to lapse since they were enacted under the Export Control Act of 1949. Any termination of controls could permit transactions to occur that would be seriously detrimental to the national interests we have heretofore sought to protect through export controls and restrictions on compliance by U.S. persons with certain foreign boycotts. I believe that even a temporary lapse in this system of controls would seriously damage our national security, foreign policy, and economic interests and undermine our credibility in meeting our international obligations.

The countries affected by this action vary depending on the objectives sought to be achieved by the system of controls instituted under the Export Administration Act. Potential adversaries may seek to acquire sensitive U.S. goods and technologies. Other countries serve as conduits for the diversion of such items. Still other countries have policies that are contrary to U.S. foreign policy or nonproliferation objectives, or foster boycotts against friendly countries. For some goods or technologies, controls could apply even to our closest allies in order to safeguard against diversion to potential adversaries.

It is my intention to terminate the Executive order upon enactment into law of a bill reauthorizing the authorities contained in the Export Administration Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
June 30, 1994.

NOTE: The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Treasury Department Report

June 30, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by section 511 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 94–95 (Public Law 103–236), I hereby transmit the report prepared by the Treasury Department on expenditures from blocked accounts.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Lee H. Hamilton, chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Statement on the Environmental Protection Agency Decision on Renewable Fuels

June 30, 1994

I would like to commend the Environmental Protection Agency for its decision to make renewable fuels a major ingredient in reformulated gasoline under requirements of the Clean Air Act. Today we are making good on a longstanding commitment to a cleaner environment and a stronger economy. This decision offers tremendous potential to provide the U.S. with thousands of new jobs for the future.

The use of reformulated gasoline will help to improve the quality of the air in the Nation's dirtiest cities. Furthermore, a greater use of ethanol and its derivatives could help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I especially support the use of ETBE, a fuel derived from ethanol, because of its special environmental promise.

Relying on renewable fuels also presents a major opportunity to farmers and other members of rural communities to get to work helping America. The rule could boost demand for corn by 250 million bushels a year.

Again, I commend EPA on this important decision to use renewable fuels to help achieve the objectives of the Clean Air Act. I believe our economy and our environment can go hand in hand. This policy is good for our environment, our public health, and our Nation's farmers, and that's good for America.

Statement on Congressional Action on Health Care Reform

June 30, 1994

Chairman Gibbons and the Ways and Means Committee stepped up to their responsibility today and took a giant stride forward on the road to comprehensive health care for all Americans. I want to commend Chairman Gibbons for his leadership and longstanding dedication to quality health care for every American.

The Ways and Means Committee understands what the American people want. They want universal coverage. They want shared employer-employee responsibility. And they want costs controlled. Others pretend that piecemeal tinkering with the health care system will satisfy the American people. But the 78 percent of the public that supports universal coverage knows they are wrong.

The Ways and Means Committee joins two other committees which have approved bills that build on the current system of workplace-based insurance, providing quality and affordable care for working Americans. The real progress that is being achieved in these committees is proving the naysayers wrong.

In a mere few weeks' time, Congress and the Nation have made extraordinary progress in the fight for real health care reform. While the special interests will continue to try and stand in the way of history, they will not succeed. The voices of doctors, nurses, hospitals, hundreds of thousands of large and small businesses, and American families must and will be heard. The Ways and Means Committee answered their call today. We must all answer the call this year. There is no turning back.

Statement on the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

June 30, 1994

I would like to offer, on behalf of our Nation, my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for Jim Courter's important contributions in leading the 1991 and 1993 base realignment and closure reviews.

I am proud of the success of the Base Closure Commission during my administration. The base closure process has been nonpartisan, very effective, and continues to be of the highest importance to our efforts to reduce unnecessary base infrastructure in order to keep our military forces ready and strong.

While serving as Chair to the Commission, Mr. Courter recommended base closures and realignments which will enable the Federal Government to save billions of dollars over the next several years.

I am grateful for Jim Courter's tenacity, hard work, and commitment to building a stronger economy, and I wish him the very best in his new endeavors.

Interview With Klaus Walther of ZDF German Television
July 1, 1994

President's Trip to Germany

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, what are your expectations in front of the first trip to the united Germany? You will have a speech in front of the Brandenburg Gate; the Wall has come down. What will your message be?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say it's an incredible personal honor for me to be able to go as the first President to a united Germany. One of the formative political images of my childhood was seeing President Kennedy stand there in Berlin at the Wall and give his speech. So, for all of us in America, it's been a source of great joy to see the Wall come down and to see what is happening now in Germany.

My message will be that we've torn down the walls, but now we have to build the bridges. We have to unite Europe, and we have to move forward on security issues, on economic issues to make a better world.

U.S. Military in Germany

Mr. Walther. What will be the significance of the remaining troops in Germany for the future?

The President. I think it's quite important. I think it's a statement that the United States puts great importance on our relationships with Europe, with NATO, and with Germany, especially, and that we have a common security future with NATO.

One of the great successes, I think, of the last year has been the Partnership For Peace, the establishment of cooperative relationships between NATO and now 21 other countries, 19 from the former Communist bloc and Sweden and Finland. So this is a very exciting time, I think, and the United States, as long as Europe wants to be our partner, should maintain that partnership and should stay in Europe.

Germany-U.S. Relations

Mr. Walther. Let me return to Germany. Is Germany still the most important ally of the United States?

The President. Germany is a critically important ally, always has been, certainly since the end of the Second World War. And I think that if you look to the future, the kinds of things we have to work together on, the way our interests tend to converge and the way we see the world, the relationship I have enjoyed with Chancellor Kohl, all the things we work together on, Russian aid, international peacekeeping, a whole range of issues, trying to find a solution in Bosnia, the German people and the American people and their Governments need to work very, very closely together, not only for the well-being of Europe but indeed for the entire world.

Central and Eastern Europe

Mr. Walther. America is the last remaining world power, and there is more aid necessary than first expected to build up the East. Is the United States willing to increase their contributions for the East, because Germany and Europe, they have spent billions of dollars?

The President. Yes. I think we should do more, and we will. There is a limit to how much we can do. We've been very active in Russia and in other republics of the former Soviet Union. And we are trying to maintain a very vigorous international defense posture as a superpower in the cause of peace. And of course, that costs a lot of money. But I do believe in Central and Eastern Europe, we should be more active, and we will be. There are limits to what we can do, but we will be more active.

Mr. Walther. Talking about peace, does it bother you that the old powers in the former Eastern bloc countries are getting back into power again?

The President. Well, it depends on what they do. I mean, change is difficult. And the changes that a lot of those former Communist countries are going through are quite painful. And I think it is only predictable that from time to time the election results will vary, depending upon the mood of the people, the level of personal security they feel, the level of results being achieved. That is inevitable.

And as long as there is a continued commitment to openness and democracy and human rights and to working with the West, I don't think we can be deterred from our policies by particular elections. After all, you know, none of us always agree with the outcome of every election in our own countries.

Bosnia and the United Nations.

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, your administration started to solve a lot of international crises through the United Nations. The strategy failed, obviously, in Bosnia. When is U.S. unilateral action in the future appropriate or necessary?

The President. First of all, I don't know that it has failed in Bosnia; it has not yet succeeded. That is, keep in mind, there has been an agreement between the Croatians and the Muslims. It is functioning. It has stabilized a lot of the country. There has been much more peace and less slaughter around Sarajevo and some of the other safe areas. So I think the United Nations, the United States working with the U.N. and working through NATO has done a lot there to improve the situation. And of course, we hope that the contact group will come up with a map that will result in a peace settlement.

If you ask me the question, will the United States continue to work through the United Nations, the answer to that is yes, wherever we can. But we must be in a position to act alone when our own vital interests are at stake. That's what we did, for example, when I received proof that there had been an attempt to assassinate former President Bush in Iraq. But I wouldn't give up on the U.N. yet or on multilateral efforts. I still think there's a great deal that can be done there. I also think you're going to see variations of that. Look at Rwanda, where the French got, in effect, permission of the U.N. to lead in an area where they had an historic interest and historic ties. So I think we will be finding new ways for international cooperation for quite some years yet.

Mr. Walther. Talking about United Nations, would you support Germany to be a member on the Security Council?

The President. Yes. I have been publicly supportive of that for almost 3 years now.

NATO

Mr. Walther. You talked about NATO, Mr. President. How do you envision NATO's future? There's no more threat coming from the East, and how do you envision NATO's future?

The President. Well, right now what we're doing is using NATO to try to build a united Europe from a security point of view and to be available to take actions in Europe out of NATO's area. That's really the significance of what has happened in Bosnia, where the NATO planes have been involved in enforcing the no-fly zone and trying to enforce the safe area, where NATO planes can be called in if needed to try to preserve agreements and make sure both sides adhere to them. And I don't think there's any question that NATO has made a contribution to the progress that has been made in Bosnia.

And the NATO Partnership For Peace is the most important thing we've done in the last several years, because it gives us the chance to have a united Europe, the chance, really, for the first time since nation states were in existence in Europe.

So that's what I see. I think NATO should be working on integrating Europe from a security point of view; toward looking toward expanding its membership to other countries as appropriate; and toward the use of coordinated action, military capacity, outside its area of membership but within Europe.

Middle East Peace Process

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, today Mr. Arafat is visiting the Gaza Strip. Is this a milestone in the development in the Middle East?

The President. Yes, it's a very important trip because it symbolizes what has happened, which is that the Palestinians are beginning to have control over their own lives and affairs. It is a tribute to the courage of the Israelis and the Palestinians and to their leaders, to Mr. Arafat and to Prime Minister Rabin. And it's also a tribute to the peace process in which the United States, as you know, has been very actively involved.

The only way to settle the problems in the Middle East is to continue the peace process. I saw King Hussein just last week. We are in close touch with President Asad. We are working with Lebanon. We are hoping for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. And I hope this trip today will show that peace can be achieved and what a good thing it will be.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:10 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks at the Presidential Scholars Awards Presentation Ceremony
July 1, 1994

Thank you. Thank you, please be seated. Secretary Riley and Barbara Holt; members of the Commission on Presidential Scholars; most important, to all of you who have won these awards and to your family members, your teachers who are here, to your friends, I look forward to this event very much every year. And I am delighted to be here with you today and to look out at your faces and to imagine your futures. I don't see how anybody could be too concerned about the future of this great country, looking at you, reading your records, knowing what you have achieved.

Today I also think we should reflect upon the God-given potential of all of our young people in this country and the importance that the rest of us must attach to providing the greatest education we possibly can, not only to those of you who have been outstanding always and who have won this extraordinary recognition but to all of the people in this society on whom the rest of us will depend to maintain America's leadership.

This administration has worked very hard to try to do everything we could to give the American people the tools they will need to go confidently into the 21st century. I have spoken a great deal since I have been President about the importance of family and community, of work and responsibility. These things have a great deal to do with your future and the future of America.

When I sought this office, I did it because I was concerned about the direction of our country, both economically and in terms of our community. I was afraid we were coming apart when we ought to be coming together. We seemed to be going in so many ways in the wrong direction. I had a strategy that was clear in my own mind for what we ought to do for the economy. I've been thinking a lot about it because, as some of you know perhaps, I will be leaving on July 5th to go to Europe for a meeting of the G–7, the world's largest industrial countries. And as I think back over the last year and a half, I can go to this meeting with a great deal of pride.

We have 40 percent of the income of the world's largest industrial countries. But we've had 75 percent of the growth, created 100 percent of the new jobs. By cutting spending, by bringing our deficit down, by reducing the size of our Federal work force, by providing incentives for small business and working families, we've been able to create 3 million new jobs, reduce unemployment by 1.7 percent, have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President—none of you were born then—the last time America brought its deficit down 3 years in a row.

But if we do all those things, it still won't be enough unless we empower our people to make the most of their lives as we move toward the 21st century, a time when information will double rapidly every few years, a time when the average person will change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime. The whole question is whether all these changes will be friendly to most Americans or terribly, terribly threatening.

Indeed, one of the main reasons I have fought as hard as I have for guaranteed health coverage for all Americans is that that will make our families more secure in the face of all these changes. But in the end, how well we do will be determined by how well we educate our people and, in the end, how well our people are capable of reeducating themselves. That's what Goals 2000 is all about. That's what the school-to-work transition bill is all about. And now today it has been announced what the consequences and the mechanisms will be for reordering the student loan program, something that was very important to me when I ran for President.

I'd like to talk a little bit about that. I became very concerned when I was a Governor about the number of young people in my State who would go to school and drop out not for academic reasons but for financial reasons and the number of young people who said that they could no longer go to college because, believe it or not, in the 1980's the cost of a college education was just about the only really important thing that increased even more rapidly than the cost of health care.

And so, we began to look at what options were available for opening the doors of college

to all Americans. And one of the things that became clear to me is that the student loan program cost too much and the repayment terms were too stiff for a lot of our younger people, particularly if they wanted to go into work which might be immensely rewarding, terribly valuable to our society, but not particularly rich in terms of the salaries that were paid.

So we decided to change the way the college loan program worked and to go to something called direct lending. The Secretary of Education had primary responsibility for figuring out how we would do that. Our new program means lower interest rates for college loans, lower fees, and much better repayment terms with the option for young people to string out their repayment over several years and to pay loans back based on a percentage of what they earn after they get out of college, not simply based on how much they had to borrow to afford the education that they got.

It also means $4.3 billion in savings for taxpayers. During this first year we're going to make $1 billion in direct loans at over 100 institutions of higher education. We've also designed the program so that 20 million young Americans who took out $50 billion in loans under the old system can switch to the new system. That is, if they want to pay back their loans at a lower interest rate over a longer period of time based on how much money they're making rather than how much they borrowed, they'll be able to do that.

Well, we're going to lay out the details of how this will work in the next couple of weeks. But the point I want to make is this. It's a great thing when gifted young people can have ample scholarships to go to college. But we now know that we need 100 percent of our young people to finish high school and to get at least 2 years of further education if they're going to have a good chance to land a productive job with growing income prospects, not shrinking income prospects.

And we also know that in every wealthy country in the world—this is something you'll have to worry more about than I have, when you're my age—there is a diversion in income. In other words, there is a widening gap between the wealthy and the poor within the wealthy countries. We know of no other way at this time to turn that around, other than to dramatically increase the education and skill levels of all of our people. Education is the great equalizer. It will change the job mix in America.

So, I congratulate you here. I ask you to maintain your personal commitment to giving this country the kind of education system it needs to guarantee that every young American will be able to live up to the fullest of his or her God-given capacities and be able to have the tools needed to guarantee the security and the strength of our middle class way of life well into the next century.

I also want to say one last thing in closing. This is a celebration not only of academic achievement but of creative ability and concern for others. Perhaps the signature program of this administration, when the history of our time here is written, will be the AmeriCorps program, the national service program, sort of a domestic Peace Corps, that this year will involve 20,000 young Americans working in community service and earning money against their further education. And the year after next, if we can just keep the funding up, we'll have 100,000 young Americans doing that, revolutionizing life at the grassroots level. To give you an idea, the equivalent of that in my time was the Peace Corps, which President Kennedy launched and which captured the imagination of every American. But there were never more than 16,000 young Americans in the Peace Corps in any given year. And we'll have 100,000 year after next. Why? Because learning is important, but giving is important as well.

I want to recognize, if I might, just one of the scholars who's here. We could recognize many. But I wanted to mention one, not because she deserves to be mentioned over the rest of you but because everybody here and everyone within the sound of my voice needs to get the flavor of the extraordinary quality and character of the young men and women we honor today. Jessica Luterman, of Staples High School in Westport, Connecticut, organized a portable art therapy program for geriatric patients called Art On Wheels, which is now permanent. She did this while being an all-State athlete, a member of the All-USA Academic First Team, serving on the boards of her YWCA and the United Way. That's what we need more of in America. Stand up, Jessica. Where are you? Stand up. Give her a hand. [*Applause*]

Like I said, if you all would just remember what got you here today and commit yourselves

to trying to communicate that to the rest of this country, our future is in good hands.

Congratulations, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:11 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Barbara Holt, Acting Chair of the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars.

Letter to Members of Congress on Health Care Reform
July 1, 1994

Dear _____*:*

As you leave to celebrate the Fourth of July after weeks of hard work, I wanted to point out what a remarkable week this has been on health care. When Congress returns after the recess, you will have the opportunity to vote to provide guaranteed health coverage to every American.

The Committees have been hard at work, and for the first time ever bills guaranteeing universal coverage will be ready to go to the floor. We can make history in the month ahead if we listen to the American people.

Look at the events of this week—

- A *Washington Post*/ABC poll reports that 78% of Americans support universal coverage; 72% support employer responsibility; and 75% support cost containment. The public knows what the health care debate is about.
- The deans of over 70 of our most prestigious medical schools announced their support for universal coverage.
- The Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform, which supports universal coverage and employer responsibility, announced they have over 625,000 small business members, making it the largest small business coalition in the country, with more members than the National Federation of Independent Business.
- More than 100 big businesses, including 28 of the Fortune 100, have announced their support for universal coverage and employer responsibility.
- The American Medical Association, in a full page newspaper ad, added its voice to that of other physician groups, nurses and other providers urging Congress to pass universal coverage and employer responsibility.
- *The Wall Street Journal* on June 27 reported that the percentage of adults who work but have no public or private health insurance has risen to 17.5% in 1992 from 15.3% in 1988.

We will have the opportunity to give the American people what they need and want, and to give the American economy what it needs—guaranteed private insurance for every American.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Members of the 103d Congress.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on Future Free Trade Area Negotiations
July 1, 1994

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with section 108(b)(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 103–182; 107 Stat. 2067), I transmit herewith the report containing recommendations on future free trade area negotiations.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, chairman, Senate Committee on Finance, and Sam Gibbons, acting chairman, House Ways and Means Committee.

The President's Radio Address
July 2, 1994

Good morning. On Monday, July 4th, we celebrate America's birth. Two hundred eighteen years ago, our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the untested idea of liberty, equality, and democracy.

Those ideas have survived and thrived because they're at the heart of the only system of government we know that produces wisdom from debate and consensus from division. Indeed right now, we're seeing how our democratic process can produce results that constantly renew the pledges of our Founders, and we're making substantial progress.

I sought the Presidency because our economy was in trouble and because our Government wasn't working. We put in place an economic plan designed to restore the middle class and guarantee growth and jobs by cutting over $250 billion in spending; reducing over 250,000 Government positions; offering tax cuts to 15 million working families, 90 percent of our small businesses, and increases to about 1.5 percent of our people to ask them to help pay down the deficit.

The result has been a remarkable recovery: 3 million jobs, a 1.7 percent drop in unemployment, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. But the agenda for change requires more. It requires us to empower the people of the United States to do well in a world filled with change and competition.

That's at the heart of the crime bill we're about to pass in Congress that will put 100,000 police officers on the street, enact a law that says "three strikes and you're out," ban assault weapons that go with the Brady bill, and at the heart of our efforts to reform the college loan program to make interest rates lower and repayment terms better so that no young person will ever not go to college because of the cost of a college education. We're going to make 20 million young college graduates eligible for these better repayment terms and issue $1 billion of college loans next year under the better terms.

And we're on our way to providing the security of health care to keep all our families whole and give Americans the confidence and security they need to compete and win in a changing world. This is especially important now, when 81 million of us live in families with preexisting conditions, people who could lose their health insurance when they change their jobs. And we know the average American will now change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime.

The real choices on health care reform facing the Congress are becoming quite clear. For many, many months now, I have been fighting for private insurance coverage—not a Government program—for all Americans, along with provisions to make health care affordable to small business, to farmers, to the families with preexisting conditions. Interest groups and Members of Congress in the other party have criticized my plan, while many of them have said that they, too, are for full coverage for all Americans, but they offer no alternative to guarantee it.

Now, I have been working on our plan to make it even less regulatory and more friendly to small business, to guarantee that no one would lose any benefits because of the plan's requirements.

Finally, after months of criticizing our plan, the Republican leader, Senator Bob Dole, has finally proposed an alternative. Unlike our proposal, his idea of reform is really more politics as usual. It gives a little help to the poor, it's paid for by cuts in Medicare to the elderly, it requires no contribution from the interest groups that are making a great deal of money out of the health care system now and no con-

tribution from those who are not paying anything now into the system, and it gives absolutely no help and security to the middle class, to small businesses and no guarantee of coverage to anyone. Estimates are that more than a million Americans would continue to lose their health insurance every month under this plan, most of them from hard-working, middle class families. It will help you a little bit if you're poor. It won't affect you if you're wealthy. But if you're in the middle, you can still lose your health insurance, and if you don't have it, it won't do much to help you.

One aspect of the Dole plan is particularly disturbing. It was brought home to me this week when small business people from all over America came to the White House and urged us to reject this approach. They don't want any plan that will make it harder to do right by their workers. The Dole alternative leaves small businesses at the mercy of insurance companies who can still charge them more than big businesses or Government. And small businesses that do offer insurance will continue to pay much higher rates, because they'll have to give a free ride to their competitors who don't make any effort at all.

Now, more than 620,000 small businesses have joined together to support the idea that we ought to have full coverage, universal coverage, for all Americans and one that requires the employers and the employees to contribute to that coverage. They know that without guaranteed private insurance for every American, small businesses that do cover their employees will have a harder time competing here at home and across the world.

There's simply too much at stake as we try to prepare our citizens to take advantage of our global opportunities. We can't continue to handicap ourselves in that way. And not only that, it simply won't work. We know from the experience in some States that if you try to reform insurance practices and you don't do anything to help small business and individuals, what will happen is that more and more people will give up their coverage because it will get more and more expensive.

For the last 50 years, our country has come close to health care reform a time or two, but we failed every time. Congressman Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut said this week that during that 50 years, our country has gone from the propeller to the jet airplane, from adding machines to computers, from the radio to virtual reality, but our health care system has actually gone backward in guaranteeing security to middle class families. That's right. In the 1980's, about 87 percent of our people had guaranteed health insurance. Now, only 83 percent of our people are covered.

That's why the vast majority of Americans agree that universal coverage must be our goal. This time we have to move forward. In health care as in crime and education, our democracy is producing solutions that hold fast to our time-honored values, building on what has always been our greatest strength: people helping one another to take responsibility for themselves and their families, their communities, and their countries.

On July 4th, we'll celebrate with family and friends at picnics and parades. But if you find a quiet moment, I hope you'll reflect on the lessons of our history and make this promise to yourself: to do the best you can to be a good American, to rebuild the safety of our communities, the sanctity of our families, the strength of our schools, the vitality of our economy.

The best way to celebrate our freedoms is by renewing our democracy. We're trying to do that here in Washington by facing up to our responsibilities. I hope you'll urge us to do that as well.

Thanks for listening, and best wishes for a wonderful holiday.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:02 p.m. on July 1 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 2.

Teleconference on the Rededication of the Mark Twain Memorial Lighthouse at Hannibal, Missouri

July 2, 1994

Representative Harold Volkmer. Mr. President?

The President. Harold, how are you?

Representative Volkmer. Just fine, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

The President. It's great to hear your voice.

Representative Volkmer. It's great to be here. Can everybody hear me? Can you hear the President?

Okay, Mr. President, we've got a nice crowd here, and we're getting ready to light this lighthouse in memory and to remember Mark Twain, on behalf of Mark Twain, our favorite son.

The President. Let me say, first of all, I'm glad to be back in Hannibal again, at least by telephone. I had a wonderful, wonderful visit there.

Representative Volkmer. Yes, we well remember, and we're almost in the very same spot that you were in at that time, just a little bit up the street, not very far.

The President. Well, I'm a great admirer of Mark Twain, and I read him as a boy and read him as an adult. So I'm very happy to be part of it. And I know that President Roosevelt in 1935 and President Kennedy in 1963 also played a role in this memorial lighthouse. So I'm glad to be a part of that history of your community. And I'm also glad to be back with all the enthusiastic people who live there. I remember them so well, and I want to congratulate you and the citizens of Hannibal and Marion County and also the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for all the work you've done to restore the lighthouse. It really symbolizes the community and your vision and the great history of Mark Twain.

[*Representative Volkmer thanked the President and wished him a happy Fourth of July.*]

The President. I'm really glad to be here. My family and I are up in Camp David, and we're having a wonderful time and looking forward to celebrating our Nation's birthday and watching our soccer team play. But I'm really glad I got to do this. I love Hannibal. I think it's one of the greatest places I've been. And as I said, it's captured my imagination ever since I was a little boy. So I'm delighted to be a part of this.

[*Representative Volkmer invited the President to visit Hannibal, MO.*]

The President. Are you going to light the candle, is that what you're going to do? Everybody going to light a candle?

Representative Volkmer. Well, we're ready. I'd like to—for you to, if you have——

The President. I've got it.

[*Representative Volkmer introduced Karol Mueller, director of the Main Street Program.*]

Karol Mueller. Hello.

The President. Hello, Karol. Congratulations on all the work you've done. You're the director of the Main Street Program, aren't you?

Ms. Mueller. I am——

The President. I love that program. And I tell you, you've done a wonderful job there.

Ms. Mueller. Well, thank you. I wish I could take all the credit, but I can't. It's truly a community effort. We have a great crew behind us, a great Main Street Program, and great architects, and we've done it together.

The President. Good for you. Well, I'm glad to be a part of it. And I'm really glad that Congressman Volkmer gave me a chance to call in tonight.

Ms. Mueller. Well, we sure appreciate his assistance on this project as well.

The President. Thank you.

Ms. Mueller. Are we ready to light it?

The President. Are you ready? I've got a candle here.

Ms. Mueller. Okay, I'm going to hand you back to Congressman Volkmer.

Representative Volkmer. All right, Mr. President.

The President. You'll have to visualize my candle, folks, but I've got one here.

[*Representative Volkmer described the ceremony and said that Mayor Richard Schwartz of Hannibal was a participant.*]

The President. I remember the mayor well, yes.

[*Representative Volkmer said that Henry Sweets, curator of the Mark Twain Home and Museum, was also participating in the event and mentioned that his own wife, Shirley, and their grandchildren were there as well.*]

The President. That's good. Well, tell Shirley and your grandchildren hello. I know it's good to have them there for the Fourth of July.

Representative Volkmer. Yes, it is. The grandchildren jumped frogs this morning, and they're going to be in a parade come Monday.

The President. They jumped frogs, is that——

Representative Volkmer. Oh yes. Yes, we have a frog-jumping contest.

The President. I used to be in one of those every year.

Representative Volkmer. Is that right?

The President. Yes, we've got a ferry about 30 miles from Little Rock, in Arkansas, called Toad Suck Ferry. And every year we had a Toad Suck Day, and we all raced our frogs.

Representative Volkmer. Very good.

The President. I never won, but I always loved it. I competed every year, but I never won.

Representative Volkmer. All right, they're ready to go.

The President. We're ready.

Representative Volkmer. Anytime you're ready to light, we're ready to light.

The President. I have just lit my candle.

Representative Volkmer. Very good. Let's see if it works.

The President. I've always believed it was better to light a candle than curse the darkness. Now, the whole town of Hannibal's done the same thing.

Representative Volkmer. Yes, that's right, and we're all waiting, and it's coming closer, and it's coming closer—there's one more. The switch should go—ahh, there it is.

The President. Good for you.

Representative Volkmer. All right, there it is, Mr. President. Thank you very, very much, Mr. President. Tell Hillary hello for us.

The President. I'll do it. Thank you, Congressman.

Representative Volkmer. And you all have a real nice Fourth.

The President. Tell everybody hello. Thank you, and God bless you.

Representative Volkmer. Thank you very much.

The President. Goodbye.

NOTE: The teleconference began at 10:45 p.m. The President spoke from Camp David, MD.

Statement on Senate Action on Health Care Reform Legislation
July 2, 1994

The action of the Senate Finance Committee today moves health care reform another step closer to final passage.

Chairman Moynihan has worked diligently to make sure his committee produced a bill to debate on the Senate floor. His commitment to universal coverage has been clear throughout this process, and I look forward to his continued leadership as we move toward guaranteed health coverage for every American.

I remain firmly committed to guaranteed health coverage for every American that can never be taken away. We must achieve universal coverage if we are to reform our health care system and assure hard-working, middle class Americans that they will have health care when they need it. I am confident that we will achieve the goal of guaranteed coverage for everyone this year, and I look forward to the debate in the full House and Senate.

Interview With Klaus Walther of ZDF German Television
July 1, 1994

World Cup Soccer

Mr. Walther. Mr. President, let us change the subject. Mr. President, first time in the history of World Cup, soccer's World Cup is played in the United States.

The President. Yes.

Mr. Walther. And on the Fourth of July there will be the game U.S.A. versus Brazil. What does it mean for you, personally, to have this game on the Fourth of July?

The President. It's very exciting and, I think, very appropriate we'll play on the Fourth of July against, obviously, a magnificent Brazilian team. Soccer is just really beginning to catch hold in the U.S. and to capture the public imagination. Our children have been playing it in larger and larger numbers.

Mr. Walther. [*Inaudible*]—your daughter.

The President. And my daughter did, yes. Probably for about 10 years now, our children have been beginning to really play in large numbers. And I think that will have an impact as those children grow up, more and more soccer at the university level, more and more professional soccer. I think that and the World Cup being in the United States are the two things that will make soccer perhaps as big a sport in the U.S. as it is in Europe and other parts of the World.

Mr. Walther. Will you watch the game?

The President. Oh, yes, I expect I will. We've been watching every game we could on television. And of course, I went with Chancellor Kohl and the President of Bolivia to the opening game between Germany and Bolivia in Chicago the other day. And I got a little lesson in soccer; both Presidents were whispering in my ear a little bit. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Walther. So who's your favorite for the championship?

The President. Well, I have to be for the United States, until we're eliminated. Besides that, we're an underdog. And I like that, since I've always been kind of an underdog, I like it when the underdogs do well. I'm proud of us.

Mr. Walther. Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:20 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. This is a continuation of the interview released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 1. This portion of the interview was embargoed for release until July 4.

Interview With Foreign Journalists
July 1, 1994

Italian Government

Q. The first question, obviously, is about Italy. You were in Italy a few weeks ago. I saw you on the Campidoglio with your wife, a beautiful evening. And you spoke with the new Prime Minister, Mr. Berlusconi. So my question is, how is your sense about Mr. Berlusconi and his policy and the implementation of his policy—the first new government in Italy?

The President. Well, my sense was that he had given a lot of thought to what he wished to do and that he was bringing a great deal of energy to the task and that he was determined to pursue a course of economic revival for Italy and to maintain a strong democratic tradition and that, in terms of our relationships, that the traditional strong relationship between the United States and Italy would be maintained vigorously. That was my impression.

Bosnia Negotiations

Q. May I follow up with a question that connects to Italy very quickly? It's Yugoslavia. We are in the front line. And one of the first requests of the government of Italy, Mr. Berlusconi's government, was to let Italy get in the contact group that's working in Geneva. Do you think this request will be evaluated, accepted, on what?

The President. I don't know. Let me say first, I think that Italy should be very closely consulted about all developments in Bosnia and in the former Yugoslavia. I think the question the contact group has to face is, how many more people could be let in? In other words, if the membership were expanded, would every country that has troops there—Canada has troops there, would they have to go into the contact group? Would other countries that border the former Yugoslavia and have intense interests there—Turkey is sending troops there—have to be put into the contact group? Or is there some other way to involve Italy closely in the policymaking without doing that? That, I think, is the question.

Q. Thank you.

Canada-U.S. Trade

Q. Excuse a parochial question, but as you know, we've had two trade agreements in the last couple of years between Canada and the United States. And yet, our trade problems seem to be deteriorating, if anything, over softwood lumber and wheat and now Pacific salmon, so much so, that our Trade Minister, Roy MacLaren, has warned of a trade show between our two countries. And even your Ambassador to Ottawa has criticized U.S. actions on wheat. Do you think the time has come for you to become personally involved on this issue before it deteriorates much further? Or is the U.S. view that Canada is an unfair trader?

The President. Well, I think that's not the only two options. First of all, keep in mind, this is the biggest bilateral trading relationship in the world, as far as I know. It's certainly our biggest trading relationship. It's a huge, huge relationship. And in one that big, it should not be surprising that there would be some frictions from time to time.

In all three areas that you mentioned, you have people engaged in the same economic activity, living very close to each other under different government policies and frameworks. That's true with lumber, that's true with wheat, and it's true with salmon.

Now, our problem with the whole salmon issue, of course, is complicated by the whole question of the size of the population and what the future of it is. And I think there are—I really believe there are ways for us to work that out. I believe that problem will be worked out. And I have talked to our people about it; I think we're all working very hard on that.

The timber disputes are of longstanding and recur from time to time, as you know.

Q. Eight years, I think.

The President. And I think—I think we have to let that one play out through the regular course of events.

With regard to the wheat issue, I think the question there—it's been referred for dispute resolution, and the ordinary process may resolve it. The real problem there is that the U.S. and Canada need to agree somehow on what does or doesn't constitute a subsidy. I think we need some general agreements that might solve the wheat problem and some other problems as well.

But I think it's important that we not overreact to this. It's a very big issue here. I mean, our wheat farmers in North Dakota are on the verge of hysteria all the time. They think they've been treated unfairly. And in Congress, there are Representatives from certain States for whom this is the only issue because they think they've been treated unfairly. So I'm trying to work it out. We don't have any bilateral relationship where we have more in common and where we tend to work more together. I mean, Prime Minister Chretien has worked with me very closely, and the Canadian Government has always worked with the American Government on everything from issues in the U.N., with problems in Haiti, our policy toward NATO, the whole range of issues. And as far as I know, these are the only three disputes we have, and we're trying to work through them as best we can.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. Mr. President, the dollar has known quite a rough ride on the currency markets these recent weeks, giving the impression that your Government didn't want to do anything about it. Do you think a weak dollar is good for the American economy, maybe for trade purposes? And if not, do you intend to do or say anything about it? And do you expect the G–7 meeting to take some resolution about that?

The President. I expect it will be discussed. But let me answer the question. No, I don't think it's good for the American economy to have—or let me put it in a more affirmative way. The United States is not trying to grow

its economy on a weak dollar. We do not believe a country can devaluate itself into prosperity.

On the other hand, these currency markets are subject to significant fluctuations. And great care should be taken before unusual actions are taken, it seems to me. And it is, I think, in the end, over the longrun, the markets tend to align with market realities.

When I became President, we had been exploding our Government deficits for 12 years. Investment was down; job growth was down. And we decided to change our policy so that the American economy would be stronger in the global economy and so that ordinary Americans would be better off. We have cut hundreds of billions of dollars in Government spending. We have slashed our—we are slashing our work force in the Government by about 12.5 percent, to make it the smallest it has been in three decades. We are targeting investments to areas of economic growth, like education and training and technology. And we have given certain tax incentives to small businesses, new businesses, lower wage workers.

The impact of all this has been that, as I leave for the G–7, in the last year and a half, the U.S. has 40 percent of the GDP of the G–7. But we've had 75 percent of the growth and almost 100 percent of the new jobs. Our exports and our rate of investment are growing higher—more than the average in the G–7. Our rate of productivity is growing more than the average of the G–7 countries.

So I believe the best answer to this over the longrun is a strong American economy. Transitory political developments in various countries may explain what's going on. There may be a lot of other explanations. But the main thing is, I do not wish—I don't take the weakness of the dollar lightly against any currency. I do not want the dollar to be too low. I am not trying to expand the American economy through a low dollar. No country has ever devaluated itself into prosperity. The United States wants to grow into prosperity, to trade into prosperity, not to devaluate itself into prosperity.

German Leadership

Q. Mr. President, you're also going to Germany after the G–7 summit. And Germany is more or less emerging as perhaps the European leader. And on the other hand, a lot of Germans are very reluctant to claim this role for their country. What is your wish and your perception of Germany in the future? Will it be the European leader? And would you be prepared to offer a partnership in leadership as your predecessor, President Bush, did?

The President. Well, I think we do have a very good partnership with Germany. Mr. Bitterlich was quoted in the Wall Street Journal today about the strong support our administration had given, stronger than previous ones, to European unity and to the European defense capacity and to greater strength and unity within Europe. Germany has strongly supported that.

Of course, it's up to the German people and to the leaders of Germany to determine what role will be played and then up to the partners that you have within Europe. But I think that Germany has a major role to play in the future in world affairs, has a strong role to play in Europe.

I support what I take to be the policy of Germany, which is support for increasing European integration and increasing efforts to reach out to the East. And I feel very comfortable with that.

Q. But you're not really into endorsing partnership in leadership, do you?

The President. As I already told you, Mr. Bitterlich said that we had a better partnership than you had before. So, you have to define what your role is going to be. It's not up to the United States. I don't see how Germany can walk away from a leadership role. You have the third biggest economy in the world. You have a huge population. You have absorbed the East, and you've managed to keep your economy strong, with all the incredible demands. You've played a very constructive role in a lot of United Nations activities.

So, I think you have no choice but to play a leadership role. It isn't an option. You've been by far more generous than any other country in investing to your east. I think that it's not even an option to talk about a world in which Germany doesn't play a leadership role. You can't withdraw from your responsibilities. Even if you sought to, the vacuum that would be created would require you to move ahead again.

But the point I want to make is exactly how these relationships will be—will work themselves out in Europe, for example, is a matter for the Europeans to determine. France has, for example, recently has played a very strong role along with Britain in Bosnia, providing the bulk of the UNPROFOR troops. Canadians have made

a major contribution. France recently took the initiative to go to Rwanda, and the United States supported the United Nations giving an approval for France to send troops there to do that until we could put together an African force, that is, a U.N. force.

I think that there will be many variations of leadership in the years ahead. But one thing that I am sure of is that the size of the German economy and the values that have been demonstrated by the German leadership guarantee that there will be a leadership role for Germany and that it will be a positive thing for the rest of Europe and for the world.

Japan-U.S. Relations

Q. The relationship between the United States and Japan is facing a little bit of difficulty. Trade conflict has caused turmoil of the currency market, and so-called framework talks have restarted but have not reached any agreement yet. Under those circumstances, Mr. Murayama, Socialist leader, was elected Japan's next Prime Minister, and you are going to meet him for the first time in Naples. Mr. President, how are you going to manage with Japan's new government and reestablish a good relationship of both countries?

The President. I had a good talk with him last night. I called him last night. And we had a very good visit. We reaffirmed our commitment to our relationship, our security partnership, our political partnership, and our economic partnership. And Mr. Murayama said that he hoped we could continue to make progress in the frameworks. If we'd both make our best efforts, he thought we could.

It is difficult, I think, to expect to have too high expectations for what has happened in the last several months because of all the political changes which have occurred within Japan. But I think we have continued to work along together. I think the important thing I would say—it's sort of like the argument I made to the gentleman from Canada. If you look at the relationship the United States and Japan—our troops are still there. Our military partnership is very strong. We worked as one to try to defuse the crisis in North Korea with regard to the North Korean nuclear program. I did everything I could to make sure that every step along the way, everything I did was coordinated closely with not just South Korea but also with Japan. Because of that and because—to get to the next question—our continuing strengthening relationship with Russia. We had good relationships with Russia during this period. We were able to reach out to the Chinese. But it worked because of the historic ties we have had.

So again, I would say that it's very important not to let trade disputes or any other disputes that are inevitable in a world where the economy has been growing slowly and where competition is stiff and where we have not yet solved the problem of how wealthy countries promote growth and new jobs in a highly competitive global economy, these things are going to happen from time to time. The important thing is to be able to absorb them and just deal with them in a disciplined and regular way and not let the other aspects of the relationship get out of hand.

And that's what I hope will happen. I mean, the United States and Japan have had some serious differences over trade. But they haven't interrupted rather an enormous bilateral investment and trade relationship and a deep political partnership. I think the Emperor and Empress, on their recent trip here, were deeply moved by the friendship and the intensity of the friendship for them and for the Japanese people that were demonstrated by the Americans. So I think the feeling in this country about Japan is as strong and as positive as it has ever been.

And you know, you're going through a period of political change. You have to work that out. That's what democracies do from time to time. Nothing is ever stable forever. You know, things change. And so, as that—the whole yen-dollar relationship may be in part a product of the perception that maybe things won't change quickly enough because of political conditions. But I think what we have to do is to reassure people that you've got two strong economies here, that these things will work themselves out if we just have the discipline to do it.

Central and Eastern Europe

Q. Mr. President, your first stop will be in Riga, and it's going to be a real and joyful celebration of independence. Many Latvians, as well as many Russians, were humiliated by the—[*inaudible*]. And we are really happy that these countries are now independent. The real, very hard question among the former Soviet people—recent developments show and especially the Presidential races in Ukraine and Belarus show—a lot of people stand for much closer

cooperation with Russia. So can you, sir, envision any kind of democratic and legal reunification of some of the former Soviet republics—newly independent states—without causing a threat to Central European countries, to Baltic countries, to Europe, to national interests of the United States and all of the world? Thank you.

The President. I think that that depends upon whether such decisions would be made really voluntarily and by will of a majority of the people. That is, I sense, particularly—and I've been to Belarus, so I have a feeling for that. I've also been to Ukraine, but I've not spent as much time. It's a very large country, and there are many different layers and opinions there. But I think that it depends upon whether such movements would develop out of a genuine democratic movement and a free will of the people involved.

I have to say that, from my point of view, the policies that President Yeltsin has pursued in the Baltics are very reassuring. As you know, the Russian troops have withdrawn from Lithuania, that we're very close to resolving the final matters in Latvia. There are still a few issues left in Estonia. The United States strongly supports the protection of Russians who remain in the Baltics and the whole issue of minority rights. It's a very big issue for us and our country and throughout the world.

But I think the feeling in Central and Eastern Europe about the intentions of Russia is probably more positive now than it was even 6 months ago. And the steadfastness of Russia in continuing to move its troops out of the Baltics is a major part of that. So that if there is a truly independent political development in Belarus, for example, that says, you know, we think we'd be better off if we had some sort of different relationship with Russia, that, I think, will depend on what actually happens. I mean, the people of Central and Eastern Europe will know if some new development occurs. I think they will know in their hearts and minds whether it was a grassroots, honest, democratic impulse. And that will be the test.

European Unification

Q. Mr. President, the British Government finds itself once again in a familiar position in Europe, i.e. in a minority of one, on the issue of vetoing the new candidate to head the European Commission. When you talked earlier about your desire for European integration, is that the same thing as supporting a federal Europe along the lines proposed by the Germans and the Belgians and the French? And do you think the British are being unnecessarily skeptical about the creation of a federal European state?

The President. I don't know that I have an informed opinion about that. I mean, I think that, again, I think that each of you are sovereign nations, and you will have to make up your mind about what you think is in your national interest. It is my—the only thing I can tell you is that the United States has viewed as in its national interest an economically integrated but open Europe. That is, the fact that Europe would become stronger and more economically integrated, not only through the European Union but also reaching out to the East, we have not viewed as threatening. We have viewed that as positive, because I think that we have to find ways to add wealth to the world's economies every year, to add to the growth rate.

We also have not viewed with alarm, at least in my administration, the prospect that there could be greater European security cooperation between the French and the Germans and between others as well. But we are willing to continue to be partners through NATO.

Now, how far you should go with your political integration is just a decision you will have to make. And we don't have views about that one way or the other except to say we are not threatened that you wish to be closer together in economic or military or political ways. That doesn't threaten the United States. We feel a stronger Europe makes for a more democratic and a stronger world. But you will have to make up your mind about the politics of it. It's not for us to say whether you're right or wrong. It's for you to say.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, you are going to start high-level talks with North Korea. Which do you prefer, the normalization of the relationship of both countries or the solution of nuclear suspicion, I mean especially—to which do you put—[*inaudible*]—weight, the so-called past suspicion or the current and future suspicion of North Korea?

The President. You mean with regard to the nuclear issue?

Q. Yes.

The President. Well, it's not so easy to divide them, because of the obligations North Korea undertook in becoming a member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty regime, because that means that North Korea has to be open to inspection by the IAEA for all its facilities from the day that it became a member, forward. I mean, if you asked me, am I more concerned about whether North Korea has one or two nuclear weapons or the capacity to make them now or whether they might make two dozen in the future, that's an easy question to answer. I'm more concerned about two dozen than I am one or two.

But in the—when you become a member of one of these international organizations and you assume the responsibilities of membership, then you have to honor those responsibilities. In terms of reunification and normalization of relations, all those things, those things will have to be worked out partly between the north and the south, and I am elated that they are going to meet. I think that's a good thing, the leaders of the two countries.

But we will begin our discussions first on July 8th. And what we hope to do is to find ways to broaden this debate because really what this is about is, even more than the nuclear weapons, is what role will North Korea assume in the future? What is the vision of the leaders of North Korea for that nation at the turn of the century or 20 years from now? Should it be an isolated country that makes money from selling No Dong missiles and low-level nuclear materials? Or should it be a country that is in harmony with its neighbors and friends, using the industry and ability of its people to strengthen trade and commerce and the personal development of its people?

To me that's an easy question to answer. If there is no threat to North Korea's security, if we mean them no ill, if Japan, if South Korea, if Russia, if China, if all of its neighbors wish to be partners in a more open world, and if the United States has that wish, then surely we should be able to work this problem out. That is my hope and my objective.

World Cup Soccer

Q. Mr. President, thank you. The last question is, who's going to win the World Cup, except the U.S.? [*Laughter*] I know that your daughter plays soccer.

The President. Yes. Well, if I take a position on that—you know, every time I take a position at home, I make a few million people mad. Now, if I take a position on that, I will make billions of people angry.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—chance.

The President. That's right. I have quite enough——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—in the world——

The President. I have quite enough controversy without that. I'm still pulling for the United States, you know. I like the underdogs when they fight. And we—this is the first time we've ever made the second round, I think.

Q. Yes, it's the first time in history.

The President. Yes. And we didn't want to be the first host team never to make the second round. And we're playing better than expectations. So I'm going to keep cheering for the U.S. until we're eliminated.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:55 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In the interview, the President referred to Joachim Bitterlich, director of the foreign policy, development aid, and security policy division, Federal Chancellery of Germany. This interview was embargoed for release by the Office of the Press Secretary until July 4.

Remarks at an Independence Day Celebration
July 4, 1994

The President. Hello. Happy Fourth of July. Let me just say, part of this wonderful celebration—can you hear?

Audience members. Yes.

The President. Part of this wonderful celebration is music, fireworks, family, friends, no speeches. But I just want to welcome you here tonight and say what an immense pleasure and pride it is for Hillary and for me to have you

here. We hope you enjoy the fireworks. We're proud to have you here on the grounds of your house and hope that you feel it is your house.

And let me just say one little thing seriously. Every Fourth of July, I try to take a little time to think about what this country means in a special way. And today, I finished a biography I've been reading of our second President, John Adams. He's the first person who ever lived in this house, in 1800. He died on the 50th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence, on July the 4th, 1826, the same day President Jefferson died. They were great friends. And they died, on the same day, as they had lived: loving this country. And what I want to ask all of you to think about is what we can do to make sure that this country's still here 200 years from now. That's our job.

Thank you. God bless you. Have a great night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Interview With Tomasz Lis of Polish Television
July 1, 1994

Poland-U.S. Relations

Mr. Lis. Mr. President, what is the most important message you would like to bring to Poland?

The President. That the United States and Poland are bound together, our futures are bound together; we're bound together by affection, by family ties, by our comradeship in World War II, and by our devotion to the constitutional idea of government, but that we have a very important future, and we need to build that future together.

Partnership For Peace and NATO

Mr. Lis. In January in Prague, you said that there was no question if NATO should be expanded, the only question was when and how. Could you make that step forward and say when and how?

The President. Well, first of all, I have to make sure there is an agreement among the NATO members about what exactly the standards should be and the timetable. And they haven't all agreed. But I do want to make it clear that, in my view, NATO will be expanded, that it should be expanded, and that it should be expanded as a way of strengthening security and not conditioned on events in any other country or some new threat arising to NATO.

The Partnership For Peace is actually exceeding my hopes for its success. We now have 21 countries signed up, 19 who were in the former Communist bloc and Sweden and Finland. And we are going to hold our first exercises, as you know, in Poland, which I hope will send a message about how important I think Poland is to the future security of Europe and our future alliance.

Mr. Lis. But will you give Poland and other Eastern European countries a clear timetable for becoming full members of NATO? Because maybe that's the only way to——

The President. I think that a timetable should be developed, but I can't do that alone. NATO is an alliance. There are many partners in it, and we have to discuss that among ourselves and to reach agreement on exactly how this staging should be done.

Last year—or earlier this year when I met with the NATO members, they felt very strongly that we should first have these exercises, these Partnership For Peace exercises, and we should gauge the nature of our security cooperation with all of the people in the Partnership and then see which people in the Partnership really wanted to become members and who was ready and then come back and meet and determine what the standards should be. So I think that probably won't be done until sometime next year, because of the feeling of all the NATO members about it.

Russia

Mr. Lis. What can the United States do to promote friendly links with Russia and, on the other hand, to enhance Poland's and Central Europe's security?

The President. I think we're doing both those things now. I think we can promote our friendship with Russia by working to develop Russia, by helping to diffuse our tensions. Our nuclear

weapons are no longer pointed at each other, for the first time since the end of World War II. We are working together to try to solve the conflict in Bosnia. So I think in all those ways we can work together. We have a commission between the Prime Minister of Russia and our Vice President working on matters of defense conversion and environmental technology and energy and things of that kind. So we have a good, broad-based relationship with Russia.

But we have to pursue independently our relationships with Poland, with Central and Eastern Europe. And I think that the security issue is one; that's why we pushed so hard for the Partnership For Peace. Also our economic issue is another where we have—the United States provides, I think, about 44 percent of total outside investment in Poland. And we know we need to do more in Central and Eastern Europe than we have done, and we will do more. There are limits to what we can do, but we will do more. I think we have to pursue that totally independently of our growing relationship with Russia.

Mr. Lis. But Mr. President, you have a vision of an undivided, integrated Europe.

The President. I do.

Mr. Lis. And don't you think that your vision is against what we often hear from Russian politicians about so-called—doubts, influence—about the Russian opposition to expansion of NATO to Central Europe?

The President. You hear some of that. But we also have to look at what is happening. I mean, Russian troops have withdrawn from Lithuania. Russian troops are, I think, about to withdraw from Latvia. We've worked out most of the issues on that. There are some minority rights issues to be worked out in Estonia, but I think that will occur. I think you'll have all the Baltics free, independent, and without foreign troops on their soil pretty soon, and the Russians have been pretty consistent in supporting that.

I also believe that—keep in mind, conditions of membership in things like Partnership For Peace, which Russia has also joined, involve respecting one another's territorial boundaries. And in terms of Russia's exercise of influence outside its borders, at least in Bosnia I would have to say so far it's been a positive thing for the cause of peace, not a negative thing.

So we have to judge people not only by the words they use and the way they use them but also by what they do. And so far, I would say there will be tensions and disagreements from time to time, but I believe we can have a united Europe with a responsible, strong Russia, and we are going to work for that.

Mr. Lis. What do you think about an idea of expanding NATO and, at the same time, signing a special treaty between such an expanding NATO and Russia, a treaty that would confirm Russia's status as a major power and a friendly one?

The President. I don't know, I haven't thought of it in exactly those terms. I think that that's where Russia is right now. Right now, it's a major power and a friendly one. And I think that what we want to do is to try to work through our differences and find new ways we can cooperate. And that's an interesting suggestion you made, but I haven't had time to think it through, so I can't comment on it.

Poland-U.S. Trade

Mr. Lis. And Mr. President, what about economic partnership? Your administration stresses very often that such a partnership should be based more on trade than aid. But what can the United States do now to ease Polish exports to your country?

The President. That's one of the things I want to talk with President Walesa about when I'm in Poland and when I have the chance to meet with other leaders of Poland, what we can do to accelerate economic development and what we can do to help cushion the pain of all these changes.

Your country last year had the highest growth rate in all of Europe, 4 percent. And I believe that the potential is very great there. So I want to think about that because even if we lower our barriers to Polish products and services, because of the distances between our two countries and because of the pattern of commercial relationships that developed during the cold war period, that may not be enough. So I want to see what else we can do to accelerate trade and investment as well as certain specific aid programs. And I will be bringing some specific suggestions and offers to Poland that I hope will bear some fruit.

Mr. Lis. I would like to ask you about it, because we hear about a new, very interesting program of U.S.-Polish cooperation concerning social issues, a program that you're going to

present in Warsaw. Could you reveal at least some details of that program?

The President. I think it's only appropriate that I speak, really, to your representatives of your people and your government first. But I just think the United States should do what it can to help countries that have been brave and courageous as the Polish people have always been but very brave in going through this period of reform, not only to continue to grow economically but to deal with the social tensions that come from this sort of dramatic transformation. And we will be talking about that in Poland. But I don't—I think I had better wait until I go there and talk to your leaders about it first.

Mr. Lis. It was said for the first time in February by U.S. officials that Poland is one of 10 big emerging markets in the world. What does it mean? What does that statement, that opinion mean in practice?

The President. We identified, as you know, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan—that cluster—Poland, Argentina, a number of other countries, Turkey, Indonesia—that's not quite all, but that's close—countries that we see as having a very bright future, having a substantial population, a diversified, strong economy, and the ability to grow into major trading powers. And what that means is that over the next several years the United States, focusing on our Department of Commerce and our other agencies involved in trade and development, will make extraordinary efforts to promote American investment, to promote American trade, the selling of our products abroad, and to promote more purchases by Americans of products coming out of those countries.

And what we're trying to do is to say not what does the world look like this year and next year but what might the world look like in 10 years or 15 years or 20 years. And the 10 nations on that list we believe will be major, major factors in the global economy. And the United States, for its own interests as well as for the interests of the world, must be heavily involved with them. And Poland is a very important part of that strategy.

World Cup Soccer

Mr. Lis. Mr. President, the last question. I have to go back to the question which was asked by my friend from Germany: What is your prediction about the score of the game between the United States and Brazil on the Fourth of July?

The President. Well, obviously Brazil will be heavily favored. But I think we have a chance to win. I mean, after all it's our Independence Day and we—it's the first time we've ever been in the second round, and our people have played very well. In two of their three games they have exceeded expectations dramatically. So I wouldn't count the United States out.

Mr. Lis. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:34 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. It was embargoed for release by the Office of the Press Secretary until July 5.

Interview With the Polish Media
July 1, 1994

Partnership For Peace and NATO

Q. You won't mind if I will read. My English is not as good as yours, so that's a great help for me.

Mr. President, the Polish people would like to join the NATO alliance, not just participate in the so-called Partnership For Peace. What is your intention for the future or for Poland?

The President. Well, my intention is to support an expansion of NATO. But in order to expand NATO we have to get agreement from all the members of NATO about when to expand and how to expand.

I can say this: The expansion of NATO is not dependent on any bad developments in Russia or anyplace else, and nobody has a veto over the expansion of NATO. But last year when I raised this question with the other NATO members, there was a strong feeling that we weren't yet ready to expand NATO but that we had to do something to try to create a better security environment in all of Central and East-

ern Europe. And so the decision was made to launch the Partnership For Peace that was our idea, the United States idea, to try to get all the nations of Europe who would join to agree to do joint military exercises and to promise to respect one another's borders.

Now 19 countries that were formerly in the Soviet bloc or the Warsaw Pact countries and formerly Soviet Union countries, plus Sweden and Finland have all agreed to join. And we will be having our first military exercises in Poland later this year. So the security of Poland is very important to me personally and to all the NATO countries. And the history of Poland is very much on our mind. But I think that the Polish people should feel very good about the rapid acceptance of Partnership For Peace, the fact that the first military exercises will be in Poland, and the fact that we are committed to the expansion of NATO.

But after such a long time—NATO, after all, has existed for, well, more than four decades—I think it's just taking a while for the NATO members to decide exactly how membership should be expanded. Meanwhile, I think it's important not to underestimate this Partnership For Peace. Even when I proposed it, I didn't dream we'd have 19 countries immediately join from the former Communist bloc and then two others. There is a real desire to try to prove that we can unify Europe from a security point of view. And so I will keep pushing on it.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, President Yeltsin recently said that nobody could, how you say, disregard the Soviet—Russian responsibility for political and moral support of the countries which for centuries were marching together with Russia. It was said, it was broadcasted all over. And that's why the Poles, I suppose, American Poles and Poles in Poland, are unhappy about the possibility of a renewed pressure and imperialistic tendencies. As—[*inaudible*]—mentioned, his study of Poland is one of the examples of what could happen in our part of Europe. Will you be in a position to say in Warsaw that the United States would oppose tendencies to restore previous—[*inaudible*]—influence of Russia in Central and Eastern Europe?

The President. We don't recognize the whole sphere-of-influence concept. We do know that the Polish people are concerned about that, but if you look at what has happened—take two examples: first, the Russian troop behavior in the Baltics and, second, in Georgia—I think it is possible to put a less threatening interpretation on President Yeltsin's remarks—or the Russian presence in Bosnia. Let's take those three.

I have pushed personally very hard for the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the Baltics, and I am looking very much forward to my trip there to Latvia. The troops are out of Lithuania, and they are withdrawing from Latvia, and I think they will be out of Estonia before long. We have a few things to work out there. So there is a recognition on the part of the Russians that these are three truly independent countries and should be treated as such.

In the case of Georgia, the United Nations was unwilling to send a full-blown peacekeeping mission there because the situation did not meet the requirements of the U.N. for peacekeeping. That is, there was not an agreement between the two sides in the fight that would permit a peacekeeping mission. So Russia was willing to go in, and the Georgian Government, Mr. Shevardnadze invited them in as long as there were international observers there who could say, "Well, yes, they're not violating any standards or rules."

In the case of Bosnia, Russia has asserted its historic interest and affiliation with the Serbs, but in a way that has put the Russians in a position of pressuring the Serbs to stop attacks on the safe areas, to recognize the sanctity of Sarajevo, to accept the peace plan. So those are three areas where I would say the behavior of Russia, while more active in its area, in its neighborhood, if you will, has been largely constructive.

So I understand why the Poles are more worried about this than anyone else, believe me. I know well the history of Poland. I know how few years of true freedom and independence the Polish people have enjoyed in the 20th century. But I think it's important not to overreact to that. We watch this with great interest. And our concern and commitment to Poland is great. But I believe that we have a chance to work out a constructive relationship where the Russians say, "We want an active foreign policy, but we will recognize the freedom and the independence of all our neighbors." And that is our policy. That is what we are working for.

Ryshard Kuklinski

Q. Mr. President, Poles see the attitude of the United States toward Poland through some personal experiences of some Poles that served the United States. Among the most outstanding people was Colonel Ryshard Kuklinski, whom we are trying to get basically back to Poland, to enable him to go back to Poland. And there is a big outcry in the Polish community that the United States is not doing enough in this matter.

I have a personal letter—not a personal letter, I have a letter from a Polish organization in Chicago to you. There's a translation on the other piece of paper. And we are very curious: What are you going to do about Mr. Kuklinski? Are you going to mention him during your trip to Poland? Are you going to advocate for him?

The President. This is the first time anyone has brought this to my attention. I will look into it, and I will give you a response. I will get back in touch with you. But this is the first time I have been asked personally about this, so I will have to look into it. But I will be happy to look into it, and I'll get back in touch with you. Thank you.

Q. But you think you will be able to bring this matter up during the trip to Poland?

The President. I don't know. I just don't want to make a statement about something I never heard of before I read this letter. I knew nothing about this issue before I read this letter. So you'll have to give me some time to look into it, and I will give you an answer, yes or no. But I can't do it on the spur of the moment.

Russian Troop Withdrawals

Q. The United States has made a significant investment in promoting the Latvian-Russian troop withdrawal agreement. How will the U.S. guarantee that the Russian Federation will fulfill its commitment under these agreements, in particular the agreement on the Skrunda radar facility?

The President. Well, I think that will be fairly easy to guarantee because the United States essentially brokered that agreement. When I was in Moscow in January, I talked at great length with President Yeltsin about it personally. And then Vice President Gore has worked with Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, and we have been very active there. And as you know, we promised a significant amount of money to help to facilitate the transition. And since I think all sides want us to do the investment, I think that our investment guarantee is the best assurance that it will, in fact, occur.

But keep in mind, the resolution of that matter was the requirement the Russians had for a timely withdrawal from Latvia. So from the Latvian point of view and from the Baltic point of view, I think what you want is the appropriate withdrawal, except they will stay around there for a little while as we work this out.

But I feel quite comfortable about that. I see no reason to believe, particularly after the major troop components are gone, that the Russians won't follow through on their commitment. It's in their interest to follow through with on it now that we have this agreement and we've put up the money.

Polish-American Radio and TV

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, a domestic, because I represent the only Polish television outside of Warsaw, daily television outside of Warsaw. There are 12 million Polish-Americans living in this country. Do you foresee any incentives for businesses to produce radio and television programming on the national level?

The President. I don't understand the question.

Q. This is a chance to grow, for the Polish—I'm talking about ethnic groups like Polish-Americans, Latvians, Lithuanians, to be able to have programming on the national level. It means for the businesses to have some incentive to—tax deductions—like other ethnic minorities have. I mean, the Polish-Americans are not regarded as ethnic but——

The President. Oh, I see. You mean like the minority requirements under the Federal Communications Commission to have African-Americans own television stations or radio stations.

Q. Yes, yes. We are ethnic, but we are not ethnic.

The President. I see. This is the first time anyone ever asked me that. Why don't you—I just never thought about it. Why don't you put together a letter to me, write me a letter stating what you think, how you think we should do it. In other words, what should be the standard? Who should be included? How should we involve other minority groups or ethnic groups in this? I would be happy to consider it; it's just no one ever asked me before.

I do believe—let me just say, for whatever it's worth, I think that there is a difference here, though. Because under the law, the idea was to get more African-American ownership of general audience radio or general audience television. And I don't think that applies to, let's say, African-American newspapers or African-American—at least printed material. It may or may not apply to African-Americans' radio stations.

But I will look into it. If you will write me a letter about it, I'll look into it, see exactly how it works and whether we should apply or consider applying it to others. It's really a matter of law; the Congress, I think would have to change the law. But they might be willing to do that.

Q. I traveled to USIA, to the WORLDNET satellite station, and I talked to the people there. And they feel that there is a need for joint business and government actions. I don't know how you also perceive the situation, possibility of changing this——

The President. I basically think that diversified ethnic press is a good thing for America. We have so many different people—if you look, Los Angeles County has members of 150 different racial and ethnic groups alone.

Q. And Chicago, 163.

Partnership For Peace and NATO

Q. I hope I'll be excused for my trembling voice. Mr. President, Polish-Americans in the U.S., and all Poles in Poland as well, with great anxiety are observing a development of the conception of so-called strategic agreement between Washington and Moscow, because it would carry away Poland's acceptance to the NATO. Mr. President, what is your point of view toward Poland's—[*inaudible*]—to become a full member of North Atlantic Treaty?

The President. Well, I will answer it the way I answered the first question. We first of all believe—I believe NATO should be and will be expanded. In order to do that, all the members of NATO, not just the United States, must decide on when and how that will occur. From my perspective, our relationship with Russia will not and must not include the proposition that any country should have veto over any other country's membership with NATO or that something bad has to happen in Russia before we expand NATO. I just—I think that is not something the Polish people should be concerned about.

Instead, what I think should be emphasized is the readiness of the Polish military forces, the success of these upcoming military exercises. We are doing military exercises with Poland and NATO in Poland for the first time this fall, and it will be the first exercises of the Partnership For Peace. So I wouldn't be too worried about that if I were the people of Poland.

I understand the historic concerns; I understand them very well. But the United States has not made an agreement to give any country veto power over membership in NATO, nor has NATO made a decision that it will not expand until there is some bad development in Central or Eastern Europe.

So I think that in the ordinary course of time, NATO will expand, Poland will be eligible. I think it will be fine. And in the meantime, the best way to build security is to make the most of this Partnership For Peace because, in order to get into the Partnership For Peace, every country must commit to respect every other country's borders and because, once in, we then began to do joint military exercises together, which will build the confidence of all the NATO members in expanding membership.

Q. Mr. President, I am wondering, couldn't we start to refer to Poland as Central European country and lose the Eastern European connotation? Poland was always the middle of Europe, never the east.

The President. I think of Poland as Central Europe. I agree with that. And I think Poland should be characterized as Central Europe. But when I mentioned the Partnership For Peace, there are a number of Eastern European countries that are also in the Partnership For Peace. But I agree with you, it should be considered Central Europe.

Q. Thank you.

Purchase of U.S. Military Equipment

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned the possible exercises, military exercises, in Poland. There are in Congress, the Senate right now, I think, five amendments concerning various aspects of the Polish situation. And some of them are opposed by—again, I repeat—opposed by the Department of State. Particularly, we are interested in the fact that Poland is trying to get the permission to purchase or lease military equipment from the United States. And it is our under-

standing that the State Department is rather opposing of this——

The President. We support the transfer of certain military equipment to Poland. The question is—and we consider Poland an ally and a friend. We have no problem there. The question is we have some general rules which we apply to everyone about certain kinds of equipment that we will not sell. And the issue here is if, as I understand the issue, if we depart from the rules we have for everyone for Poland, then will we be forced to change our policy in general because people will say, "Well, yes, Poland is your friend and Poland is a democracy, but so are we, so you must include us in anything you do for them."

So the State Department, when they issue a letter, has to consider not just Poland but what will our policy be when someone else comes along and says, "We have been also a friend, and we are also a democracy, and give us the same treatment." That's really what is at stake here. We have no problems with transfers of a lot of military equipment to Poland, but we have to be careful if we get into something that we don't do anywhere else, how shall we describe the difference in the Polish situation and others.

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, I ask a question about a thing that is not only of Polish concern here but of all immigrants in the United States. We are kind of noticing a toughening of the policy towards immigrants or preparations to this kind of a process. How do you perceive that matter? Will you support any toughening of the U.S. policy towards immigrants, no matter legal or illegal?

The President. Well, first of all, I support a vigorous immigration policy. This is a nation of immigrants. Only the American Indians are not immigrants. And some of them actually came across from Russia millions of years ago when we were tied through Alaska to Russia. So we are all immigrants.

The only thing that I have supported is stronger requirements on illegal immigration because the number of illegal immigrants is largely concentrated in a small number of States, in California and Texas and New York, to some extent, New Jersey. And where there is a large legal immigrant population, the costs of dealing with that largely fall on a few States. And the feelings against immigrants in general tend to get very high.

For example, California is one of the most diverse States—ethnically diverse States in America. And yet, now there is a great feeling there among some people that we ought to shut off immigration. Why? Because they have a high unemployment rate and a lot of illegal immigrants. So I have tried to help California to strengthen its border patrol and to do some other things which will reduce the flow of illegal immigrants into California. But I do that because I do not want any further restrictions on legal immigration.

And I think our country has been greatly strengthened by immigrants. And I think that all we should want is a set of rules that everyone follows for how we expand our population. But I have no plans, for example, to try to limit the number of legal immigrants from Central Europe or from any other place in the world.

Russian Troop Withdrawals

Q. Last year at your Vancouver summit with President Yeltsin, you promised that the U.S. would provide $6 million to build 450 housing units in Russia for officers withdrawn from the Baltic States. There are reports that much of these funds administered by the U.S. AID are not being utilized to benefit the withdrawing officers. In view of the fact that the U.S. will be financing several additional thousand housing units for these officers, how will the U.S. monitor that these apartments will actually be given to officers withdrawn from the Baltic countries?

The President. What are they saying, that the——

Q. That the money is actually being allocated in different——

The President. To people who are not officers or to something other than houses?

Q. Right. Both, actually.

The President. Well, let me say this. We are trying to get—right now we are trying to get a better oversight on all of our Russian aid programs in general. But I would say it would not be in the best interest of the Government of Russia for this money not to be spent in the appropriate way. Because after all, if we make a commitment and we deliver the money and they withdraw the soldiers, which they have to do—it's part of the deal—then I would think it would not be in their interest not to build the houses for the soldiers, because the whole

idea is to try to stabilize the domestic political situation by doing the right thing by the soldiers who are coming home and giving them some way to make a decent life for themselves.

So I think if this has occurred, it is not a good thing for the Russian Government and for Russian society. It's not in their interest. But we are trying to improve our oversight of all these programs because, as you pointed out, we have actually committed to spend even more money on housing to get the withdrawal done in a fast way.

President's Visit to Poland

Q. Mr. President what is your main objective when you visit Poland?

The President. My main objective is to reaffirm the strong ties between the United States and Poland and to reaffirm our commitment here in the United States to helping Poland achieve a successful economic transition—the Polish economy, as you know, grew by 4 percent last year, more than any other economy in Europe—and to do so with some help with easing the social tensions caused by the transition. And I have some ideas and some suggestions that I wish to share with President Walesa and then perhaps in the Polish Parliament, too. You know I'm going to speak in the Polish Parliament. I must say I'm very excited about it. It's a great honor. I'm so excited; the idea that I will be able to address the Parliament, that I will be able to visit some monuments of places I've only read about or dreamed of, it's a great thing not only for me as President but just for me as a citizen and for my wife. We're very excited about that.

We're also, I might say, very excited about going to the Baltics. I grew up in a little town in Arkansas that had a substantial Lithuanian population. So I grew up knowing about the problems of the Baltic nations. Interestingly enough, we had a lot of people from Central and Eastern Europe, a lot of people from the Czech Republic in my hometown in Arkansas who came down from Chicago, most of them came from Chicago, and moved to my State because it was a little warmer but still it had four seasons. So I'm very excited about it.

Poland-U.S. Relations

Q. Your decision, Mr. President, to consult Mid and East European issues with American ethnic groups from this region was widely welcomed and accepted with great appreciation. I am talking about this meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, you couldn't unfortunately attend. Mr. President, will the Department of State continue this kind of link with ethnic Americans?

The President. Yes. We will do a lot of it right here out of the White House also. I have had—I am taking about a dozen Polish-American leaders to Poland with me. I have had leaders of various ethnic groups into the White House to meet with me personally, as well as the Vice President's trip to Milwaukee. And we will continue to do this as long as I am President. I think it's very, very important. It helps us to make good policies as well.

You know, for example, the United States is today the biggest foreign investor in Poland. I think about 44 percent of all the foreign investment in Poland comes from the U.S. The Polish Enterprise Fund has been responsible for about 10,000 new jobs in Poland. And I want this to grow. And I think it has to grow through the involvement of citizens, not just government officials. So I will do more and more of that.

Q. You have my thoughts, sir.

The President. Thank you very much.

Q. Thank you.

Ryshard Kuklinski

The President. Thank you all for coming.

I will get on this. I did not know of this case; I will get right on it.

Q. Sir, this is not from me, now. I would like to make a statement here that this letter is not only from the Alliance of the Polish Clubs in Chicago, this really reflects widespread attitude of Poles and concern of Poles about Mr. Kuklinski. And we kind of feel that the United States has somewhat an obligation to do something about it because Mr. Kuklinski helped a lot, contributed so much to the cause of the world peace and defeating the Communist system. And now he cannot even go back to his own country that he loves and he wants to go.

The President. I'll get on it.

Q. Thank you, sir.

The President: When I was a boy I went to school with a man named Richard Kuklinski. [*Laughter*]

Q. Oh, really? This can help him.

The President. I wonder if he was related to this man.

Q. I hope it will help him as well.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 6:07 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In the interview, the President referred to naturalized U.S. citizen Ryshard Kuklinski, former Polish military officer who would face imprisonment for espionage if he returned to Poland. This interview was embargoed for release by the Office of the Press Secretary until July 5. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks on the Upcoming Economic Summit
July 5, 1994

Thank you very much, Secretary Brown, Ambassador Kantor, Secretary Reich, Deputy Secretary Talbott, National Security Adviser Lake, National Economic Adviser Bob Rubin, to my Special Assistant for Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, and so many others who have worked hard to make this upcoming trip a success. I'd like to also recognize and acknowledge the presence of the members of the diplomatic community who are here today, as well as the leaders from business and labor, Government, and academia, many faces of our national interests that seek to advance our international economic policies.

It is fitting that we should gather here at the moment of my departure for the G–7 meeting, as well as our trips to Latvia and Poland and Germany, fitting that we should be here because it was here last year that I signed into law the North American Free Trade Agreement. NAFTA was more than a trade agreement; because of the circumstances surrounding its debate, it was a defining moment in our modern history. It was ratified only after a principled and momentous debate over how the United States should enter into the post-cold-war era. Would we hunker down, turn away, and ultimately, in my view, suffer a slow and steady decline in our living standards, or would we, instead, take a different path? Would we build new walls where old walls had crumbled, or would we embrace eagerly the challenges of a new and rapidly changing economy? Our vote on NAFTA was our answer to that question. We chose to embrace the world. It is for us now to shape what kind of world we will live in.

This moment in history demands that we master the rapid, even dazzling pace of economic change and ensure that our people have the confidence and skills they need to reap the rewards that are there for them in a growing global economy. That is the purpose of my Presidency. And the mission to Europe on which I embark tonight is simple: to create jobs and a world of prosperity.

We are in the midst of a rare moment of opportunity. If our people have the confidence, the vision, the wisdom to seize this moment, we can make this a new season of renewal for Americans and for the rest of the world as well.

At the G–7 summit is Naples and in visits to Latvia, Poland, and Germany, we will seek to find ways to create jobs and better prepare our people to fill them, to develop the infrastructure for the new global economy, to commit to sustainable development for all the nations of the Earth, to continue the economic, the political, the security integration of the new democracies into the family of free nations.

Even as we speak and meet here, powerful forces are shaking and remaking the world. That is the central fact of our time. It is up to us to understand those forces and respond in the proper way so that every man and woman within our reach, every boy and girl, can live to the fullest of their God-given capacities.

A global economy, constant innovation, instant communication, they're cutting through our world like a new river, providing both power and disruption to all of us who live along its course. The cold war has clearly given way to a new birth of freedom in Central and Eastern Europe. And this means enormous opportunities. But citizens find themselves buffeted by changing tides, cut loose from their moorings, facing stagnant incomes, shrinking job prospects, social problems of staggering dimensions. Stubborn unemployment is especially endemic in Europe. And here in the United States, our incomes are still largely stagnant, even when the economy is growing.

Here in America we're preparing for this new world by putting our fiscal house in order, dramatically cutting our deficit, by aggressively opening our efforts to increase access to foreign markets. We're helping our working people adapt and prosper in the global economy by creating a system of standards for world class education and a better system for moving our young people from school to work when they don't go to college and better opportunities for people who do go to college and, finally, a system of lifetime learning and reemployment for those who lose their jobs. And we must work to give them health care security as well.

From the first day of preschool to the last day before retirement, every American will have to continue to be a learner. And that is the lesson that every American must be taught from the first day of preschool to the first day on the job to the last day of retirement. Lifetime learning is not an option. And so our responsibility is to be able to say to every American, whatever the economy brings, you will be prepared to make the best of it.

Even as we sow the seeds of our own renewal, we also must recognize that what happens around the world affects us here at home. We must have global economic growth, because when global markets grow, our exports boom, and that means higher paying jobs here in America. If workers in other nations embrace protectionism, that means a race to the bottom in which all will lose. If the nations of Central and Eastern Europe fall backward into chaos or authoritarianism, then legitimate security needs will soak up an ever greater part of our budget in the future.

Our challenge is the challenge of all advanced nations. We will only act most effectively when we act together. We began to do that a year ago in Tokyo at the first G–7 summit of my Presidency. For years, the G–7 did less than it could, but in the past year we've replaced a decade of drift with a real commitment to action. We closed the deal on the world trade talks that were stalled for years. And with our help, the once-crippled Russian economy is struggling to its feet. We have shown together that bit by bit and year by year, the decisions made at these G–7 meetings really can make a difference.

For a decade, our out-of-control budget deficit robbed us of the standing to press our partners to act. Indeed, year after year at these meetings our friends and allies hammered us about the deficit and claimed that they were unable to listen to our suggestions about what they could do to promote global growth. Well, now, instead of having the biggest deficit in the G–7, we have among the smallest.

With the largest deficit cut in our history, including $255 billion in spending cuts, we now have the standing and the credibility to speak and to be heard. We're on the brink of passing a new budget, I might add, which with new spending cuts, including the first reduction in aggregate discretionary domestic spending in 25 years, will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

Now, we have to use this newfound strength to address how to give the citizens of our Nation and all other nations the confidence they need to prosper in uncertain times. We have to move from coping with crises to planning for prosperity. In other words, we have to lay the foundation for the 21st century economy, one in which change will be the order of the day, and the real question will be whether change is our friend or our enemy.

Our first job is to create jobs and to develop the high-skill work force to fill them. It may seem obvious, but many, many of the advanced economies of the world have been unsuccessful in creating jobs for several years now. In Tokyo, we agreed on a common strategy to spur expansion. And today, growth in the G–7 is 2½ times faster than it was a year ago. America has powered that expansion. With 40 percent of the annual income of the G–7, we have produced fully three-quarters of the growth and almost 100 percent of the new jobs. Our exports are rising faster than those of any other G–7 nation. We will continue to do everything we can to expand on this record by expanding trade.

Last year when we ended 7 years of global gridlock, leading to the signing of the largest trade pact ever with the Uruguay round of GATT, we knew we were on the right track. Now, we have to lead the world in ratifying it.

These trade agreements are good for our country. Thanks to NAFTA—you heard what Secretary Brown said—let me just mention one thing that was of particular concern during the debate. This year we are exporting automobiles to Mexico at 5 times the rate of a year ago. If you look at what NAFTA did and then you

compare the potential of GATT, you get a sense of the importance of ratification here in the United States and in the other countries. GATT means a $744 billion tax cut over the next decade for the industrialized countries and in half a million new American jobs alone. Congress must pass the agreement this year. And all the G–7 nations must work to implement it in good faith.

But we know also that we have to do more. At the Detroit jobs conference in March, for the first time ever, finance and labor ministers of all these countries began a serious conversation about the economic well-being of working people. For all the advanced countries, new competition from rapidly developing nations places an even greater premium on the skills of their work force even as it places greater pressures on wages of their workers.

We've got a lot to learn from each other. We can learn a lot from the German apprenticeship and health care systems, from the French child care system, from the way the Italians in the northern part of Italy cooperate in research and development and marketing among small businesses. We have things to learn from every nation in the G–7. Every nation is addressing these qualities.

I have talked to the Japanese about it. I have talked to the British about it. I have talked to the Canadians about it. I was so impressed to see the Prime Minister of Britain carrying around a little plastic card which had the goals for British education in the year 2000. And it sounded very much like the legislation that I signed in the Congress just a few weeks ago.

We know we can learn from one another. We know that the United States because of its adaptable work force has been able to create more jobs. But we also know that every nation has got to work harder to create even more jobs and increase incomes.

In Naples we will be pressing forward with this common agenda. And let me say that, to the best of my knowledge, no group of advanced nations ever in all of human history has ever tried to work together in common on these problems, the problems of ordinary citizens that lie behind the complex statistics we read about in the newspapers every day.

Our second goal in Naples will be to build a new infrastructure for this new economy. In the 21st century, there must be a nerve system to carry the ideas, the information, the investments of the new economy. These will require new technologies and certainly the building of what the Vice President always talks about in the information superhighway. We must create this infrastructure and use it to increase productivity so that we can expand overall growth within the limits of our planet's resources. We will begin to lay those plans in Naples.

Third, we will discuss the tinderbox issues of global population and the environmental crisis. In the coming years, prosperity and security will depend more than ever on progress on the environment and sustainable development. We must stabilize population growth, because poverty is both the cause and an effect of exploding population. Otherwise, we will find ourselves with a worsening shortage of the food to feed future generations, a shortage of the environmental sustenance needed for them to live in peace, instead of closing up camp and moving across national borders, and a shortage of the capacity to create jobs to sustain the people of the 21st century.

Fourth, we will continue to work with Russia and the other new democracies to make the difficult transition from command economies to free markets, from repressive regimes to open societies. In Tokyo, Russia was in dire economic straits. We mustered the international community to provide emergency aid for reform. Already $26 billion of the promised $43 billion has been disbursed. The Russian Government deserves enormous credit for staying on the path of reform, especially in these last several months. And slowly but surely, reform is working. Today, the Russian budget deficit is a smaller percentage of its income than the deficit in some other European countries. Russian monthly inflation has dropped to single digits. And half of all Russian workers are now employed in the private sector. Life in Russia is still difficult, but now her people have tangible reason to hope. And in Naples, for the first time, President Yeltsin will join our ranks as a full participant in discussing political issues.

The G–7 will strive to bring the economies of Central and Eastern Europe fully into the world economy with trade and long-range reform. We want those nations to hold to the path of economic reform and democracy, for those are the only true routes to prosperity and peace. But the prospect of renewal will only be complete if Europe is whole, if the young democracies are fully integrated into security

and into the society of that continent. That's why we have worked so hard to create NATO's Partnership For Peace, to link peaceful nations committed to respecting one another's borders, from Vancouver to Vladivostok. They must believe that this difficult journey is worthwhile.

To that end, I have the great honor of visiting Riga, Latvia, to be the first American President to touch free Baltic soil. I will visit Warsaw, where a free people is coming into its own, where the Polish economy is now growing faster than any other economy in Europe, and eager to be a full partner in our deliberations for the future.

And then I will end the trip in Berlin, where for 50 years, our Presidents made pilgrimages to proclaim our commitment to freedom. It will be a privilege to represent all of you as the first President to visit that city since that glorious day when the Germans united to topple the Berlin Wall. There I will witness the end of a proud chapter in our own history, as the last American brigade comes home from Berlin. As the last detail on freedom's frontier returns, we must remember again the dire consequences when America withdrew from the world after World War I. So, these troops will leave Germany and Europe because their mission is complete, but some 100,000 others will stay, working through NATO to promote peace and to secure the Continent. And we will stay through our commitment to trade and political integration.

A month ago when I represented our Nation in Europe, it was on a journey of remembrance, to honor the generation that saved the world for freedom in World War II. Tonight I return to Europe on another mission, to join others in renewing the world that the generation of World War II has left to us.

It will serve us to remember that when World War II was won, profound uncertainty clouded the future. Europe and Japan were buried in rubble. Their peoples were weary. People did not know what to expect or what would happen. But because of the vision of the people who were our predecessors here in the United States and the other allies, new institutions were created and the path that was followed after World War I was abandoned and instead the world was embraced with optimism and hope and a determination to make the world work, not just for Americans but for our friends and allies and, indeed, our former foes as well. It is that spirit, that idea, which must animate us today.

We have had a good year in America since the last G–7 meeting, but we are nowhere near where we need to be. We are simply moving on the path that will take us. And I want all of you to know that as long as I am President, I will continue to work for these things: an integrated and strong security partnership in Europe, the right kind of political partnership, and continued expansion of our economic frontiers. I hope you will continue to support that direction.

Think of the world you want the children in this country to live in 20, 30, 40 years from now. It is within our power to make it, but we must make the right decisions today. This trip is an important part of that decisionmaking. I hope you will wish me well, but more importantly, I hope you will support these efforts here at home and, as you can, around the world.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:08 p.m. at the Mellon Auditorium.

Statement on Signing Transportation Legislation

July 5, 1994

Today I have signed into law H.R. 1758, an act to revise, codify, and enact certain general and permanent laws related to transportation.

Section 31134 directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Regulatory Review Panel. The legislation grants panelists a position within the Federal Government that is endowed with tenure and continuing duties as well as significant authority, including the authority to compel the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a regulatory proceeding and to prescribe final regulations. For this reason, panelists are officers of the United States. Fourteen of the fifteen mem-

bers of the panel are to be appointed from lists submitted by two committees of the Congress. The Constitution prohibits the Congress from sharing in the power to appoint officers of the United States other than through the Senate's confirmation role. As such, no statute may require an appointment to be made from a list submitted by a Member, committee, or other agent of the Congress. I therefore do not interpret section 31134(c)(2) as binding and direct the Secretary of Transportation to regard any lists submitted pursuant to section 31134(c)(2) as advisory.

I also note that section 42104(c) purports to enact a legislative veto with respect to specific regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor pertaining to air carrier employees. The Supreme Court has ruled definitively that legislative vetoes are unconstitutional. Under the Court's precedents, the legislative veto provision contained in section 42104(c) is severable from H.R. 1758. I therefore instruct the Secretary of Labor to disregard section 42104(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 5, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 1758, approved July 5, was assigned Public Law No. 103–272.

Statement on Signing Federal Housing Administration Legislation
July 5, 1994

Home ownership is one of the foundation stones of the American dream. Renewing and expanding this dream is one of my Administration's highest priorities and deepest commitments.

Our economic plan, which did so much to lower interest rates, has helped make homes affordable for more people. As more Americans realize that home ownership is within their reach, many of them turn to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) for Government assistance. These programs, some of which operate at a profit to the Federal Government, have enabled millions of Americans to enjoy the pride and sense of accomplishment that come with owning your own home.

As new home purchases and refinancings continue at a rapid rate, single-family home purchasers will soon be unable to do business with the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Ginnie Mae—absent corrective action—because the increased demand for loans has exhausted their loan authority. That is why the Congress, acting responsibly and in a fiscally prudent manner, adopted a supplemental appropriation to replenish these funds. Today I am signing into law H.R. 4568, which provides a supplemental appropriation for HUD and Ginnie Mae so that these agencies can continue their good work in helping low- and middle-income Americans build their piece of the American dream.

Specifically, the Act provides: (1) increased loan commitment authority of $35 billion for the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance program; (2) increased Ginnie Mae loan guarantee commitment authority of $55 billion; (3) an increase of $3 billion in loan volume for condominium and other housing insurance programs; and (4) an additional $18 million in budget authority to subsidize mortgages for the purchase or construction of rental housing. Equally important, this legislation will not add a penny to the Federal deficit. So, as we continue putting our fiscal house in order, this legislation will ensure that home ownership becomes the order of the day for more and more Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 5, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 4568, approved July 5, was assigned Public Law No. 103–275.

Statement on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty Headquarters Relocation
July 5, 1994

The Radios made a significant contribution to the victory of freedom during the cold war. All friends of liberty appreciate the strong support of the German Government and in particular the Bavarian officials over the last four decades. With this move, the Radios begin a new chapter in the continuing struggle to consolidate democracy throughout the former Communist bloc. I am grateful to President Havel and the Czech Government for its generous offer and look forward to working with it to ensure the Radios' important work continues.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary on the decision to accept the offer of the Czech Government to make the former Parliament building in Prague available to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Exchange With Reporters During Discussions With Baltic Leaders in Riga, Latvia
July 6, 1994

Baltic Nations and Russia

Q. Mr. President, did you make any progress in your conversation with Mr. Yeltsin?

The President. I think we're making good progress. I think we're making good progress toward completing the troop withdrawals on schedule, working out some of the remaining controversies over the rights of Latvian minorities. I feel good about it.

We talked about that here, as well as about our economic cooperation. And this agreement is, I think, just the beginning of what will be a long and very deep relationship between these two countries and with the United States and the Baltics generally.

Q. Did Yeltsin give you a firm commitment on August 31 withdrawal?

The President. Well, he certainly clearly wants to complete the troop withdrawal, and he's worked very hard. You know, this has been a priority issue between the two of us, and I think that it will proceed apace. I feel good about where we are right now.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:30 a.m. in the White Room at Riga Castle. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Baltic Leaders in Riga
July 6, 1994

President Clinton. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Last year I had the pleasure of meeting these three Presidents, President Ulmanis, President Meri, and President Brazauskas, during the opening of the U.N. General Assembly. It is a great honor for me to see them again here as the first American President to set foot on free Baltic soil. On Monday, my country celebrated the birth of democracy in America 218 years ago. Today, on behalf of all Americans, I salute the Baltic countries for another birth of democracy. And I salute the Baltic people for the courage, the perseverance, and the discipline that made independence possible.

We have just had a very productive session. We noted the considerable progress made since we met last year and focused on the goals we all share: to expand democracy, security, and the broad integration of the Baltic countries with the West.

Much of our discussion focused on the hope for an historic withdrawal of the last Russian troops from Latvia and Estonia by August 31st. I congratulate President Ulmanis on the withdrawal agreement he and President Yeltsin signed in Moscow. The United States is prepared to double the level of assistance it is providing, up to $4 million, to help Latvia to take down the unfinished radar structure at Skrunda.

President Meri and I discussed the status of the Russian-Estonian talks on the withdrawal agreement. I believe the remaining differences between the two nations are narrow and can be resolved with flexibility on both sides. I told President Meri of my intentions to discuss this subject with President Yeltsin at Naples.

To help reach this milestone the United States has more than doubled the housing vouchers we will provide to qualified Russian officers who want to resettle from Latvia and Estonia into Russia. The United States is also providing a $2 million package of assistance as part of the international effort to restore the environment at the former nuclear training site at Paldiski, Estonia.

We also discussed the issue of ethnic minorities. I believe all three Presidents share my view on this matter. A tolerant and inclusive approach is needed to integrate these groups into the political and social life of all the countries. The progress made so far on troop withdrawals provides hope that the new democratic Russia, unlike the Soviet Union, can work with the Baltic countries for peace in the region.

The three Presidents and I discussed progress in developing active bilateral and multilateral defense relationships. I'm pleased that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were among the first states to join the Partnership For Peace with NATO. In recognition of their role I have asked the Congress in the budget for 1995 for $10 million for the Baltic peacekeeping battalion and other peacekeeping troops in Central and Eastern Europe.

We also covered the remarkable progress the Baltic nations have made in reforming their economies. Supporting the economic reintegration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with the West is a top priority of the United States. The hardships of transition are real, but the prospect of better times is visible. The trade and investment prospects are excellent. Just yesterday in Washington, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation signed an agreement with US West Telephone Corporation to ensure a $200 million telecommunications deal with Lithuania.

Today we're announcing the American membership of the board of directors of the Baltic American Enterprise Fund, headed by Ambassador Rozanne Ridgway. Over the next several years, this fund will provide $50 million to develop businesses in the Baltic States.

From our own history, Americans know that winning the fight for independence is followed by even more arduous and difficult struggles for economic stability and national security. The people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have hard work ahead. But our meeting today convinces me that that work can and will be done successfully.

President Guntis Ulmanis of Latvia. Mr. Presidents, dear audience, everybody who hears me today, I would like to welcome our guests to Latvia, President of the U.S.A. and the Presidents of Lithuania and Estonia.

I think that this is a historic event. It's one more step in the direction of consolidation of Baltic independence. In this connection, I want to announce that the three Presidents of the three Baltic States have just signed a common statement in which the course of events of today has been reflected, and the main problematic issues have been mentioned that either promote or interfere with the consolidation of Baltic independence and economic growth.

I fully agree to President Clinton about the viewpoints and measures and suggestions on which we have achieved mutual agreement. And I would like to lend emphasis on several issues that we discussed in greater detail.

The three Presidents of the three Baltic States consider the main issue being the security issue of the Baltic region. The security—and the main issue here is the further cooperation within the project of Partnership For Peace, promotion of activity within this project not only on our side but also on behalf of the U.S.A. and other countries as well as finding the demands that the members of the Partnership For Peace should meet.

We also talked about the duties and responsibilities of the member states of this project. Today we can point out that we have talked about the issues that support partnership should become only one stage in the course of consolidation of peace and security in the region. And the ultimate aim would be the guarantee of national security and joining the security structures.

We also touched the issues of economic growth. It's of course clear that we all want and we are all convinced that Russia will withdraw its army on the 31st of August, and we see no reasons why it shouldn't be completed.

The next issue we addressed was economic issues—economic problems in the Baltic States, and the main issue was the development of energy resources so that the Baltic States could irreversibly become independent. So economic independence is essential for national independence. We talked of gas and electricity and other energy sources. We touched also social issues, educational issues. We talked about how to stimulate the youth from the Baltic States to gain education not only in the Baltic States but so that they can access educational systems in other countries. We also think that the number of students now studying in the U.S.A. is much too little.

We also addressed the issue of the criminal situation and inner security of the Baltic States. And all the four Presidents supported the importance of this issue, and I understood that the President of the U.S.A. gave us all the grounds to think that the U.S.A. will participate in these processes also with practical assistance and also by sharing their know-how.

Speaking about security, we touched upon the issue of the army, about armament and about further possibilities to create normal mobile defense structures that could guarantee the security of the Baltic States.

Maybe one of the central issues today was the relationship with Russia. We touched upon the issues about the withdrawal of the Russian troops, about the monitor system with regard to Skrunda radar station, about the prospects of the situation in Khaliningrad region, and so on and so forth. It's clear that, speaking about the relationship with Russia, all the four Presidents came to a common agreement that this relationship should be normal, interstate relationship where the interests and rights of all countries should be respected.

I want to express once again my respect and gratitude to the U.S. President who found it possible to visit the Baltic States and talk to the three Presidents of the Baltic States and gave his viewpoint with regard to the further development of the Baltic States.

Thank you.

Now, I would like to invite you to ask questions.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Does your phone call to Mr. Yeltsin on the eve of your visit to Riga have certain concerns about the possible Russian reaction to this visit?

President Clinton. First of all, I called President Yeltsin to tell him where I was going on this trip and to talk about my firm conviction that we must continue with the schedule on Russian troop withdrawal. And that is something I've worked on since I first became President. I've worked very hard on it, and the United States has tried to support an orderly withdrawal in many ways, including funds for housing for Russian troops that are going back home to Russia as well as for dealing with specific issues like this Skrunda radar facility. So I wanted to just get an update from him about where he thought things were and tell him what I was going to do.

He raised the issue, which he always does, about being concerned about the condition—the living conditions and the political rights of Russian people who stay in the Baltic States and become part of the minority population of the new democracies here. And I reaffirmed the position that I always have taken, which is the position of the United States within the United States, which is that in democracies, minorities have to have certain rights to participate and are entitled to fair treatment, and that that was the position of the United States, but that I thought the troop withdrawal should continue on schedule. It was a very straightforward conversation, as all of our conversations are.

Securing Baltic Independence

Q. Mr. Clinton, you and your Baltic colleagues hope that things are going to go right in Russia. But supposing they don't? Supposing in 2 years' time we have a President Zhirinovsky or some other hard-liner in Moscow? Can you now assure your Baltic colleagues here that America will not permit them again, either by

subversion or bullying or any other means, to come back under Moscow's sphere of influence?

President Clinton. Well, sir, the whole purpose of the Partnership For Peace was to move toward that sort of security. Everybody who signed up for the Partnership For Peace had to, as a condition of its participation, recognize the territorial integrity and the independence of all the participating countries, and we now have 21 nations doing that.

I think it is obvious from all the actions the United States has taken on security, on political matters, on economic matters, that we are trying to do everything we can to secure the independence of the Baltics. I also think it is obvious that we should deal with the world as it is and deal with people based on what they say and do. And I think that's where we are now.

I don't think you should predict the worst in any country. And I can only report to you that we are laying the foundations that I think are most likely to guarantee the long-term security and independence of these nations.

Haiti

Q. We have had a—[*inaudible*]—policy that was announced in Haiti before you left. Right now you are talking about opening new safe havens. It seems sort of confusing to understand why this is going to somehow speed the leaving of the military dictators, what one has to do with the other. Do you have confidence at this point that your policy is really going to lead to the departure of these people?

President Clinton. I think the answer to that is yes, I believe it will. But in May when I announced the original policy of ending direct return, I said we would seek participation as we needed it from other countries, and that's what we're doing. And I think that it's an appropriate thing to do. But I also think the sanctions are having an impact.

Russian Withdrawals

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—President Yeltsin's wish to tie troop withdrawal from Baltics with the situation of Russian minorities in these countries—I mean, Latvia and Estonia. Thank you.

President Clinton. We believe the two subjects should not be linked and that the withdrawal should continue, but we do support appropriate protections and rights for Russian minorities.

Q. Did you get assurance from the Baltic Presidents that Russian minorities would be treated properly and they would be nondiscriminatory? Apparently, they don't feel that way now.

President Clinton. I thought that their statements to me over lunch were quite forthcoming about that. I felt good about it. I believe—let me say—let's look at this in the context of where we are. There is an agreement with Latvia for withdrawal of Russian troops by August 31st. The troop withdrawals have been completed in Lithuania. There are remaining differences to be resolved between Estonia and Russia. President Meri and I discussed that in some detail today, and I think the differences are narrow and will be bridged in the appropriate timeframe. And I'm going to do what I can to be helpful in that regard.

Role of Baltic Nations

Q. Mr. President, what is the role of the Baltic States in this post-Communist situation in Europe, and what is the main motivation of your arrival to Latvia today?

President Clinton. Well, the role of the Baltic States in the post-Communist world is, first and foremost, to provide a free and good existence for the citizens of the nations to people who live in Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. But I think that the role of the Baltic States is greater than that. First, the Baltic States have agreed to participate in the Partnership For Peace. Secondly, the Baltic States have achieved a degree of economic stability and success that is much admired throughout Europe and indeed throughout the world, different in different countries, perhaps there's a higher growth rate in one country, a lower inflation rate in another country, but certainly, more success than many other countries have had in converting from a Communist economy to a more open market economy. I think that's also very important.

I came here today because the Baltics are important to the United States. We have one million Americans who have roots in these three nations. We have always recognized these three nations as independent nations. We never recognized the loss of freedom and independence in the Baltics. And we have supported and admired the remarkable transformation in these nations in the last few years.

So I came here to try to build on the successes of the end of the cold war, to enhance

our security ties, to enhance our political cooperation, to enhance your economic development and our economic partnership because those things are important to the United States and important to the rest of the world.

Russian Withdrawals

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—President Yeltsin—[*inaudible*]—withdrawal in Estonia? And are you taking anything to Naples that you can tell President Yeltsin?

President Clinton. I'm going to Naples, and I'm going to discuss with President Yeltsin the conversation I had with President Meri. And I will continue to do what I have done on this for a year and a half now, to push in a deliberate and firm way and to offer all the incentives we can offer to continue the troop withdrawals.

It's been one of the great successes of the post-cold-war era, a success not just for these countries but a success for Russia as well, in making clear its intentions and making possible its participation in the world in a broader way. But I think it would be wrong to characterize our role as brokers. These are two independent nations. They have to reach agreement between themselves, and I'm confident that they will. If we can assist in that, we're going to do everything we can to assist. But they will have to make the decisions, and I think they will.

Q. Can we get President Meri's reaction? President Meri?

President Clinton. Please! [*Laughter*] Do you need English?

President Lennart Meri of Estonia. No, I need your question. [*Laughter*]

Q. Are you as confident as President Clinton seemingly is that Russia will withdraw all of its troops from Estonia by August 31st?

President Meri. Well, let's have it clear why August 31st is so important, not only for Estonians, not only for Latvians but also, and in the first place, for Russia. You see, it is a highly symbolic date, meaning that the last ruins of World War II will be dismantled in Europe, that Europe will enter a new era where we will be in a position to build a security system which will be open, a free market system which will be open, and first of all, of course, a democratic society. That is the meaning of August 31st. It will be a first day of a new Europe, or if not, it will be just an example that we have some problems still to solve. And those are by no means Baltic problems. They are European problems, which means they are global problems.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 60th news conference began at 1:40 p.m. in the State Room at Riga Castle. President Ulmanis spoke in Latvian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to Citizens in Riga
July 6, 1994

Today we celebrate a moment of renewal. Today we remember your courage. Today we rejoice, for only one force rules in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and that force is freedom. Thank you, President Ulmanis, for your gracious words and your warm welcome to this beautiful capital. And my thanks, also, to President Meri and President Brazauskas for your contribution to this historic event. To the people of these lands, to those gathered in this square, to those listening or watching from afar, to all who have kept the faith, I am deeply honored to stand before you, the first President of the United States to set foot on free Baltic soil.

Today we remember, we remember an August day just 5 years ago when the peoples of your nation joined hands in common cause. From Tallinn to Vilnius, a million strong, you reached across the boundaries of fear. And here in this square, sheltered by the Freedom Monument, that human chain found its center. You showed the peoples of the world the power of the Baltic way.

Now today, I stand with you here. And on behalf of all Americans, I proudly take a place in that unbroken chain for freedom. The chain stretches back to your grandparents exiled to the wastelands of Siberia, many never to return; back to your fathers, men who took to the for-

ests to resist the occupying troops; and to you, who took up their cause, stood vigil over the bonfires of liberty, and sang the songs of independence; and to those in all generations who gave their very lives for freedom.

Vabadus! Laisves! Briviba! Freedom! No matter what the language, it is the link that unites the peoples of our nations, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and American. No matter the century, no matter the invader, you have proved that freedom never dies when it lives in the hearts of men and women. You have taught us never to give up. You have inspired the world. And America has kept faith with you. For 50 years we refused to recognize the occupation of your nation. Your flag flew in our capital. Many of your countrymen and women sought refuge on our shores. Now some have returned to serve their homelands, while others remain to keep your spirit alive all across America. The chain that binds our nations is unbreakable.

We marvel at your strength and your reborn independence. But we know also that many of you face hardship and uncertainty in your daily lives, for the path of reform is not always smooth. Yet America calls on you to hold fast to that path, to seize this moment of renewal, to redeem the struggles of your ancestors, to extend the chain of freedom so that it reaches across generations to your children and beyond.

And as you return to Europe's fold, we will stand with you. We will help you. We will help you to restore your land, to bring new markets to light, to find prosperity for all your people. And we will rejoice with you when the last of the foreign troops vanish from your homelands. We will be partners for peace. Our soldiers, the new Baltic battalion among them, will join together to bring security to a new Europe. We will be partners so that your nation can be forever free.

I come from a nation of people drawn from all around the world, a nation of many, many peoples who once were bitter enemies, but who now live together as friends. In your homeland, as in America, there will always live among you people of different backgrounds. Today I appeal to you to summon what my Nation's greatest healer, Abraham Lincoln, called "the better angels of our nature," to never deny to others the justice and equality you fought so hard for and earned for yourselves. For freedom without tolerance is freedom unfulfilled.

The shining figure of liberty stands guard here today, and the spirit of your peoples fills the air and brings joy to our hearts. We hear the songs of freedom that have echoed across the centuries. We see the flames that lit your way to independence. We feel the courage that will keep the chain of freedom alive.

May the memories of this day linger. May the spirit of the Baltic souls soar. May the strong sense of freedom never fade. So, in the name of the free people of the United States of America, I say to the free people of the Baltic nations: Let freedom ring. *Vabadus! Laisves! Briviba!* Freedom!

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2:45 p.m. in Freedom Square.

Remarks Following Discussions With President Lech Walesa of Poland and an Exchange With Reporters in Warsaw

July 6, 1994

President Clinton. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Let me say again how delighted I am to be here with my party and with my family in Poland.

We had, from my point of view, a very satisfactory discussion about what we could do together to strengthen Poland in terms of its economic future and its political and security future and about what we could do to continue to integrate the democracies, the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe into a broader Europe. I think they feel a great solidarity with the people of Poland in their common efforts to now make freedom work.

President Walesa opened his remarks with a statement that I think may be well-known in Poland but perhaps not so much in the United States. He said Poland's future needed more American generals, starting with General Motors and General Electric. [*Laughter*] And we talked

about what we could do to continue the process of economic reform—after all, Poland had a 4 percent growth rate last year, a very impressive rate of growth—but also to spread the benefits of that reform to the people who are still unemployed and who are having a hard time, not only to ease the pain of this economic transition for them but to raise a better promise for the future.

We also talked about the security future of Poland. And let me just say that the most important thing for the present is that we are having the first Partnership For Peace military exercises in Poland in September. The United States and our NATO allies are very excited about that and deeply impressed that Poland led the way to 21 nations joining the Partnership For Peace. That is the beginning of a process that will not only eventually lead to an expansion of NATO but much more importantly gives us a chance to have a secure and unified Europe in which, for the first time, all nation states really do respect the territorial integrity of one another. And both these developments, the economic developments and the security developments, are due in no small part to the steadfast and courageous leadership that President Walesa has displayed for so many years.

I thank him for that, and I thank him for the opportunity to make these few remarks.

President Walesa. I wish to thank President Clinton for coming to our country. I wish to thank him for the initiatives which we welcome with great satisfaction.

America, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, always held a certain promise for Poland and other countries of the region, but this hope was in a different context. Today, the hope consists in the generals I mentioned, if we could get the American generals, the generals I meant, General Motors and General Electric. Certain proposals have been set to encourage the generals to come our way, to make full use of the potential that we have. I think after supper we'll find solutions to all the problems.

NATO and Aid to Poland

Q. Two questions to President Clinton. Mr. President, after Poland has become the most active partner for peace, it's time to start working out some concrete timetable of the Polish NATO journey. Do you agree with the idea? And the second question is we can observe—[*inaudible*]—that to refer to the Central and Eastern European countries started to go more and more slowly. Does the United States plan to provide some economical, financial support to stop this negative tendency—[*inaudible*]—to accelerate once again?

Thank you.

President Clinton. First of all, with regard to your first question, I have always stated my support for the idea that NATO will expand. But NATO is a partnership of many nations. I asked the NATO partnership to embrace, first, the Partnership For Peace, so that we would have a way of reaching out to all the nonmember democracies in Europe. I did that as a first step toward expansion of NATO but also because, in my mind, I wanted to see whether there was a real feeling that Europe could be united and that these countries could each pledge to respect one another's borders.

I must tell you that I was surprised that 21 nations, including Sweden and Finland, two formerly neutral countries, asked to be a part of it. So it is taking on a life of, vitality of its own which should not be underestimated. And now what we have to do is to get the NATO partners together and to discuss what the next steps should be. Since that has not been done, I can't really say more about it, because it is a joint decision which has to be made, except to say that I believe that NATO will be expanded, and I believe everyone is impressed by the leadership which Poland has shown.

The answer to your second question is yes, the United States should and will do more to help sustain the process of reform here in Poland and elsewhere, and to help to ease the transition for the people who have still not found jobs and who still have problems with their incomes.

As President Walesa said in our meeting, many people in Poland who are unemployed are unemployed not because there is overproduction in Poland but because the transition from a Communist-controlled economy to a free market economy has not been completed where they live. We have some experience in dealing with those problems, even though they are problems everywhere, including the United States. And I think we must do more to help, and we will.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering—a question for both of you, sir. I'm wondering about Presi-

dent Walesa's lingering concerns about Russia, and I'm wondering what you have told him to ease those concerns.

President Clinton. Only he can answer the first part of the question. But I will say that from my point of view, we are in better shape now than we were a few months ago. Russia has agreed to join the Partnership For Peace and, therefore, to accept the integrity of its neighbors' borders, the prospect of joint exercises here in Poland and in other countries, and the premise that NATO will expand. At the same time, Russia has brought its deficit down, its inflation rate down, and continues to privatize its economy.

So, in an uncertain world, I think we are doing about as well as we can in moving things in the right direction. And I feel that we are moving in the direction that will maximize the chances of reform and democracy staying alive in all these countries.

President Walesa. Mr. President, my apprehensions amount to 40 percent and my hopes amount to the other 60. If the United States continues to extend its assurances of stability and security in this region of the world, the proportions will change. As for today, we should say that the United States did provide the proper assurances, and the proportion of hopes keeps expanding all the time. Russia, a democratic state, is a free-market economy, is a partner for everyone.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:25 p.m. at the Presidential Palace. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by President Lech Walesa of Poland in Warsaw

July 6, 1994

President and Mrs. Walesa, ladies and gentlemen, it is a tremendous honor for me and for our party of Americans and for my family to be here with you in Poland. In this short time, we have felt already your hospitality and friendship. And we see that, just as you rebuilt this wonderful city after World War II, you are now rebuilding this magnificent country after communism. You have enshrined freedom and democracy, and after a difficult beginning, you have achieved a high rate of economic growth. These are tributes to both your people and your leaders.

Mr. President, your personal struggle ever since the events in Gdansk more than a decade ago have inspired people everywhere in the world. In a very real sense, Poland is the birthplace of the new Europe. And in so many ways, you are the father of that wonderful child.

You and many other of your countrymen and women have proved that individual acts of courage can change the world. And in a time when ordinary people all over the world feel helpless in the face of forces shaping and changing their lives, you have proved that ordinary working people can transform their own lives.

Poland has the moral support of all the American people but of two groups especially: first, the millions of Polish-Americans who share your heritage and the love of your soil and your history, and second, the members of the American labor movement who have supported your struggle from the beginning. And I might say, we are especially glad tonight to have the leader of our labor movement who has been your supporter from the beginning, Mr. Lane Kirkland, with us. Welcome, sir.

As you said, Mr. President, it is now for us to build on what has been done. In Poland, that means a stronger economy and greater security and more concern for those who have been left behind. We know the path of reform is difficult, and special steps must be taken to help those who have not yet seen its benefits. Beyond Poland, it means building a truly united Europe, a Europe united economically and in its common support for democracy and freedom and territorial integrity.

These things are important to the United States for many reasons. We are on our own journey of renewal at home. But we know that in the end, our success depends upon your success. We seek to be free in a world more free.

We know to be prosperous, the world must be more prosperous. We know to be secure, those who believe in the things that we believe in must also be secure.

So tonight, I urge the people of Poland to take pride in your achievements and not to lose hope. The road to the future is not smooth, but you have known difficulties in the past far greater. The United States will stand with you. Our partnership will grow, and Poland will triumph.

And so I raise my glass, Mr. President, in a toast to you and Mrs. Walesa and to the people of Poland.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:14 p.m. at the Presidential Palace. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Address to the Polish Parliament in Warsaw
July 7, 1994

Thank you very much. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Marshal Oleksy, Mr. Speakers, and representatives of the people of Poland: I am honored to stand before you today in this chamber, at the heart of Poland's democracy. I know that you have extended your session in order to hear me today, and I am very grateful for your hospitality.

We gather today to honor a friendship that is as old as my Nation. And we honor ties that grow stronger every day. We admire the contributions that Polish-Americans, millions of them, have made and are making to our Nation's strength. And we celebrate the cultural ties that bind our peoples. But at this moment of decision in history, in this time of renewal for Poland and for the United States, Poland has come to mean something even greater, for your success is crucial to democracy's future in Central and Eastern Europe, and indeed, all across the globe.

It has been said that if it were not for the people of Poland, democracy might have perished on the continent of Europe a half-century ago. For it was the Polish mathematicians from the laboratories of Poznan who broke the secrets of the Enigma Code, what Winston Churchill called the most important weapon against Hitler and his armies. It was these code-breakers who made possible the great Allied landings at Normandy, when American, English, French, Canadian, and yes, Free Polish forces joined together to liberate this continent, to destroy one terrible tyranny that darkened our century.

Yet, alone among the great Allied armies who fought in Normandy, the Poles did not return to a liberated land. Your fathers instead returned to a nation that had been laid waste by its invaders. Then one would-be conqueror gave way to another, and an Iron Curtain fell across your borders, a second foreign tyranny gripped your people and your land.

It was here in Poland that all those who believe communism could not stand, first found their hopes fulfilled; here that you began to hammer on the Iron Curtain and force the first signs of rust to appear; here that brave men and women, workers and citizens, led by *Solidarnosc*, understood that neither consciousness nor economics can be ordered from above; here that you showed the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe that with hearts and hands alone, democracy could triumph.

But I come here today not simply to recall the events of 50 years past or even to rejoice at those of 5 years ago, for others have done that and done it very well. Instead, I come to the heart of a new, democratic Central Europe to look ahead, to speak of how we can reverse the legacies of stagnation and oppression, of fear and division; how we can eradicate the artificial lines through Europe's heartland imposed by half a century of division, and how we can help chart a course toward an integrated Europe of sovereign free nations.

The challenges our generation faces are different from those our parents faced. They are problems that in many cases lack pressing drama. They require quiet and careful solutions. They will not yield easily. And if we meet them well, our reward will not be stunning moments of glory but gradual and real improvement in the lives of our people.

We must find the will to unite around these opportunities of peace as previous generations have united against war's life-or-death threats and oppression's fatal grip. To the courage that enables men and women to drop behind enemy lines, face down rumbling tanks, or advance freedom's cause underground, we must add a new civil courage: the energy and optimism and patience to move forward through peaceful but hard and rapidly changing times.

Our course must be guided by three principles: supporting democracy, advancing free markets, and meeting new security challenges. Half a century after our fathers beat tyranny into submission and half a decade after the Soviet empire collapsed, the voices of violence and militant nationalism can once again be heard. Would-be dictators and fiery demagogs live among us in the East and in the West, promoting ethnic and racial hatred, promoting religious divisions and anti-Semitism and aggressive nationalism. To be sure, they are weak imitators of Hitler and Stalin, yet we dare not underestimate the danger they pose. For they feed on fear, despair, and confusion. They darken our road and challenge our achievements.

In this fight, democracy remains our indispensable ally. For democracy checks the ambitions of would-be tyrants and aggressors. It nurtures civil society and respect for human rights and the habits of simple tolerance. Its progress is slow and uneven, and as you doubtless know in this chamber, occasionally frustrating. But it cements economic reforms and security cooperation. And it offers once-captive peoples the opportunity to shape their own future.

Five years ago, your nation seized that opportunity. Discarding dictatorship and a failed command economy that was imposed upon your nation, you stepped into the unknown and started to build a free market economy. Doubters said that it couldn't be done, but the Polish people have proved those naysayers wrong. Poland's reforms are working. You are beginning to win the struggle for economic transformation. You have ended hyperinflation, stabilized your currency, privatized enterprises that drive growth, and doubled your exports. You have proved that free people need not wait for the state to tell them what to do. You have demonstrated an entrepreneurial talent that generates one of Europe's highest growth rates.

But we must be sober and honest in our judgment. When you began this process the old Communist economic system was already collapsing. You knew then your journey would be difficult at best. And although many Poles are prospering today, many others have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, and their hardships abound. In a time like this it is easy to focus on that pain, not on the promise of reform.

My message today to the people of Poland and to all the people of Central and Eastern Europe is simple and direct: Free markets and democracy remain the only proven path to prosperity and to peace. You must hold hard to those tracks. Sustain the civil courage that has brought you so far so fast, and do not give up or turn back. You will not be alone.

The United States has stood with you since you began to build the modern economy, and we stand with you now. America is the number one investor in Poland, with $1.2 billion already in place and much more on the way. The American people are proud to have supported Poland as you have put tens of thousands of your people to work, created thousands of new enterprises, and begun to free your economy from its inherited burden of debt.

Today we are announcing new initiatives that will pump hundreds of millions of dollars into the Polish economy. For example, our Government, along with some of our Nation's largest labor unions, has established a $65 million Polish Partners Fund to promote new investments in business. We are also working to quicken the speed of privatization, to assist people in finding new jobs and housing, to help protect your citizens from the economic pirates of organized crime.

Taken together, these goals—hopeful citizens, thriving entrepreneurs, new investments and expanded trade—are the future pillars of a prosperous, reformed Poland. Economic reform and democracy, though important, however, will only flourish if the free peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are also secure.

In moving to guarantee its own security, Poland has indeed become a model for the other nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Your decisions to establish good relations with Russia, Ukraine, Germany, and Lithuania are shining examples of the potential for peace that the new Europe provides. At this moment, in fact, Poland faces what may fairly be described as its best prospects for peace and security in 350 years. And yet, as you have taught us, we must

not forget the lessons of history. There appears to be no immediate or short-term threat to Polish sovereignty, but history and geography caution us not to take this moment for granted.

When my administration began, I stressed that Poland's security and the security of all democratic nations in the region is important to the United States. In January of last year, when I visited Prague and met with the heads of the Visegrad nations, I learned a Polish phrase: *Nic o nas bez nas*, nothing about us without us. That phrase echoes in my mind today as we solidify and search for a new security arrangement in Europe. Because the simple fact is that Poland should never again have its fate decided for it by others. No democracy in the region should ever be consigned to a gray area or a buffer zone. And no country should have the right to veto, compromise, or threaten democratic Poland's or any other democracy's integration into Western institutions, including those that ensure security.

I know that these are ambitious goals, but history has given us a rare opportunity, the opportunity to join together and to form a new, integrated Europe of sovereign nations, a continent where democracy and free markets know no borders, but where nations can rest easy that their own borders will always be secure. This is the vision behind the Partnership For Peace.

Twenty-one nations have now jointed that Partnership since we began it, and they are already moving to fulfill the dream of a unified and peaceful Europe. They have sworn not only to pursue democracy but also to respect each other's sovereignty and borders. They are moving along a course that is both visionary and realistic, working for the best while always preparing for the worst.

Poland, as all of you know, has taken a leading role in the Partnership For Peace, and I am proud and pleased that some 2 months from now your nation will host the first Partnership exercise on the territory of a former Warsaw Pact state. For the first time since 1945 Polish and American troops, troops that once faced each other across the Iron Curtain, will train together on the plains of Europe.

The United States recognizes that full participation in the Partnership requires resources. And I am pleased to announce today that I will ask our Congress to designate $100 million, effective in the fall of next year, to help America's new democratic partners work with us to advance the Partnership For Peace's goals. In response to your nation's demonstrated commitment to security and democracy, I will ask that fully one-fourth of that money, $25 million, be directed to Poland.

But the Partnership For Peace is only a beginning. Bringing new members into NATO, as I have said many times, is no longer a question of whether, but when and how. And that expansion will not depend upon the appearance of a new threat in Europe. It will be an instrument to advance security and stability for the entire region. We are working with you in the Partnership For Peace in part because the United States believes that when NATO does expand, as it will, a democratic Poland will have placed itself among those ready and able to join. The Partnership For Peace and planning for NATO's future mean that we will not let the Iron Curtain be replaced with a veil of indifference.

I have learned another Polish phrase which, even in my tortured accent, well describes our goal for a more secure, democratic, and prosperous Poland: *Rowni z rownymi, wolni z wolnymi*, "Equal among equals, free with the free." It is time to bring that phrase to life.

Here in the middle of the rebuilt city of Warsaw, we are reminded that the Polish people have always fought for that right. Fifty years ago this month, the Polish home army was planning the greatest urban uprising of this century. On August 1st, Polish heroes seized much of their city preparing for liberation. The uprising ended in ruin. Some of the heroes perished; others escaped. Yet amidst the flame and the rubble, a lone radio signal could be heard in the West: "Immortal is the nation that can muster such universal heroism," came the broadcast from Warsaw, "for those who have died have conquered, and those who live on with fight on, will conquer and again bear witness that Poland lives while the Poles live."

Here in the heart of a free Poland, you can hear the echoes of that broadcast today. So now let us summon the civil courage that will keep your nation forever free.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:35 p.m. at the Parliament Building. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak of Poland; Jozef Oleksy, Marshal of the Sejm; and Adam Strujik, Speaker of the Senate.

Remarks at the Children's Memorial in Warsaw
July 7, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Ryszard Paclawski, Adam Bielaczki. And to Magda Kierszniewska, didn't she do a good job? Let's give her another hand. [*Applause*]

We are gathered at the wall of an old city to honor a people whose love of freedom is forever young. Fifty years ago a heroic chapter of history was written here, a chapter stained with the blood of war but brightened by the enduring power of the human spirit. Next month you will honor that spirit by marking the 50th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising. And I am pleased to say that the Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, will be here with you in August, just as I am today.

The seeds of rebirth that are now flowering across this wonderful country were planted a half-century ago. When the brave Poles took up arms against Hitler's tyranny in the summer of 1944, Warsaw was on the verge of total destruction. For 63 days, Polish men, women, and children struggled against the Nazis. For 63 days they faced the tanks, machine guns, and bombers with courage and faith and solidarity. Two hundred thousand of them died. And this beloved city seemed beyond salvation.

I have seen photographs of Warsaw at the end of the war. An exquisite city that took six centuries to build was razed to the ground in 2 monstrous months. The statue of King Zigmund was toppled from its base, an elegant column literally blown to bits. The majestic arches of St. John's Cathedral were battered until only a skeleton remained. The Old City marketplace was obliterated.

No one sacrificed more than the children. The statue behind me honors the children of the Warsaw Uprising. The terror of war took their innocence. Their childhoods were buried in the rubble. Young girls braved sniper fire to deliver messages for the Resistance, and the *Szare Szeregi,* the Young Scouts, faced the frontlines of battle.

Thousands of children witnessed the unimaginable. One boy was 8 years old when the bombs began raining down, when the Nazi planes destroyed the building where he lived, when his family courtyard was turned into a graveyard for his neighbors. But that little boy survived. He never forgot Warsaw, and he never gave up trying to give meaning to the tragedy. Today, that little boy is the highest ranking military officer in the United States of America, General John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who has dedicated his life to the fight for peace and freedom.

His life, like the lives of so many other children of Warsaw, teaches us what Poland taught the world: Out of the wreckage of oppression can grow the redeeming spirit of freedom. Some of those other children, now grown, are with us today. Let us thank them all for that profound lesson. [*Applause*]

Sometimes in life, we do not realize the good we have done. Fifty years ago, the heroes of Warsaw seemed defeated. Fifty years later, we know the Polish spirit did not die in the ruins. Sometimes what seems to be the final chapter in history is but one sad page of an unfinished and triumphant story.

The Polish people never gave in to the shadow of despair. They found strength through the light cast by the uprising, and after the war, the survivors returned to the ruins. Brick by brick, with cold and tired hands, they rebuilt this city. Day by day, they revived a nation, even as new invader overwhelmed the homeland they loved. For five more decades, as Poles had done for centuries in the face of attack and invasion, they held fast to their dreams; they endured the darkness of domination; they prepared and fought for a new day to come.

Just as the men, women, and children of the uprising won their fight, so you in this generation have won yours. Warsaw is not a city under siege but a city in peace. Poland is not a nation consigned to the darkness of tyranny but a nation inspiring the entire world in a season of renewal.

This moment reminds all of us that darkness could always enshroud us again, that fear and intolerance do find new lives of their own. But let us remember the words of the Polish philosopher Joachim Lelewel, a great Polish thinker, who said, "The last bastion of our nation is our people's heart, and that bastion will never be conquered."

That is the lesson of the Warsaw Uprising. That is the lesson of democracy's triumph in Poland today. And that is the lesson that we as free peoples, Polish and American, must embrace.

Today we have no doubt that the children of the Warsaw Uprising won their larger war, for the hearts of the free can never be conquered.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:25 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Ryszard Paclawski, Adam Bielaczki, and Magda Kierszniewska, children who participated in the ceremony.

Statement on the Flooding in Georgia
July 7, 1994

The people of Georgia are in our thoughts and prayers as they work to recover from this devastating storm.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing disaster assistance for Georgia.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus
July 7, 1994

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through March 1, 1994. The current report covers the remainder of March through May 20, 1994.

This has been a very active period for negotiations on the U.N. proposed package of confidence-building measures. I hope that in my next report, I will be able to state that progress has been made.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 8.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama of Japan in Naples, Italy
July 8, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to meet with Prime Minister Murayama for the first time. We had a warm and productive session in which we reaffirmed the strong relationship between our two countries.

We began our talks with a discussion of North Korea and the fresh opportunity to resolve the situation that our common determination and diplomacy have produced.

This is an important day. The third round of high-level talks is now beginning in Geneva. During those talks, North Korea has agreed to freeze verifiably the reprocessing and refueling elements of its nuclear program. Throughout this process, we have worked very closely with

Japan and the Republic of Korea as well as with Russia and China.

I'm especially pleased by the assurances of Prime Minister Murayama this morning of the continuity of Japanese foreign policy and our security relationships. We agreed to continue frequent consultations on the Korean situation.

The Prime Minister also described his plans for increasing Japan's economic growth and his policy of working toward global growth. I support the Prime Minister's measures to spur Japan's economic growth and to pursue strong open market efforts through GATT. I urged the Prime Minister to also pursue strongly our framework talks and our common efforts to complete the GATT this year.

We discussed this weekend's G–7 meetings, agreed that in this meeting the G–7 leaders should turn to a long-term emphasis for laying the foundations for the global economy of the 21st century.

In closing, let me reaffirm my view that there is no more important bilateral relationship in the world than that between the United States and Japan. I believe that Prime Minister Murayama and I can build on the relationship that we began today to make real progress in all aspects of the Japanese-U.S. relationship, security, political, and economic. I look forward to the opportunity to turn today's constructive talks into constructive action.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Murayama. Thank you. For about an hour and a half I had exchange of views with the President. I very candidly explained the Japanese political situation today. For as many as four times the government changed within a year in Japan, and I believe that there are some people who take various views about the situation. I wanted the President to have a full understanding of the situation.

For 38 years, one party was in power, and now we have shifted over the days of coalition. And Japanese politics will be changing significantly. And after a change, we believe—in order to change the policy of Japan we also need a stable government. So the Liberal Democratic Party, the Japan new party, the Social Democratic Party of Japan and—organized into a coalition in order to try and find out the future course of Japanese politics. And in a word, as the President has just said, we shall continue with the foreign policy that our past governments have maintained. The Japan-U.S. security system will be maintained as well.

As for Japanese domestic politics, we shall actively pursue reforms. To that end, we absolutely need a stable government. That is what I explained to the President, and I believe the President understood it in full.

A continuation of Japan-U.S. relations in a favorable state will be very essential in making sure that Japan and the United States will be able to address important situations around the world properly. And we, therefore, I told the President, would like to maintain steadfastly the Japan-U.S. relations.

On the economic front, Japan will work to recover the economy on the strength of domestic demand and ensure sustainable growth of the Japanese economy. The U.S. economy is on the track toward expansion, and we also see that the Western European economies are gradually moving on to recovery.

So how are we to manage Japanese domestic policy, economic policy, bearing in mind such economic situations around the world? And I made three points that, first of all, we shall continue with a tax cut next year at the same level as this year. Now, as I mentioned, Japanese public investment is gradually improving, and personal consumption is gradually improving, and fiscal—is proceeding.

In order to further give strength to the Japanese recovery we should like to further review public investment, qualitative and quantitatively. We have set on 430 trillion yen over a 10-year period. We shall review qualitative and quantitatively this amount and rethink the amount. And also, in terms of public investment and distribution of that amount, we shall shift emphasis to the consumer and try to expand the Japanese economy on the strength of expanding domestic demand. And this was kindly understood by the President.

We also discussed North Korean issue and others as well. And fortunately, thanks to the tenacious efforts by the United States, now U.S.-North Korean talks are proceeding in Geneva, and soon there will be North-South Korean summit talks as well. And we very much hope that through dialog the matters will be resolved, and we should like to do our best to that end. And Japan, U.S., and South Korea will have to maintain close contact with each other in order to achieve that. And we have a common understanding on that point.

Inclusive of this, as well as other points, Japan and the United States, to the maximum extent possible, should maintain good relations with each other not only in the interest of our two countries but for the entire world. And this again we see eye-to-eye with each other.

Thanks to the meeting this time, I, at a personal level as well, I believe have been able to have the President's understanding and the President's suggestions not only in word but in deed—that is show what we can. And so in good faith we'd like to continue to promote good relations between Japan and the United States.

Thank you very much.

The President. Let me say, as we begin now, by prior arrangement we're going to take a couple of questions today from the American press and the Japanese press. And then I'm going to meet with all of you again in the news window in a couple of hours. But we'll start.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, you didn't mention trade in a very strong way. And there is a perception in the United States that Japan likes to sell to us but doesn't really want to buy many of our products. And you didn't talk about widening and opening your markets, which is apparently the crux of our problem. What's your answer to that?

Prime Minister Murayama. May I? Well, as I mentioned earlier, we decided on 279 derivation items, and we shall continue to promote deregulation, for that matter. And also, we shall decisively promote market access opening, trade liberalization, so that U.S. products as well as others will flow into the Japanese market and the Japanese consumers will be able to enjoy the benefits of those products. And so we should like to promote two-way trade and not that we are disliking American products or anything.

The Yen and the Japanese Government

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, I'd like to ask two questions. First of all, the precipitous yen appreciation is shaking the Japanese industry. To what extent did you discuss that matter? And the other question, with regard to maintenance of Japan, your security—you are Prime Minister from the Socialist Party, and I wonder, do you think that you've had the understanding of the President on your position?

Prime Minister Murayama. With regard to yen appreciation, there is—macroeconomic conditions lie behind that situation, I believe. And I don't think that they'll be stipulating an exchange rate immediately. However, if countries around the world, and especially Japan and the United States, should—or at least these two countries should—take policy that is conducive to more stable exchange rates in cooperation with each other. So we hope that those responsible for the matter will talk to each other and work at it properly. There is a common understanding on that.

With regard to the security system, there was a clear-cut understanding when we established a coalition government, and the Social Democratic Party of Japan will adhere to that understanding. This government is not led by ideology, but rather politics today is led by pragmatic policy. That policy must keep abreast of reality, and I'm sure we would have to promote policy that will be supported by the general public as well. And I don't see any contradiction between security and our policy.

Global Economy and Trade

Q. President Clinton, I'd like to ask what your impressions were of the situation involving the yen and the dollar. And also, do you feel that Japan has made sufficient progress in the year since the last G–7 on opening its markets to the U.S.?

The President. First, with regard to the yen and the dollar, I think that the relationship of the yen to the dollar is obviously a function of the movement of world currency markets, which have something to do with macroeconomic realities and something to do with perceptions and movements in the market. I think it's important not to overreact. The United States does not seek to grow its economy or change its trade balance through a low dollar; we do not want that. We want the dollar to be properly valued, not undervalued. We want to grow through productivity and economic strength.

But I think, on the other hand, it would be a mistake for us to change the fundamental objective that we all ought to have, the one we agreed to here at the G–7 last year, which is to pursue global growth. The United States was asked to bring its budget deficit down; we have

done that in a remarkable fashion and more than anyone thought we could.

Europe was asked to lower its interest rates, and they did that for a year. Now, they've gone up again in the first 6 months of this year, largely because of the signs of new economic growth. Japan was asked to expand its economy through domestic stimulation, and the Prime Minister has reaffirmed his intent to pursue that course.

Now, if you look at what's happened in the last year, we have had growth in the G–7, and we have had growth without inflation. If we continue to pursue growth without inflation and to work on generating new jobs out of that growth, then eventually the macroeconomic realities will assert themselves, and the currencies will be righted according to market conditions. I think that is what will happen. And I think it's important that we not lose sight of the real economy in which the people of the G–7 nations and indeed the people of the world live. So that's what I think about that.

On the second question, my candid answer would have to be no. But I think if you look at—the Prime Minister was very good—basically run through the last year of Japan's very interesting political history with me in a way that, frankly, increased my own understanding not only of what has happened but of the nature of this present coalition government. It is frankly difficult to imagine how the hard issues that are the subject of the framework talks could have been resolved against a background of as much political change as the nation has sustained in the last year.

So I think what I'm looking forward to now is a resumption of the talks in good faith and continued progress. And I was encouraged by what the Prime Minister said about wanting more open markets, wanting more American sales.

There have been, I might add, some specifically encouraging developments. The United States was able to sell rice in Japan in substantial quantities this year. Even though the number is quite small, there's been a substantial increase in the sale of American automobiles in Japan partly, I might add, due to the aggressive efforts of our auto companies to build cars with the driving mechanisms on the right side of the car from the point of the view of the Japanese and to do some other things that are important, so I wouldn't say the signs are all bleak. My answer is, no, we haven't made enough progress, but I think we may be in a position now and in a more stable position to make some progress, and that's what I'm looking toward.

We agreed to stop at the three questions, so I will honor my agreement, and I'll meet with the American press again later today in a few hours.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 61st news conference began at 12:31 p.m. at the Hotel Vesuvio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

The President's News Conference in Naples
July 8, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. During this trip we are addressing three concerns that will determine whether we have a peaceful and prosperous future.

In Latvia and Poland and later in Germany, we are focusing on the aftermath of the breakup of the Soviet empire and the need to strengthen democracy and economic growth there, to work for a united Europe that can be a partner in trade and a partner for peace.

Second, we are working against nuclear proliferation. In Geneva, the third round of talks between the United States and North Korea has just begun today. Here in Naples, at my first meeting with Japan's new Prime Minister, Mr. Murayama and I had a very good discussion about the North Korean situation, and the Prime Minister praised what he called the United States' "tenacious efforts" and pledged his continuous support in our nonproliferation efforts.

Finally, as the world's leading economic powers gather tonight for our annual summit, we will act on the third and in some ways the most important issue of this trip, economic growth. I'm here to keep our economic recovery going back home by promoting economic recovery throughout the world. More than ever, what happens in the world economy directly affects our ability to create jobs and raise living standards for our own people.

For too long, our leaders ignored the economic realities. At home, our economy drifted; the deficit exploded; the middle class suffered. Now, with the strategy for renewal, we have taken action. We are putting our economic house in order, cutting our deficit in half, and reducing the Federal work force to its smallest level in 30 years. We're expanding exports by tearing down trade barriers and preparing our workers and our children through better education and job training for the jobs of the 21st century.

The economy has responded. I'm pleased to report today that in the last year and a half our economy has created over 3.8 million jobs, 380,000 in the last month alone, and the highest number of manufacturing jobs in the last 4 years. Ninety-two percent of those new jobs are in the private sector, and last year more new businesses were incorporated than in any single year since the end of World War II. Our economy is coming back on its soundest footing in decades, with more jobs and low inflation. In fact, we're leading the world.

America has 40 percent of the G–7's gross domestic product but provided 75 percent of the growth and about 100 percent of the new jobs over the last year. Growing our economy and shrinking our budget deficit from the biggest among these nations to one of the smallest gives us the authority to speak and the credibility to be heard on the matters of discussion here.

Our partners are making progress, too. The growth strategy we urged the world to adopt at the G–7 meeting in Tokyo last year is working. The economy is recovering worldwide. We produced a landmark GATT trade agreement, and Russia's economy is making progress as well, with lower inflation, a reduced deficit, and more and more people working in the private sector.

Now in our meetings this year, on behalf of all the American people, I'm urging the G–7 leaders to keep the world recovery on track. This weekend we will take steps on four fronts: First and foremost, we will continue to work to spur growth and create jobs. One of the most important ways to do that is for all of us to actually enact the Uruguay round of the GATT agreement this year. Passing it this year, immediately, will provide a shot in the arm for the world economy. We must maintain this momentum toward a more open world economy. I'll urge my G–7 colleagues to review and analyze the remaining trade and investment barriers and to report back to us in Halifax next year. But these meetings will go beyond the traditional concerns of G–7 summits to the traditional concerns of working people and their families. We will address the education, the training, the job skills of our working people, building on the jobs conference in Detroit earlier this year. This will be an historic first for the G–7.

Second, we'll begin to build the telecommunications infrastructure of the new information-based global economy, without which we can't take full advantage of our efforts to tear down trade barriers.

Third, we'll focus on the explosive mix of overpopulation and environmental degradation that could overwhelm all of our own economic efforts.

Finally, we'll continue to help the economies of Central and Eastern Europe through long-term reforms, trade, and investment. As a priority we plan to offer our support and advice to the Ukrainian Government on economic reform and on nuclear safety. And President Yeltsin will join in our political discussions for the first time this year as a full and equal participant.

We know these issues will not be resolved overnight. But I have no doubt that for every American and for people all over the world, we must work together to build these foundations of the future.

Now, before I close and take questions, let me say a brief word about the people back home in America who are battling the fires and the floods. This is a time of particular difficulty for many of them. We've lost many lives in the fire fighting in the West and Colorado, and we have problems in other States there. And of course, we've had the terrible floods in Georgia, the problems spreading to Alabama and Florida. My thoughts and prayers are with the people back home who are battling these fires

and floods and especially with the families of those who have lost their lives in the disaster.

I have spoken with the Governors of Colorado and Georgia, and I have instructed all the Federal Departments who can help to make their most aggressive efforts to do so. I am convinced that at this time we are doing everything we can, but the situation remains difficult on both fronts.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, more than 16,000 Haitians have fled in boats in recent weeks, giving rise to talk that it's going to require a military invasion to depose the military leaders of Haiti. Do you think that that's increasingly likely, and what is in the U.S. national interest of such a move?

The President. Well, let's divide the two things if we can. First of all, as Amnesty International has recently reported, the human rights violations in Haiti are on the increase; the use of murder, rape, and kidnaping as a means of maintaining political control has intensified; we have seen the gripping pictures of more people lying dead in the streets.

I think, overwhelmingly, the reason for the increased exodus, people looking for safety, is the violation of human rights by military dictators who overturned a legitimate election and who broke their own word to leave. And I don't think we should lose sight of that.

In the face of these continuing human rights violations and their intensification, the United States determined that its policy of direct return should be changed. I did not believe that policy was sustainable, given what we knew about what was happening in the human rights area and the fact that the government had blocked all reasonable attempts by citizens to restore economic growth and political democracy.

Now, we have interest in what happens in Haiti. There are a million Haitian-Americans. There are thousands of American citizens trying to survive and live and work in Haiti. We have an interest in promoting democracy in the area. Cuba and Haiti are the only two countries in the entire hemisphere now that are not ruled by democratic governments. We have an interest in seeing that the United Nations and its work is upheld, and there was an agreement—the Governors Island Agreement—signed in the United States in which the rulers, the military leaders committed to leave. So we have very clear and significant interests in addition to the massive outflow of people seeking refugee status in our country, which is a significant problem.

But I want to divide what is happening there with the refugees from the question of how best to deal with it. We are working on very tough enforcement of the sanctions, and we have not ruled other options out.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. Mr. President, regarding all the progress that's been made over this past year on the economic front, many people are confused though because the dollar has dropped to almost a record low, especially in connection with the yen. How do you explain this tremendous loss of faith in the dollar when you point to these economic achievements over the past year?

The President. Well, first of all, I think it's important that you pointed out that the dollar has dropped to an historic low against the yen only. It's also dropped some against the mark but well within historic variations. And that's partly because the economy is picking up in Europe as well, something that we really want to happen, and we hope that it will continue to pick up.

I think that the main reason is a macroeconomic reason, the persistent existence of the trade debt surplus that Japan has with the United States and the fact that over the past year the Japanese economy has been flat except for a good first quarter, so that there's not been the capacity to reduce the trade deficit through buying more American products. And Japan, as the Prime Minister said today, has had a number of changes of government so that there has not been the political capacity to reach any agreements which would permit the trade deficit to narrow. And as a result of that, the currency values have changed to try to reflect that reality.

I still believe that the best thing we can do is to keep focusing on the fundamentals. If America is leading the world out of a global recession, we should be very concerned about the value of our dollar, and we should tell the world that we do not wish to have a low dollar so that we can have more American goods bought and so that we won't buy more foreign goods. We do not wish to seek prosperity through devaluation of our currency, but we do wish to continue our own growth and to promote growth in Europe and Japan. As Japan grows and engages us on the framework talks and continues to open its own economy, as those

three things happen, you will see the value of the dollar rebound because the trade situation will right itself.

We ought to follow the economic fundamentals in the real economy, and that's what I'm trying to do.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, in the past when Presidents have ticked off, as you did just moments ago, American interests in a place where there's trouble, it has often been the precursor of at least serious consideration of military action. Would it be fair to say, sir, that you at least are seriously considering that? And could you give us some of the up side and down side of a possible action of that kind?

The President. It would be fair to say that my position has not changed since I first commented on that a few months ago. I do not believe that we should rule out any option. I believe we should continue to pursue the aggressive use of sanctions. I believe we should continue to call on the leaders of Haiti to leave now. They promised to leave. They continue to violate the international community's sense of decency and to violate human rights, and they're in there illegally, and they ought to go.

Bosnia

Q. The contact group has presented a take-it-or-leave-it plan for the party, a plan that basically ratifies ethnic cleansing in several areas. Could you explain how your thinking shifted on this, how you came to believe that stopping the war was more important than taking the moral high ground on this issue?

The President. First of all, the contact group has worked with all the parties there. We were successful, as you know, in helping to get the Croatians and the Bosnians back into a federation where they were working together. This contact group proposal would restore to that federation something over 20 percent of the land in Bosnia and would provide still for a loose federation involving all three major ethnic groups.

It seems to me that that is a fair and reasonable way to proceed and that the people who have followed this most closely believe that this is the most just result that can be obtained while bringing an end to the conflict.

The United States has spent about a billion dollars a year there, has done its best to contain the conflict: We have our troops in Macedonia; we have used our air power through NATO; we have supported the creation of the safe zones; and we have supported the contact group's efforts as a way of recognizing what can most nearly be done to reconcile these interests with the termination of the war.

I think it's fair to say that the contact group believes that this is the fairest proposal that can be achieved to all the parties concerned and still bring a fairly rapid end to the bloodshed, which is something that's in the human rights interest to all the people involved.

Haiti and Ukraine

Q. Can you tell the Congressional Black Caucus in good conscience that Haiti is a regional issue that doesn't have a role here, but yet Ukraine is a place which deserves possibly billions of dollars in international aid and will be one of the focuses here?

The President. Well, first, let me say that both France and Canada, two other members of the G–7, have served as friends of Haiti. There are a lot of Haitians in Canada, and France has historically had an interest in it. So I think we will be discussing it.

Secondly, we have intensified our humanitarian assistance to Haitians, both to feed more Haitians and to provide more medical assistance there, so as to offset the impact of the embargo. So I do think it's an important thing.

But the difference is that Ukraine is part of our historic mission to try to unify Europe around democracy and market reforms and a new sense of common respect for national borders and common commitment to mutual security. There are 60 million people who live there, and their fate and what happens to them is of immediate and pressing concern to the rest of Central and Eastern Europe as well as to Western Europe.

I might say that when I was in both Latvia and Poland the first subject which came up after the interest of the countries that I was visiting, on their initiative, was the future of Ukraine. I think it is very important, and I don't think one should be used to denigrate the other.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Panama and Haitian Refugees

Q. We've spent our lives, American lives, and many dollars to restore democracy to Panama. Can you explain to the American people how

an ally such as Panama could now be refusing to help us out of this crisis? And does the increasing flow of refugees, if it continues, make it more likely that you will have to resort to some military option because we have no place to put these unfortunate people?

The President. I believe we will be able to develop a network to deal with them. The Panamanians will have to explain their own actions and their retraction of their former position. That is not for me to do. But I will say this: I appreciate what Grenada, Antigua, Dominica have done in agreeing in principle to help us with this. And Mr. Gray is working hard with them and with others to develop a network which will permit us to deal with those who are seeking safety. And I think we'll be able to do that.

Q. How do you feel about what Panama has done?

The President. Well, I'm disappointed. But my concern right now is to build a network of friends in the hemisphere who agree that the Haitians are entitled to consideration here and who want to help us to do it. And I'm grateful for the three nations who do want to help us to do it.

The Economy

Q. Mr. President, a strong unemployment report today in the States has given rise to concerns that the economy might actually be overheating. Do you think that the Fed should raise interest rates again to counteract that possibility?

The President. I don't think I should depart from my past policy of not commenting on the Fed's actions. But let me say, the evidence, if you read it, is encouraging on the inflation front. While 380,000 new jobs came into the economy in the last month—and we're now up to 3.8 million in the first 17 months of our administration—the wage levels did not go up a great deal, the working hours did not increase a great deal. It appears that, among other things, you've got a lot of young people coming in for summer jobs and more robustly than normal, and you also have some employers switching from using more overtime to actually hiring more workers as they have greater confidence that we're going to have a sustained recovery.

I don't think we should do anything to undermine the recovery when we have still Americans who need jobs, we have still Americans who are working part-time who wish to work full-time, we have parts of America that have not felt the recovery, and we have no evidence of inflation.

The real key is, is the economy generating real genuine substantiated fears of inflation? The answer to that is, no. If you look at the wage levels and the other indicators, we're having a growth with low inflation, really for the first time in 30 years an investment-led growth. We're leading our partners in the rate of investment, in the rate of productivity growth, in the rate of export increase. And I think we ought to keep it on that track. I don't think we should reverse course.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, what are you going to tell President Yeltsin when you see him about the extent of the U.S. ability to help him when in Russia right now there is great concern that the U.S. has reached, essentially, the extent of its ability to help, and it isn't felt to be very much?

The President. I think we've done quite a lot. But let me say, we just had a new energy deal signed there as a result of the work of the Gore-Chernomyrdin commission, which is a multibillion-dollar energy deal. I think that Russia always felt that most of our help to them would come through private investment in their country, not through tax dollars.

Given the commitment we have made to reduce the deficit in this country and the fact that I've presented a budget that eliminated over 100 Government programs and cut 200 others, we've been, I think, quite generous in our governmental assistance to Russia. But what we really want to do is to help them to grow their economy through the private sector and to make Russia more attractive for private American business and individuals to invest and to help them grow in that way.

And I think the work that we're doing with them on energy and on privatization and, frankly, on housing for the soldiers that are coming home, a lot of these things will help to generate more private sector development over the long run. And that is a long-term commitment of the United States that we're not going to weaken on.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. You're putting economic growth at the top of your list of priorities. Does that account for

the fact that you do not want any sudden action at this G–7 summit with regard to the dollar; that you feel that if there were international concerted intervention currency markets or a common strategy to raise or lower interest rates to stabilize currencies, that that, in fact, would hurt the recovery and the growth that you're talking about?

The President. Well, first, let me answer the first question. We have participated twice recently in interventions, and what we see is that sometimes they work for a little bit and sometimes they can make a real difference. But over the long run, the economic fundamentals will have to work themselves out. And I think that the best thing to do to stabilize the dollar and the other currencies because, as you know, in the last few years we've had some terrible problems with other currencies which massive interventions have not reversed—the best way to do that is to send a signal to the markets that we are working on the economic fundamentals; that we are trying to build the economy, not just the economy of the United States but the economy of Europe, the economy of Canada, the economy of Japan and the global economy, that we're seriously working on Central and Eastern Europe and Russia.

These things, it seems to me, together offer the promise of strengthening the dollar over the long run in a realistic way but also strengthening other currencies as well. Keep in mind what I wanted the United States to do when we drove the deficit down and we got our interest rates down for a time—very low, and they're still modest by historic standards, recent historic standards—was to be able not only to generate more jobs here in the United States, or back in the United States, but to also spark growth in Europe, Japan, and elsewhere. So what I want our trading partners to consider and some of them have already mentioned to me is, we don't want to adopt a strategy in the short run that is just a short-run strategy and could choke off growth in the other G–7 countries and in other parts of the world.

I very much want a reasonably priced dollar. I'm not for a weak dollar. We have not done this intentionally. No one has tried to talk down the dollar. But I think it's important not to overreact to these movements. We need to work on the economic fundamentals. Markets that involve some amount of speculation and calculation about the future need to, as far as possible, reflect long-term fundamentals. And that's one of the things I was encouraged about in my conversation with the Japanese Prime Minister today, when he reaffirmed his commitment to economic growth in his country, because that will help a lot.

Russia

Q. There are elements in Russia who are not happy with the current borders, and they could come to power in our lifetime. When you say that there's no gray area in Europe, are you saying that the tripwire for war for the United States is now the eastern border of Latvia, Poland, and other former Soviet satellites?

The President. I do not believe that we should be discussing the matter in those terms when Russia has recently signed an agreement to join the Partnership For Peace, which means that it has recognized the integrity of the borders of its neighbors, and when it has already signed an agreement to withdraw troops from Latvia by August 31st, has already withdrawn troops from Lithuania, and when we're on the verge of getting an agreement for withdrawal from Estonia.

It seems to me what we ought to be doing is making it clear that we support the integrity and the independence of these countries and that we have embraced them in the Partnership For Peace but that we are working toward a positive outcome. And I don't believe that it furthers the debate to conjure up a future that we hope we can avoid and that we believe we can avoid.

Economic Summit

Q. Some State Governors think that this extravaganza of the G–7 is too expensive and doesn't really produce much. Now that you're President, do you think that the personal contact is worth it, and does lead to things that affect working people?

The President. Absolutely. But let me answer you with two points, if I might. First of all, last year, we, the leaders of the G–7, agreed that the conference had become too stilted, too formal, too bureaucratic, and in a sense, too expensive. We decided to pare it back some and make it more informal. So we begin tonight with a leaders-only dinner, with no set agenda, that is not dictated by staff work and driven toward a final statement that often has been the lowest common denominator. And through-

out this meeting we will have more flexibility, more informality, and I think it will work very well.

The former Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Ciampi, very much wanted this kind of meeting, and when Prime Minister Berlusconi took office, he was eager to embrace this as more consistent with his own background in business. So I think you will see that this will be the beginning of something that will become a lean and more efficient operation.

Now, secondly, does it affect Americans back home or Italians back home or Germans back home? I believe it does. If you look at what we did last year, we made a commitment, first, that we would try to finish the GATT round; we did that; second, that we would do everything we could to try to help integrate Russia and the other former Soviet republics into the mainstream of the world economy, and we are making progress on that. That has made a significant difference. And just since then, we have started working on things that world leaders never talked about with each other before, like education and training systems and how to have adaptable work forces. All these things have a direct bearing on the livelihoods of our people back home. So I think this is a very important and valuable forum. And I hope we will continue it but continue to make it as lean and efficient and as economical as possible.

Haitian Refugees

Q. President Endara complained about miscommunication. Is there any validity to that complaint, and is there not a risk that the reversal in Panama will lead peoples of the other countries you're dealing with to decide they don't want to participate, either—to put more pressure on their governments?

The President. Again, I can't comment on that. All I know is what was said to me and what was clear. But the other countries have been quite steadfast, and I think that, again, right now what we have to focus on is building a network of support for the Haitians who are entitled to protection. And that's what we're doing, and I think we'll be able to do it.

Algeria

Q. Mr. President, eight Italians have been brutally murdered in Algeria yesterday. The situation seems to be growing politically and towards instability over there. What is the position of your government toward the government of Algeria and towards the situation over there and towards this atmosphere?

The President. Well, we're very concerned about the developments in Algeria. When I was in France recently, the discussion of Algeria occupied a fair amount of my time with Prime Minister Balladur and with President Mitterrand. And I'm actually looking forward to having the opportunity to discuss this matter with the other G–7 leaders.

What we have hoped to do is to support the government of Algeria in its attempts to restrain terrorism and destructive and illegal conduct and still hope to help it and to find a way of accommodating legitimate forces of dissent so that a democracy, or at least a functioning government, could occur that would reduce the amount of violence and destruction there. It's a very troubling thing, particularly given Algeria's history and strategic location and its enormous potential for good in that part of the world. And I look forward to discussing it more.

Haitian Refugees

Q. Mr. President, back in 1980, as Governor, I think you learned firsthand that the refugee problem can be especially politically volatile. Does that help you appreciate a little more President Endara's decision? And how does your personal experience weigh into your deliberation now, especially given the political situation in places like Florida?

The President. Well, there were two problems with the 1980 situation in our State, which I'm very mindful of, which do not apply in this case. If you will remember, a lot of the people who were released from Cuba in 1980 had either serious mental health problems or criminal backgrounds.

And the two problems that existed there that the United States does not face now with the Haitians in any kind of general terms were that the refugees that were brought to my State, number one, weren't screened in advance, which is something that had been done with the Vietnamese refugees, for example, when we took large numbers there in our State with no problems and with open arms.

And number two, the military authorities who were charged with maintaining order denied that they had the capacity to maintain order. So one of the things that I have done is to reassure all the leaders of the countries with whom I

have talked that if they were willing to help us with the safe havens or with processing centers, depending on which country we're talking about, that they would bear no cost and that they would not have to worry about the security problems. Those are the two things that, I think, that are legitimate concerns.

Now, in Florida the main problem there is the cost problem. And since I have been President, I have worked very, very hard to increase the allocation of Federal assistance to States that have disproportionate refugee or illegal alien burdens. That's not only Florida but also California, Texas, New York, New Jersey—they are the major ones, and some other States. And we've increased that aggregate assistance by, oh, about a third, by several billion dollars since I have been in office.

Q. You said that, first of all, you referred to the lifting of the policy of direct return. Can you explain why you think it's appropriate, given the human rights deterioration that you cited in Haiti, to force people between choosing the right to political asylum in the United States and leaving Haiti? And second of all, you say your position has not changed on whether military invasion is an option, but has the deterioration and conditions in Haiti made that option more likely to pursue?

The President. I think the conduct of the military leaders will have more than anything else to do with what options are considered when. And their conduct has not been good.

Now, secondly—but let me answer the first question. What we owe the people of Haiti is safety. There is no internationally-recognized human right to go to a particular place and to have a particular response. We have increased our processing in-country. We still know that's the safest and best way to get out. And we know that people are able to get to those processing centers. We've increased our processing in-country, and as the human rights situation has deteriorated; the percentage of people in-country qualifying for refugee status has increased as based on the objective conditions in the country.

So we are still doing what we said we would do, and we are going forward. There is a limit to how much the United States or anybody else can do given the facts that now exist. We are spending a lot of money to manage this problem. We asked some of our neighbors in the hemisphere—as I said last May when I announced this policy, we asked some of our neighbors in the hemisphere to help us when we needed it, and some of them are doing so, and we are very, very grateful to them for doing that.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 62d news conference began at 5:30 p.m. at the Zi Teresa Restaurant.

Statement on the Resignation of National AIDS Policy Coordinator Kristine Gebbie

July 8, 1994

Kristine Gebbie, the first National AIDS Policy Coordinator, served ably and with dedication as a member of our administration. With her help, the Federal Government finally began exercising real leadership in response to this terrible epidemic. Working together, we boosted funding for the Ryan White Care Act, increased resources for prevention and research, sped the research and approval process for new drugs, and required every Federal employee to receive comprehensive workplace education. While more needs to be done—and more will be done—to fight AIDS, Kristine Gebbie's service as the Nation's first AIDS Policy Coordinator gave this vitally important battle a lift when one was desperately needed and long overdue.

NOTE: A statement by Kristine Gebbie was also made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

The President's Radio Address
July 9, 1994

Good morning. I'm speaking to you from the seaside city of Naples, Italy, where the leaders of the Group of Seven major industrial countries have gathered for our annual meeting.

What my trip to Naples this week, as well as to Latvia, Poland, and Germany, is all about is dealing with three concerns that, for better or worse, will determine whether we have a peaceful and prosperous future.

In Eastern Europe, we addressed concerns raised by the breakup of the Soviet empire and the need to continue to strengthen democracy and economic growth there, to work until we have a united Europe, a strong trading partner, and a partner for peace.

In negotiations with North Korea that began yesterday in Geneva and in my first meeting here with Japan's new Prime Minister, we are addressing another challenge: the threat posed by nuclear proliferation and the need to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Now, this weekend, I'm meeting with other world leaders to act on what is in many ways the most important purpose of the trip. I'm here to keep our economic recovery going by promoting economic growth throughout the world. What happens here affects every American. More than ever, what happens in the international economy has a direct impact on our jobs, our incomes, and our prospects.

This morning I want to talk with you about the economy, what we've done, how well it's worked, and how America is in a position to lead the world.

This is a time of rapid, often remarkable change. Especially when it comes to the emergence of a truly global marketplace that has opened enormous opportunities. But for a decade, in the face of this change, our leaders mismanaged the economy, walked away from a lot of our challenges, let the deficit explode, and didn't produce enough jobs. And of course, America's middle class fell behind.

Now after years of drift we're pursuing an aggressive strategy for renewal. We began by putting our own economic house in order. We enacted the biggest deficit cut in our history including $255 billion in specific spending cuts. Our deficit is now going down for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

We're expanding exports through trade agreements that tear down foreign barriers to our products and services. And we're creating a world-class education and job training system so that every American has the ability and confidence to compete. From the first day of preschool to the first day on the job to the last day before retirement, you should know that whatever the world brings, you and your children will be prepared.

Our strategy is working. Our economy is coming back. Just yesterday we received some very good news. Since I took office, our economy has produced over 3.8 million jobs, 94 percent of them in the private sector. Just last month, the economy brought us 380,000 new jobs. Unemployment has fallen by more than 1.5 percentage points since I took office and inflation is the lowest in two decades. We have to do more, but this is a very good start.

This news is especially significant as I meet with our trading partners this weekend. America's economic growth is helping to pull the rest of the world out of recession. Our workers and businesses, while accounting for about 40 percent of the overall income of the G–7 countries, produced three-quarters of the growth in the G–7 nations last year and nearly 100 percent of the new jobs. We have the authority to speak and the credibility to be heard.

In Naples, I'm urging our partners to do everything we can to keep the growth going and the new jobs coming. I want these countries and our Congress to ratify the GATT world trade agreement and to do it this year. Ratifying GATT will mean some half a million jobs and billions of dollars in exports for the United States. And because these meetings should be about more than high finance, I also want us to begin to focus hard on the training, education, and skills of our working people and what they'll need to compete and win and to bring us prosperity in the 21st century.

Before coming to Naples, I visited Latvia and Poland, countries that are breathing the fresh air of freedom. I wish every American could have been with me as 40,000 people filled Free-

dom Square in Riga, Latvia, waving American flags and looking to us with hope and admiration. We should see ourselves as they see us, a nation of doers, of optimists, a nation with a future, leading the world to a future of peace and prosperity.

Visiting Eastern Europe reminds us of the remarkable changes that we must deal with every day. The global economy has the power to remake our lives for the better, if we make those changes work for our people. If we move forward with our successful strategy for economic growth, we'll do just that.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:02 p.m. on July 8 in the Hotel Vesuvio in Naples, Italy, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 9.

Exchange With Reporters on North Korea in Naples, Italy
July 9, 1994

The President. Good morning.

Q. Where do we go from here on North Korea?

The President. Let me say, first of all, I have extended sincere condolences to the people of North Korea on behalf of the people of the United States after the death of Kim Il-song, and I have expressed my deep appreciation to him for his leadership in enabling our two countries to resume our talks. We hope the talks will resume as appropriate. We believe it is in the interest of both countries to continue.

Obviously, the people there are preoccupied with their surprise and their grief at this moment. But we have no reason to believe that they will not continue at this time.

Q. Do you have any sign of any foul play?

The President. No. All we know is what was reported. And it was reported that he died of a heart ailment, and that's all we know. We believe, as I said—first of all, we believe that Kim Il-song's leadership in starting these talks again was a very good thing, and we believe it remains in the interest of both countries to continue them, and we hope they will as appropriate.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 9:15 a.m. at the Hotel Vesuvio. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Death of President Kim Il-song of North Korea
July 9, 1994

On behalf of the people of the United States, I extend sincere condolences to the people of North Korea on the death of President Kim Il-song. We appreciate his leadership in resuming the talks between our Governments. We hope they will continue as appropriate.

The President's News Conference in Naples
July 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. First, I would like to thank Prime Minister Berlusconi for his able leadership of this meeting over the last day and an evening and to say that Secretary Christopher and Secretary Bentsen will also be here to answer your questions in a few moments.

I'd like to read a brief statement, and then I'll take questions.

This G–7 meeting opened in an atmosphere of much greater optimism than the meeting we held last year. Last year the G–7 had a record of meeting but not accomplishing very much, and the meeting occurred against the background of a global economic slowdown, recession in the United States, Europe, and in Japan.

We made a commitment last year to pursue a coordinated strategy of global growth, to try to get an agreement on the GATT, and to begin to help Russia in a constructive and cooperative way. We have done all those things, and most importantly, our growth strategy has worked. In the United States, the jobs are up, growth is up, Europe and Canada are beginning to recover, Japan has committed itself to policies that will enable it to contribute to the global economic recovery. We have much to build on, and there was a real sense of confidence at this year's meetings.

Before the summit began, I outlined four principal goals on which progress was made, in fact, at this meeting. First, I said we would continue our focus on growth and to be more specific about what we would do in a cooperative way. It is significant that the leading industrial nations gathered here today jointly pledged that we would actually ratify the GATT agreement this year and that the new World Trade Organization would be up and running by January 1st.

Immediate enactment of the GATT agreement would be a vital shot in the arm for the world economy. It means more trade, more jobs, higher incomes for all our countries. Indeed, we have set aside any new trade efforts to focus on this paramount goal. The Congress, I hope, will take note of the world community's unanimity on this issue and will ratify the GATT in the United States this year.

I am particularly pleased that for the first time the G–7 committed to work cooperatively on the issues of lifetime learning, job training, and skills that are so central to what we are trying to accomplish in the United States. Before we held the Detroit jobs conference, a lot of our colleagues were actually reluctant to engage in the kind of conversation that dominated the dinner table last night and to begin to work together on what we can do to prepare our people for the 21st century.

Second, we're taking steps to build a new infrastructure for the information economy. The G–7 nations will convene a conference on telecommunications issues to lay plans for a global information superhighway. I'll be asking Commerce Secretary Ron Brown to head our delegation.

Third, we are deepening our commitment to the economies and transition from communism to free markets. In particular, we agreed that the international community, led by the IMF and the World Bank, will provide more than $4 billion in financial assistance to Ukraine as that nation carries out a fundamental economic reform program. And we pledged a total of $300 million, actually a little more, to pay for the initial stages of shutting down and cleaning up the nuclear reactor at Chernobyl and to enhance reactor safety there. If this plan is successful, that facility will be closed forever.

Fourth, we continued our commitment to the environment and to sustainable development. This is an important issue not only in the developing world but also among the G–7 nations themselves, important not only as an opportunity and an obligation to clean up the environment but also as a source of new jobs for our people. We're putting our words to the test by agreeing to report back next year on our respective successes in living up to the clean air agreements and the treaties we have signed.

Last year in Tokyo, at the first G–7 summit I attended, I became convinced that these meetings would be more effective in the long term if they were less formal and more open to genuine discussion. To a greater degree than has been the case in the past, the leaders in Naples had the opportunity to take a long-term look at the issues we face together, to focus on tomorrow's opportunities as well as today's problems.

Starting last night, we had an excellent discussion about this moment of historic, economic, political, and social change. As an old world gives way to the new, it is up to the leading economic powers to renew and to revitalize our common efforts and the institutions through which we make them, including the G–7, so that the world economy works for the people we represent.

To that end, the communique commits us to focus on two questions in Halifax next year. First, we will ask how we can assure that the global economy of the 21st century provides the

jobs, the growth, and the expanded trade necessary for us to continue to provide a high quality of life for our people. Second, we will ask what framework of institutions will be required to meet these challenges and how we can adapt existing institutions and build new ones to ensure the prosperity of our people.

Finally, just let me say, I was struck by the degree to which the vision and the goals of the United States are shared by our partners. We all recognize that jobs and wages at home must be paramount, that we are tied to each other in fundamental ways in our ability to achieve our national goals, that our nations will only thrive if we have an environment of open and continually expanding trade, and that for advanced nations especially, the skills, the education, and the training of our workers is the key to our future prosperity.

Now, in addition to that, there was a new emphasis this year on the idea that long-term prosperity requires us to lead the world in developing a concept of sustainable development. That will help not only the economies in transition from communism to free markets but also developing nations with their problems of population, environmental destruction, violence, and other problems.

This kind of comprehensive approach and the extent to which we have agreed across our national lines, it seems to me, give us a real chance to keep going now after two summits in which there were specific forward-looking achievements into the future, to make sure that the G–7 is always a place where we're pushing forward, not just looking backward or talking about things that happened in a reactive way.

So we have some good aims for next year and beyond. We had a good summit this year. And most importantly, the world is well underway to a significant economic recovery. And I think we all understand that we have to continue to work together if we're going to keep that recovery going.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, do you know anything about Kim Il-song's son? And do you think you can continue to do business with North Korea in view of the developments? Have you learned anything today that might enhance your knowledge of this?

The President. Well, I can tell you what we've learned today. We have learned today that, apparently, the North Koreans desire to continue on with the summit with South Korea and that, while they did ask that we suspend our talks with them, they asked that our representatives stay in Geneva. And we agreed to do that. So we believe that they will stay with their policy and stay with their course, that this reflects the feelings of the leadership in North Korea and not simply the feelings of Kim Il-song.

Now, I'm only telling you what I know today, and all I know today is that they said they wanted us to suspend the talks. We understood that, but they asked that we remain in Geneva. And they communiqued to the South Koreans that they wish the summit to go forward. So I think that is a piece of good news. And that is the only news I have about it.

Q. And Kim Il-song's son?

The President. I don't know how to answer that. I know some things, obviously, about him. But I haven't met him. And one of the things that we're trying to do in North Korea, that I've tried to do from the beginning, is to open the prospect of a continuing and a personal dialog. I don't think we want to be isolated from each other. And as I said, the preliminary indications in what must be a very difficult time for them and a sad time have been encouraging.

Q. You say the North Koreans have suggested they're ready to start this dialog with the South Koreans and have this summit. Does that mean North Korea would be represented at the summit by Kim Jong Il, the son, the heir apparent? And following up on that, if you—do you think it would be appropriate at this moment for you to reach out and to meet with Kim Jong Il and start some sort of new relationship between the United States and North Korea?

The President. First, let me reiterate: I can only tell you what I know. It is our understanding that the North Koreans have communicated their desire to continue with the summit, and they did ask our people to remain in Geneva. I do not know anything else, and I do not think I can really say anything else today. But I think you have to view those two signs as hopeful.

The biggest problem we've had in the past, I think, is that, the sense of isolation and misunderstanding which can develop. So I am hoping that we'll be able to continue to talk, but I know only what I said. I can't comment on anything else yet.

Q. Mr. President, as a gesture of this new openness and willingness to work, are you going

to offer to send an official U.S. delegation to the funeral, and have you got any idea of who would be in such a delegation?

The President. It is my understanding that they want to have a funeral that has no foreign visitors and that is a personal thing for North Koreans only. That is our understanding.

Q. Would you send a delegation if one were welcome?

The President. If they were inviting foreign dignitaries to the funeral or receiving them I would certainly send someone there.

Q. Mr. President, the German official said that this was discussed by the leaders this morning. Can you share with us what some of your colleagues at the G–7 felt about the nonproliferation issue and how this might affect it and what steps U.S. summit leaders might be taking to make sure that you remain on track on nuclear nonproliferation?

The President. We didn't really discuss it in that level of detail. What they wanted to know from me was what happens now. So I can only tell them what I've already told you. And one or two said that what I have reported to you was consistent with what they understood to be the facts. And that's about all we could say at this time. We don't have any more information; when I have some more I'll be glad to give it to you.

South Korea

Q. You made a decision already, sir, today, your military made a decision, which we were told was approved by you, not to increase our state of alert.

The President. We did do that; absolutely, we did.

Q. Can you tell us what our situation is in South Korea, where we have 38,000 men?

The President. General Luck, General Shalikashvili, and the Secretary of Defense all recommended, based on General Luck's personal on-site observations, that we continue as usual in Korea and that there was no evident, alarming change in development and that we should, therefore, proceed as we ordinarily would on any other day. And that was a decision made that I approved, based on General Luck's recommendation and the strong recommendation of General Shalikashvili and the Secretary of Defense.

Economic Summit

Q. Mr. President, last year you had what everybody seemed to think was a pretty successful summit in Japan. This year, you've had to abandon your trade proposal, and your comments yesterday about the dollar caused great fluctuation or drop in the currency markets. How do you judge this summit as compared to that summit in terms of your personal——

The President. I feel good about it for two or three reasons that I might—that are very important to me over the long run, especially. One is the leading statement in this summit is a reaffirmation of what we did at the Detroit jobs conference and a commitment that is without precedent among the industrial nations that we will work collaboratively on these people-oriented issues, the investment in our work force.

We had an amazing conversation last night that I've never heard among world leaders before where the leaders of these various countries were trying to analyze whether there was a traceable relationship in their unemployment rate to their investment policies and what the differences were. This is unprecedented—countries are not used to doing this.

Now, in the United States, American Governors do this all the time; that's what they do when they meet. But among the nations of the world, this sort of thing had never happened before. And I wanted to make sure that we have good, strong language about that. I felt good about it.

The second thing that I felt very strongly about was that we ought to be as forthcoming and explicit as possible in our discussion of Ukraine. After what happened in Russia last year, I don't think there is any question that the strong, explicit, and forthcoming statement by the G–7 leaders and the subsequent endeavors to make those commitments real in Russia helped to keep reform moving and made a contribution to what you see now in Russia, which is, even though the economy is still troubled, you see inflation down, you see a deficit that is smaller as a percentage of their income than many European countries had, you see over half the people working in the private sector.

So I felt very good about that, because there were some here who thought we should not be so explicit about what we were going to do for fear that we might not be able to do

it if a reform program did not take place. Well, everybody understands that. We can't just throw money at a problem, we have to have a reform program.

The third thing that happened here, actually happened here but that I think is very important, and that is commitment to discuss in Halifax what we want the world to look like 20 years from now and what kinds of institutional changes we're going to have to make to get it there. And let me explain why this is important, if I might, just very briefly, because I did not—I came here with this in my mind, but I had no earthly idea that we could reach even a limited agreement among ourselves. And it turned out all of them were worried about it, too.

But let me try to just quickly distill the significance of that. That's the commitment to what we're going to discuss in Halifax about the institutions. All of you from home at least have heard me say a dozen times that at the end of World War I, America made the wrong choice. After the war, we became isolated. We withdrew. Other countries withdrew. The Depression came. We wound up with World War II. At the end of World War II, we made the right choice. We got together; we created all these institutions. At the end of the cold war, everybody has made the right choice in general. I mean, you can see that in what we've done with NAFTA, with China, with you name it, trying to reach out and work together.

But there are a relatively small number of new institutions. The European Union, basically it came into effect finally in 1992. It's essentially a post-cold-war institution, and it's reaching out to the East. The World Trade Organization is a new institution. The Partnership For Peace is a new alliance tied to NATO. Otherwise, we are still working with the institutions that we settled on at the end of World War II.

Are they adequate for the problems we face today and tomorrow? And if not, how do we need to change them? This is a very practical thing. You see it hear when we—you see the first example of it here when tomorrow Russia comes here as our partner in a G–8 for political purposes. But that's just one example of a whole slew of questions that have to be asked and answered if we're going to get from where we are to where we want to be 20 years from now. So I would say all those things make a lot a sense to me.

In terms of the trade issue, every member of the G–7 except one affirmatively said they agreed with my trade proposal. One country said that this could complicate—if we raise another trade issue now, that approval of GATT in his country was not a foregone conclusion and approval of GATT in one or two other European countries was not a foregone conclusion and we shouldn't do anything that would impair the near certainty that we can drive through GATT approval in all the major countries this year. I clearly agree with that. That has got to be our number one goal. So I still felt very good about this G–7 summit.

Japan-U.S. Trade

Q. Mr. President, a year ago, we began the framework talks with Japan. It's a year later, four Japanese governments later, nothing's happened on that track at all.

On another track, we've twice threatened trade sanctions, once on textiles with China; we got immediate results, once on cellular phone with Japan; we got immediate results. Is there a lesson there? Is it time for us to start acting on our interests and not waiting for Japan to finally get a government that can deal with us in a serious way?

The President. Well, I think the answer to your question is, yes, we should begin acting in our interest on specific issues. But we should also continue to pursue the framework talks, because they embrace large structural issues which will enable us to have a more normal trading relationship with Japan. And I think, in fairness to our people and to theirs, it is difficult to face those very tough structural issues with the kind of political changes that have occurred there.

If I might, though, we have had a lot of progress in Japan. You mentioned the cellular phone issue. We've also had a contracting issue, a public contracting issue. We're also selling rice in Japan for the first time—the people, the rice farmers in northern California think that there's a new day in relationships with Japan.

So we're making some headway here, and I think now if what we heard from the new Japanese Prime Minister and his team was an indication that they're going to pursue an aggressive growth strategy, so they'll be able to buy more of their own products and other products and they are determined to stay in this thing for the long run and they want to reengage, then

I think we may be able to make some progress on the framework talks. But I agree that we also have to pursue specific issues.

Press Secretary Myers. Last question.

The President. I'll take two. And I'll take one from you, but let him go first.

North Korea

Q. We now have a country with a succession problem, a succession question, and a military where we're not really sure who controls it and maybe who controls nuclear weapons. Recently, your administration has made statements like it's more important that they not develop further nuclear weapons and maybe not as important that we deal with their current nuclear capability if they have one.

You've said you're committed to a nuclear-free Peninsula, but can you tell the American people what your state of knowledge is about what nuclear weapons the North Koreans might have and how committed you are, what steps you will take, besides going to negotiations of trying to make certain that any nuclear weapons are eliminated?

The President. Well, I think it only—let me just go back to what I said. I think it only stands to reason that we would all be more concerned about the prospect of any country producing large numbers of nuclear weapons in the future which might be transferred to other countries. That's just a practical statement of fact.

However, North Korea is a member of the NPT and has made commitments to a non-nuclear Peninsula, and because of its membership there and because of its commitments, we still care very much about what's happened since 1989. And what we hoped to do is to resolve these questions in these talks. And we think we can safely proceed with these talks with absolutely no downside to our allies in South Korea, to our friends in Japan, to the Chinese, to the Russians, to any others in the neighborhood, and to ourselves, as long as North Korea maintains its commitment to freeze the important elements of its nuclear program, the reprocessing and the refueling. And so we are proceeding ahead on both fronts, as I think it should.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—nuclear weapons——

The President. We are engaging in the talks. One of the issues in the talks is what's happened to the fuel since 1989. That's the subject of the talks and part of the request for the inspections. What has been reported in the press, varying opinions of intelligence agencies, represents their best judgment, their—I don't want to use the word "guess," but there are differences of opinion based on best judgment. No one knows that for sure. That's what the talks are for, in part.

Terrorism in Algeria

Q. Mr. President, could you explain to us your reluctance to clearly condemn Islamic terrorism in Algeria, and is it a part of the global strategy vis-a-vis the Arab world?

The President. First of all, I don't think we've been reluctant at all to condemn Islamic terrorism in Algeria or anyplace else. We deplore it, and we condemn it.

What we have sought to do in Algeria is to support a process which would enable the government to successfully govern and to limit terrorism while recognizing any other legitimate concerns of opposition in the country. That is our position. We do not condone terrorism, we condemn it, and we will continue to do so.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 63d news conference began at 6:20 p.m. in the Palazzo Reale. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Gary E. Luck, senior U.S. commander in South Korea. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

The President's News Conference With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Naples
July 10, 1994

President Clinton. Good afternoon. As you know, this was a very important day in which President Yeltsin joined us as a full partner in the G–8 for political discussions. And we followed that meeting with a bilateral meeting, continuing our good personal relationship, which made some significant progress.

I'd like to make a few comments on the G–8 and on our bilateral meeting and then have President Yeltsin make any statement he'd like to make. And of course, we'll take some questions.

First of all, today's statement read by Chairman Berlusconi on behalf of all eight of us makes it clear that we share fundamental foreign policy goals: support for democracy, free markets, building new security relationships. On these matters, we spoke as one. If you read each of the items in that statement, I think it is remarkable that these eight countries have together agreed on these things.

In the wake of the death of Kim Il-song, we also expressed our strong commitment to continuing talks with North Korea and our support for the holding of the summit which had previously been scheduled between leaders of North and South Korea. We also strongly agreed on the importance of pushing ahead with a resolution of the crisis in Bosnia.

Finally, the United States and Russia joined all of the nations in expressing regret over the death of the Italian sailors at the hands of terrorists in Algeria and reaffirmed our opposition to terrorism anywhere, anytime.

With regard to my meeting with President Yeltsin, let me just mention one or two issues. First of all, there has been a promising development in the Baltics. After my very good discussion with the President of Estonia, Mr. Meri, I passed on his ideas to President Yeltsin today in effort to break the impasse between the two nations over troop withdrawals.

I believe the differences between the two countries have been narrowed and that an agreement can be reached in the near future so that troops would be able to withdraw by the end of August. But now that is a matter to be resolved between President Yeltsin and President Meri, which President Yeltsin has promised to give his attention and for which I am very grateful.

When the Russian troops withdraw from the Baltics and Germany, it will end the bitter legacy of the Second World War. I want to say publicly here that none of this could have been accomplished without the emergence of a democratic Russia and its democratic President. And I thank President Yeltsin for that.

We talked about Ukraine, its importance to Russia, to the United States, to the future. And we agreed on continuing to work on the issues that we all care about, including economic reform and continuing to implement the agreement on denuclearization which has so far been implemented quite faithfully. We talked about our security relationship, and I must say again how pleased I am that Russia has joined the Partnership For Peace.

And finally, I'd like to congratulate President Yeltsin on the remarkable, steadfast and success of his economic reform efforts. Inflation is down. The Russian deficit is now a smaller percentage of annual income than that of some other European countries. Over half the workers are now in the private sector. There's a lot to be done, and the rest of us have our responsibilities, as well. And we talked a little bit about that and what the United States could do to increase trade and investment.

Looking ahead, I have invited President Yeltsin to come to Washington to hold a summit with me and to have a state visit on September 27th and 28th, and he has accepted. I'm confident that would give us a chance to continue the progress we are making and the friendship we are developing.

Mr. President.

President Yeltsin. Thank you, Mr. President Bill Clinton, for the kind words that you said toward Russia and its President.

I of course am very satisfied by the summit, the political 8, which has taken place today. I think that this of course is just a beginning. But as I said, the Russian Bear is not going to try to break his way through an open door, and we are not going to force ourselves into

the full G–8 until it is deserved. When our economic system, our economic situation, will become coordinated with the economic systems of the other seven countries, then it will be natural and then Russia will enter as a full-fledged member of the 8 then.

Nonetheless, I am grateful to the chairman, Prime Minister of Italy, Mr. Berlusconi, and to all the heads of the states of the seven for the attention which they showed towards Russia, the welcome, including yesterday's statement by the chairman and today's statement on political issues.

Together, today, we held a discussion on political, international issues around the world, and we found common understanding, which says a lot about the fact that we can find this mutual understanding and in realistic terms cooperate and help in the strengthening of peace on this planet.

I believe that this meeting and—yesterday's, I mean—and today's is yet another large step towards the security of Europe, for a much more economically stable situation, and an order that, really, the world can live in peace and in friendship. And we should all help in this endeavor, and I think this meeting is yet another large step to full security of peace on Earth.

In developing my thoughts, I wanted to add that this meeting was a meeting, bilateral meeting, that we had with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. But our meetings are always held in a very dynamic and interesting way; we get very specific. We don't have a lot of philosophizing there now. Say if it's 1:15 p.m., 1:20 p.m., we get in and start discussing about 30, 35 different issues, at least, on one side, on the other side. And we find—of necessity, we sit down and we find some kind of compromise solution to find an answer.

And I have to say, yet again, this time we were able to summarize after the last summit meeting, where Bill came to Russia, we were able to summarize all the things that happened. Many, many things took place, very positive things, and we expressed satisfaction to the fact of how our relationship is developing and growing, our partnership, our friendship, our cooperation.

At the same time, of course, as people who are sincere, both of us could not but touch upon some of the issues which, unfortunately, are yet unresolved, which still we could not have found answers to up until now. This has to do with certain discrimination toward Russia in trade, for example.

This time at the 8, Russia did not ask for money. It said—I said—let's all together take certain measures and steps and decisions in your individual countries, included among them the United States of America, so that Russia on an equal basis, equal basis, could trade with everybody. We're not asking for any preferential conditions, we're not asking for any special circumstances for us alone. No. We're saying let's give us equal rights, get rid finally, once and for all, of this red jacket. Take that red jacket from the President of Russia, which I don't wear now for 3 years; I've taken that red, besmirched jacket off of myself. You understand what I'm talking about, right? You understand.

You earned the right of asking the first question. [*Laughter*]

Russian Troop Withdrawals

Q. I said, you're not going to like my first question. Will you have all the Russian troops out of the Baltics by August 31?

President Yeltsin. No. I—nice question. I like the question, because I can say no. [*Laughter*] We took out of Lithuania—we removed 31st of August with drumbeat, we're going to take under his arms and take that last soldier from Latvia. Now Estonia, somewhat more difficult relationship since there in Estonia, there are very crude violations of human rights, vis-a-vis Russian-speaking population, especially toward military pensioners.

Bill Clinton, when he was there in Riga and he met with a large group of people, about 40,000 people, and the heads of three Baltic States, he expressed his point of view that you have to maintain and protect human rights. And I think that after his saying so, the President of Estonia will begin to listen. I promised Bill that I personally will meet with him, with the President of Estonia. We're going to discuss these issues, and after, we're going to try to find a solution to this question.

Russian Trade Limitations

Q. Boris Nikolayevich, you said that at the 7, now 7—where you're not with the political 8—but with the 7, you talked about removing discriminatory measures. Do you feel that this is a task that is a timely task, vis-a-vis relations with the United States? In other words, Russian

high technology had access to the marketplace included among the United States market.

President Yeltsin. I have to say that we signed with the European Union at Corfu, we signed an agreement in Greece where all the discriminatory measures are removed from Russia. Now, as far as other countries are concerned, some of those provisions remain.

Now, let's talk about COCOM, export of high technologies, et cetera, except for weapons. Today Mr. President of the United States, at the 8 and then later when we talked together, he stated that when I come to the United States with an official visit on the 27th and 28th of September, he's going to make an official statement that these limitations are being removed altogether.

But in the new post-COCOM organization, our specialists are going to participate in the development of lists of all those materials and technologies which are not going to be allowed for export in the whole world, and that will also have to do with Russia. In other words, we're going to be on an equal footing.

President Clinton. Just a minute, I'd like to just clarify and support what President Yeltsin said on that and make a couple of points.

First of all, the United States is committed to joint economic activities that advance Russia's interests. The most significant one that's been ratified recently is the overwhelming support in the United States Congress for the space station program, which now is a partnership between Russia, Europe, Japan, and Canada.

Secondly, what happened when the COCOM was even out of existence is a lot of the countries' individual laws were still in existence. So we need a new order to replace COCOM. And what I said was, as he said, was we want Russia to be a part of that, so that there will be no discrimination in trade between Russia and other countries, except insofar as we all accept restraints that tend to limit the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The third thing I want to say is, I was glad to see Europe sign that agreement with Russia at Corfu. But if you look at the facts of who's done what kind of business, I think you'll see that the Americans stand up very well against the Europeans on that.

Bosnia

Q. President Yeltsin, the Americans are looking to Russia for help on persuading the Serbs to agree to the new map for Bosnia. Will you provide the help? I know, of course, Russia joined in the statement, but how aggressive will you be about that? And I'm going to throw in a quick second question. What is the state of Russian trade with terrorist-supporting countries? The communique today, of course, took a strong stand against terrorism.

President Yeltsin. As far as the map is concerned, the Bosnian map, Croatia, and between Serbs and the Muslims, 51–49, the contact group has developed these proposals. The ministers of foreign affairs, including Minister Kozyrev of Russia, have agreed with this proposal, and that's why we are going to act, and I personally, very decisively, as much character as we have in our bodies.

Now, as far as trade is concerned from the countries where terrorism stems from, we're going to attempt to limit—we're moving in the direction of limiting trade with those terrorist countries.

Russian Role in Economic Summit

Q. What do you feel is the principal difference between the Tokyo summit last time and this one? And how do you feel the next meeting of the 7, or maybe we can call it the 8, from the Naples session—how is the next one going to differ?

President Yeltsin. Well, I will say that this one differs significantly from the Munich and the Tokyo summit very significantly. Russia, for all practical purposes, has been accepted into the world community. It has been recognized as a democratic state. For us, this is the most important.

Of course, it hurts a little bit that that amount of money which we're calling support back in Tokyo and we weren't even able to get half of it—but in the final analysis, I said that today the most important thing is not to ask money, but that we be accepted and recognized as equal. And then we, together, are going to go out and earn.

Now, as far as from the perspective of the Halifax meeting next year—I received an invitation today from Prime Minister of Canada, and he said that from the point of view of the 8, this is going to be a much more official and stronger, more cohesive meeting.

Press Secretary Myers. Last question.

Haiti

Q. Did you discuss at all with the other leaders of the 8 the possibility that the United States might take military action in Haiti at some point? And do you still maintain that you would discuss such action with the United States Congress, or can you foresee a situation, sir, in which you would judge American lives to be in danger and therefore feel that you could move immediately?

President Clinton. The answer to your question is that I did not discuss that with the 8. The thing that I appreciated was that they were all very vigorous in saying that the military leaders should keep their commitment and should leave and that we should restore democracy to Haiti and that they supported that. That was the full extent of the conversation.

NOTE: The President's 64th news conference began at 3:40 p.m. in the Palazzo Reale. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

The President's News Conference With Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany in Bonn
July 11, 1994

Chancellor Kohl. President Bill, ladies and gentlemen, it's the very great pleasure for me to be able to welcome you, Mr. President, here to Germany, here in the Chancellery of the Federal Building of Germany.

I salute the President of the United States, the country to which the Germans owe so much after the war, more than any other country in the world. American soldiers brought freedom to Germany. American soldiers were those who brought us freedom, and the United States of America helped us in those difficult times. And Bill as a representative of a generation that experienced that. I was 15, 16 years old then—those who, until the monetary reform here in Germany, had firsthand experience of hunger and starvation, had experience of the kind of rubble in which our cities had fallen and the destruction that had been wrought through the war. As someone of that generation, I say to you how much that means, friendship and partnership with the United States, to us here in Germany. And we have not forgotten the millions of American soldiers who, over a period of more than 40 years, defended freedom and peace and security for us here in Germany, who were here, far from their homes, together with their relatives, with their family members.

And we have certainly not forgotten—certainly I have not forgotten—that all American Presidents, ever since Harry S Truman, the unforgettable Harry S Truman, and George Marshall always were ready to help us in difficult times. And all Presidents of the United States, from Harry S Truman onward, all the way to George Bush, and to you, to you, Bill, and to your term in office, all of you have helped us along the way.

I will never forget the German unity in those dramatic days and months, 1989, 1990, and the years after that, that this would not have been brought about without the assistance and help of our American friends. And in this dramatic moment of change in the world, where I feel it is changing for the better, it is of tremendous importance that we should continue this good cooperation.

Tomorrow you will go to Berlin. And that is something for which I am highly grateful, because for us Berlin is the symbol of the free world. And without your assistance throughout the years—the airlift is just one case in point—people would not have been able to live freely in peace and freedom in Berlin.

For the future, we want to adhere to the clear maxim of Konrad Adenauer, who said again and again that German security, German future rests on two pillars: the unification of Europe and transatlantic partnership and friendship. And this basic tenet of our foreign policy will not change, which is why I am grateful that the President of the United States, once again, on the 9th of January of this year in Brussels made it very clear in his speech that

the presence of American soldiers here in Germany and in the whole of Europe will be maintained.

I think we have launched a lot of common initiatives. I would like to mention here the exchange programs of young students, the contribution that was made to the German American Academic Council, that apart from military security issues and economic issues, cultural relations are very important, too, and they also strengthen our relationship.

We have just talked about how the ancestry of so many Americans—so many Americans know about their roots that they have here in Germany. And what we have built up over these years, decades, centuries, is something that we want to continue.

You see these old trees, very old trees, that were planted by generations that were before us. And we are happy to see them grown, because others have been so farsighted to plant them. And if we bring together young Americans and young Germans, it's as if you've planted the seedlings for a new forest. And this is something we want to do together.

We talked about many topical issues of day-to-day politics yesterday and today, yesterday in Naples. We will continue our talks here today. Once again, a very warm welcome to you here in Bonn and later on in Berlin. And what is important and what still stands is what we said after our first meeting: Watching a German-American friendship, a German-American partnership is one of the basic prerequisites for upholding peace and freedom of our country, and I'm truly grateful for this.

Thank you.

The President. Thank you very much. I was very grateful to have the opportunity to visit here in Bonn for the first time and to be the first American President to come here since the fall of the Wall and the unification of Germany. I also want to say, I appreciate very much having the opportunity to see Chancellor Kohl again and to build on the work that we have just done at the G–7 Summit at Naples.

The relationship between Germany and America in the last several decades has been truly unique in history. And the Chancellor and I both hold our offices at a moment of historic opportunity. The walls between nations are coming down; bridges between nations are coming up. The integration of Europe, strongly supported by the United States, is well underway.

We know from our experience how half of Europe was integrated through NATO and other institutions that built stability after World War II. We marvel at the leadership of Chancellor Kohl and his fellow Germans who came from West and East and who have now made their nation whole, who are working so hard to revive the economy, not only of Europe but of the entire globe.

At the heart of our discussion today was what we have to do to integrate Europe's other half, the new independent nations of Central and Eastern Europe, Poland, the Baltic countries, Russia, Ukraine, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, the others. We noted how American and Russian forces will soon leave places in Germany where they have been since 1945. We discussed how important it is to expand joint military exercises with our allies through the Partnership For Peace. But we also recognize that trade, as much as troops, will increasingly define the ties that bind nations in the 21st century.

We discussed how new institutions and relationships must be built on even broader stability in the wake of the aftermath of the cold war. We discussed how new institutions and relationships must build even stronger stability after the cold war, institutions such as the European Union whose presidency Germany has recently assumed, the World Trade Organization, and of course, the Partnership For Peace.

As we build on the work we did in Naples and look to next year in Halifax, the economic, cultural, and security bonds between Germany and the United States will grow stronger. The Chancellor and I will continue to do everything we can to make the microphones work—[*laughter*]—and to integrate the newly independent countries of Europe into shared security with their neighbors, helping them to reform their economies, attract new investment, claim their place at the table with free and friendly nations of like mind.

Let me say again how much I personally appreciate the working relationship I have enjoyed with Chancellor Kohl and the partnership that has existed for so long now between Germany and the United States. As we look forward to further progress in integrating Europe, in dealing with the difficulties in Bosnia—and we hope that peace will be made there—I think it is clear that to imagine any of these things working out over the long run, the German-American

partnership will have to be maintained and strengthened, and I am confident that it will be.

German Leadership

Q. Tomorrow a German court will rule whether Germany can send troops beyond NATO's borders. How would you like to see Germany play a greater role on the world stage? I would actually like to ask the Chancellor how he sees that as unfolding.

The President. The German court will rule—for fear that I will have an adverse impact, although I doubt that the opinion of the United States can or should have much impact on a constitutional judgment by a German court.

Let me answer you in this way. I have great confidence in the larger purposes and direction of this country and of the support Germany has given to a unified Europe in which it is a partner, but an equal partner, with its friends and neighbors, as well as to a more aggressive effort to solve the problems within Europe, like Bosnia, and beyond Europe's borders.

I think anything that can be done to enable Germany to fulfill the leadership responsibilities that it is plainly capable of fulfilling is a positive thing. But of course, the German court will have to interpret the German constitution. That's beyond the reach of Americans to understand, much less comment on, but I do hope that we will have the benefit of the full range of Germany's capacities to lead.

Chancellor Kohl. First of all, ladies and gentlemen, I think you will well understand that before the court has come to its final ruling I will not be able to comment on that. Here in Germany we say that on the high seas and in front of a tribunal you are always in God's hands, and I think a chancellor would be well advised to stick to this kind of advice.

I can only tell you how we see our position in general terms, the role of Germany. Well, we are members of the United Nations, and as members of the United Nations we have certain obligations and we have certain rights. And I think it is simply inconceivable and incompatible with the dignity of our country that we make full use of the rights and do not fulfill our obligations. This is unacceptable.

That is also the background of the internal dispute that is currently in discussion, that is going on here. We have had help from our neighbors, from the United States, that I already mentioned. Now when things get a bit rough, we cannot simply sit back and let others do the work. We will have to discuss, obviously, how we are going to do this in detail once the court has come to its final ruling. We have to assume our international responsibilities.

This excuse that we had for the past 40 years, and it was a justified opinion under the circumstances, where we said, "Well, as a divided country we will simply not be able to take certain decisions," that is something that is no longer valid. One cannot be a reunified country with 80 million people with the kind of economic strength that we have, with the kind of reputation and prestige that we claim for ourselves, if we do not fully assume our responsibilities and fulfill our obligations. And as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, I would have you know that it will be the opinion of this Federal Government that we will bear responsibility within the framework of our responsibilities.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, back home you've been criticized by the Republican leader, Bob Dole, for your condolences that you offered to the Korean people on the death of Kim Il-song. How do you feel about his comments? Do you think it was a mistake to offer condolences, and are you concerned about this latest postponement of the North-South talks and also the Geneva talks?

The President. First of all, let me say that the statement that I issued was brief, to the point, and appropriate, and very much in the interest of the United States. It is a fact that after years and years of isolation and a great deal of tension arising out of the nuclear questions, we began talks again with the North Koreans on the day that Kim Il-song died.

I think it is in the interest of the United States that North Korea continue to suspend its reprocessing, refueling, and continue to engage in those talks. They have told us that the talks will resume after an appropriate time for grieving. And I would think that the veterans of the Korean war and their survivors, as much as any group of Americans, would very much want us to resolve this nuclear question with North Korea and to go forward. So what I said and what I did, I believed then and I believe now was in the interest of the United States and all Americans.

Bosnia

Q. On the situation in Bosnia, there seems to be a growing concern in the United States to go ahead and finally lift the arms embargo so that Bosnian Muslims can defend themselves. Are you now prepared to support that, and why has it taken so long?

Perhaps, President Clinton, you'd like to respond to that as well.

Chancellor Kohl. Well, first of all I don't think it would be wise to discuss this question at this present moment in time, publicly, and I will not do so. We have come to clear agreements so the participants to the conflict have a clear-cut plan submitted to them on the table.

There is a very clear period for a decision that has been granted to them, and I think we should wait until that has run out and then come to our decision. But I would like to use this opportunity to appeal to all parties to the conflict in Bosnia to seize this opportunity that may open up itself if all parties to the conflict show themselves willing to compromise.

If you look at the declaration, the statement that emanated from the conference yesterday in Naples, where President Yeltsin also had a share in that since eight countries participated yesterday that here, a very clear-cut position comes out of this declaration and I support this declaration, and I am in complete agreement with my friend Bill Clinton on that.

The President. Let me just say, too, the Bosnian Government has, with great difficulty—because the map is not easy for anyone—but the Bosnian Government has said that it would accept that contact group's proposal and present it for approval, and I think we should support that. I think that the Serbs should do the same, and I think it should be implemented.

The contact group has worked very hard to bring an end to this conflict and to be as fair as possible to the parties. And what we have to do with this problem in the heart of Europe here is to give the chance for peace to occur, and we all need to be supporting this. And I feel very strongly that the fact that we've been able to achieve a united position here gives us a chance to have the peace agreement work if it is accepted in good faith. And that's where I think we ought to go. I think we ought to work together with our allies in Europe to solve this problem, and we have come very close to doing that.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, are you operating on blind faith in terms of North Korea? It seems to me that the fact that they in the future will get to us through diplomatic channels and really postpone the talks, now today the breakoff of the North-South summit. Don't you have some sense that things may not go so well?

The President. Well, the evidence will be in the action. That is, we have been told—first of all, let me break these two issues up.

The United States said that we would go back to discussions on the nuclear questions if, but only if, the reprocessing and refueling were suspended so that the situation could not further deteriorate. The North Koreans have told us that they were prepared to continue the discussions, but they wanted an appropriate period of time in the aftermath of Kim Il-song's death. So I think, on balance, we know whether or not they will keep their word and we will be able to see that. We will know whether or not they continue to avoid reprocessing, refueling. And they say they want to continue the talks, so I'm hopeful on that.

On the question of the summit, as I understand it—and I haven't had a chance to visit with President Kim about it, I'm going to talk with him in the next couple of days—keep in mind, that's a matter for the North Koreans and the South Koreans to determine between themselves. And I don't think it's entirely clear right now, at least, where both parties stand on the timing of that. I do hope it will be held as soon as it's appropriate and so do the G–7 countries. We, the G–8, yesterday, came out for that in our political statement.

But there's no pie-in-the-sky optimism here; there are facts, which are the predicate to continuing talks. And the facts are, will the nuclear reprocessing and refueling be suspended and will the talks resume at an appropriate time and a reasonable time. And so far, the answers to both those questions seem to be yes, and therefore, I think that's good news.

Q. Mr. President, the indications seem to be that the younger Kim is a somewhat peculiar chap, and I wonder what sense you may have of that and how it may affect any calculations you might be making as to whether and when, if at all, to reach out to him diplomatically in any way?

The President. I wish you'd answer that question, Helmut. [*Laughter*]

Chancellor Kohl. I don't think either of us knows anything specific. And in such difficult times and in such a difficult situation, I think the best thing is probably one to wait until you see the original, and don't hear reports that you hear about the original.

The President. Let me give you an answer. I was only halfway serious, but he did a good job, didn't he? [*Laughter*]

I don't know the younger Kim. And I think you have to be careful in judging people by what others say about them one way or the other. I think we need to proceed on the facts. If the facts are that North Korea is serious about continuing to talk with us in Geneva and will continue to suspend these important elements of the nuclear program, then we should proceed on that basis. Any other questions will have to be developed as we know more than we now know.

Decline of the Dollar

Q. Really a question for Chancellor Kohl, whether or not you have some concerns about the falling U.S. dollar, whether or not you and President Clinton discussed that, and do you think that the U.S. should take some action by involving the dollar at this time?

Chancellor Kohl. That was not the subject of our discussions today. But on the margins of the conference in Naples, that was an issue among others. But I must tell you that it's not my job to talk to a government with whom we have such friendly ties in such a forum and then to make this in any way public. That is something that I do not want to do.

The American economy, and this is to our advantage infinitely here in Europe and in Germany, has, thankfully, now picked up again and is in an upswing. And I think the American Government knows very well how the domestic situation is and is in the best position to make decisions. I don't think that it would be appropriate to discuss this publicly. I have a very vivid memory of this kind of discussion in my own country over the years; this is why I always held back in this kind of discussions with others.

The President. Let me say I'm reluctant to say more than I already have, which is that we will not use the dollar as an instrument of trade. We take this issue seriously, but the fundamentals of the American economy are sound. I appreciate Chancellor Kohl talking about our economic recovery in saying that that is good for Germany. We want to be in a position to buy more as well as to sell more.

Germany-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, you said that the German-American relations were a truly unique relationship. Obviously, one thinks immediately of a special relationship that played quite a significant role in the relations of your country with the U.K. Now, which country is going to be the most important half of the talks for you in the future?

The President. That's like asking me to pick a team in the World Cup. [*Laughter*] Once we were eliminated I declined to do that.

Well, the relationship we have with the two countries is different, you know. I mean the history is different. The relationship we have with the U.K. goes back to our founding. Even though we fought two wars with them early in the last century, it is unique in ways that nothing can ever replace because we grew out of them.

The relationship we have with Germany is rooted in the stream of immigration that goes back 200 years. Indeed, as Chancellor Kohl said, most Americans might be surprised to know that German-Americans are the largest ethnic group in the United States, about 58 million of them. But what we have shared since World War II, I think, is astonishing. And I think 200, 300, 400 years from now historians will look back on this period, this 50 years, and just marvel at what happened in the aftermath of that awful war. And it has given us a sense, I think, common partnership that is unique now because so many of our challenges are just to Germany's east. What are we going to do in Central and Eastern Europe? What will be our new relationship with Russia, will it continue as strongly as it now seems to be doing?

So there's a way in which the United States and Germany have a more immediate and tangible concern with these issues, even than our other friends in Europe. And so history has dealt us this hand, and a very fortunate one it is, I think.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 65th news conference began at 11:49 a.m. at the Chancellory. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks at a Luncheon Hosted by Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany in Bonn

July 11, 1994

Chancellor Kohl, distinguished guests, on behalf of my wife and myself and our entire delegation, let me first thank you for receiving us so warmly, for arranging such wonderful weather and such a wonderful feeling of hospitality.

Let me begin by thanking the Chancellor for his very fine statement. I found myself listening to him describing his vision of the present and the future and imagining what I would say when I stood to speak myself. And it reminded me of what so often happens at the G–7 meetings or NATO meetings. They call on me, and I say, "I agree with Helmut." [*Laughter*]

But let me say that the United States does strongly support the movement toward a more united Europe and understands that Germany's leadership toward a truly united Europe is critical. We see today the growing strength of the European Union and NATO's new Partnership For Peace, which has 21 nations including Russia, the other former republics of the Soviet Union, the former Warsaw Pact countries, and two formerly more neutral countries, Sweden and Finland, all signed up to work with us toward a more secure Europe in which all nations respect each other's borders.

Chancellor, I thank you especially for your kind remarks about the American military and their presence in your country over these last decades.

The thing that is truly unique about this moment in history is that all of us through NATO and the Partnership For Peace are seeking to use our military to do something never before done in the entire history of the nation state on the European Continent: to unify truly free and independent nations of their own free will in a Europe that is truly free together, rather than to have some new and different division of Europe that works to the advantage of some country and to the disadvantage of others.

To be sure, no one knows for sure what the future holds or whether this can be done, but for the first time ever sensible people believe it is possible and we must try. If we are able to see a united Europe through common democracies, the expansion of trade, and the use of security to protect freedom and independence rather than to restrict it, this would be a truly momentous event in all of human history.

We may all debate and argue about exactly how this might be done and what should be done next and whether the next step should be one of economics, or politics, or strengthening the Partnership For Peace. But there is one thing on which we must all surely agree: The future we dream of cannot be achieved without the continued strong, unified efforts of Germany and the United States.

In closing, I would like to just refer to a bit of American history. What we have done together since the end of the Second World War is familiar to all of you. But some of you may not know that my country, from its very beginning, has been strengthened by people from Germany who came there first primarily to the State of Pennsylvania, known for its tolerance and openness to people of different racial and ethnic and religious groups.

Just one week ago on this day, one week ago today, we celebrated the 218th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. As soon as the Declaration of Independence was issued, it was immediately reprinted in German so that it could be given to the colonists in our colonies who at that time still only spoke or read German. I might say, today, unfortunately, more of you speak our language than we speak yours, but we're trying to do better. [*Laughter*]

At any rate, down to the present day, after 218 years, there are only two copies of the original German printing of the American Declaration of Independence in existence. And some of your freedom-loving fellow citizens have purchased one of those copies for the German Historical Museum.

And so, Chancellor Kohl, it is here today, and I am honored to be here with it. And I hope all of you will have a chance to view it as a symbol of our unity and our devotion to freedom. Thank you very much.

I would like to now offer a toast to a free, democratic, and unified Germany, with great thanks for our common heritage and our common future.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. at the Petersburg Guest House.

Remarks to the Citizens of Oggersheim, Germany
July 11, 1994

Thank you very much, Chancellor Kohl, Mrs. Kohl, Oberburgermeister Schulte, Mrs. Schulte. How did I do with that? Okay? I said the word almost alright?

Hillary and I are very honored to be here tonight in Chancellor Kohl's hometown. When we were coming here on the bus, of course, I saw much of the unique and rich history of Germany, including the marvelous cathedral at Worms, where Martin Luther tacked his theses to the door, as Chancellor Kohl has said. But I also saw the fields of the farms, which reminded me of my home, and the small towns which made me feel at home. And more importantly, when we got out down the street and began to walk down here, I felt a sense of friendship, a sense of real contact with people that, too often, leaders of great nations don't get in this day and time.

And so, Hillary and I would like to thank you for making us feel at home and for your friendship toward the United States and for reminding us that behind all the decisions that leaders in public life make, there are real people whose lives will be affected, children whose future will be shaped, and our obligation every day is to remember the faces of our homes.

So I thank you for your friendship to my country. I thank you for your outpouring of friendship today. And I thank you for making Hillary and me feel as if we, too, are at home.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 6:40 p.m. in front of the residence of Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany. In his remarks, he referred to Hannelore Kohl, wife of the Chancellor, Dr. Wolfgang Schulte, Lord Mayor of Oggersheim, and his wife, Dr. Dorothee Schulte.

Remarks to U.S. Military Personnel at Ramstein Air Base in Ramstein, Germany
July 11, 1994

Thank you. First, let me thank the Air Force Band. They were great. Thank you very much. Thank you, Chief Bailey, General Joulwan, General Oaks. Minister President Scharping, thank you for joining us tonight; Colonel Caine. It is an honor for me to be here with the men, the women, and the families of the magnificent 86th Wing and the KLM community. Thank you for coming out; thank you for serving America; thank you for making us proud. I'm also proud to be here visiting the largest American community outside of the United States of America. I want to thank the crews who just showed me the C–130 and the F–16 and all of you who serve in any way.

You know, last month I came to Europe for the 50th anniversary of the Italian and Normandy campaigns of World War II to honor the brave airmen, soldiers, and sailors who rescued freedom in its darkest hour in this century. Tonight I come here to honor you who keep the torch of freedom alive. We are in your debt.

You know perhaps better than any other group of Americans, that though the cold war is over, the world still has its dangers and challenges; America still has its responsibilities. You do America's work and freedom's work, and the families who support you, who often are separated from you for long periods of time, also do America's work, and we thank you all.

You have done so much in Somalia, in Turkey, in Macedonia, over the skies of Bosnia, and other places in the former Yugoslavia. From 1991 through 1993, during Operation Provide Comfort, you flew nearly 5,000 combat sorties over northern Iraq. Since 1993, as part of Operation Deny Flight, Ramstein F–16's flying out of Aviano Air Base have flown almost 2,000 missions over the former Yugoslavia. And last February, when six Bosnian Serb air force fighters violated the no-fly zone to bomb a munitions factory, Ramstein pilots, including Captain Bob Wright, who I just met, got the call to respond. And all America showed what America's pilots could do and America's planes could do in the cause of freedom.

You at Ramstein and at Rhein-Main are involved in one of the great humanitarian missions of our time as well, delivering supplies and hope to people under siege in Bosnia. I have just seen an impressive demonstration of how you get that job done as well. You've done so much that the airlift in Bosnia has now surpassed the great Berlin airlift of 45 years ago, both in time and missions flown. In the greatest humanitarian airlift in history you have brought relief to the vulnerable, pride to the people back home, and you have made history. I salute you. America salutes you.

Our world is very different now. The walls between nations are coming down, and bridges are coming up. Last week I had the honor to represent all of you as the first American President ever to set foot on free Baltic soil when I spoke in Riga, Latvia, to over 40,000 people. Tomorrow I will have the honor to represent you as the first American President to walk into what we used to call East Berlin. There I will join the troops of the Berlin Brigade as they case the colors and begin heading home, knowing their mission has been accomplished.

Berlin is free; Germany is united. But make no mistake about it, our commitment to the security and future, to the democracy and freedom of Europe remains. Our security and our prosperity depend upon it. The entire transatlantic alliance knows that the United States is still critical to its success and to its future. That's why we intend to keep our forces here in Europe, some 100,000 strong. I think you know we need to stay. Our European friends want us to stay. And I believe a majority of the American people support our continued mission here, thanks to the work you have done and the example you have set.

At the end of World War II, our country did not make the same mistake it had made in the past. We didn't let our guard down, and we didn't walk away from our friends and allies. With the cold war over and freedom on the march throughout Europe, it is important that we recognize our mission has changed but we still have a mission. We can't let our guard down, and we can't walk away from our friends.

We actually have the opportunity, those of us who live now, to work with our friends in Europe to achieve for the first time in all of human history a Europe that is united for democracy, for peace, and for progress, not divided in ways that help some people at the expense of others. In order to do that, America must stay here, America must work here, America must stand for peace and freedom and progress.

It has already been said, but I want to say again how hard it has been for the members of our armed services to continue to do these incredible things in the face of the dramatic reductions in military spending and manpower that we have sustained.

I believe that when the history of this era is written, one of the untold stories that will emerge clearly in the light of time is the absolutely brilliant job done by the United States military in downsizing the military, still treating members of the military like human beings and citizens and patriots, and maintaining the strongest, best equipped, best prepared, and highest morale military force in the entire world. It is a tribute to you, and someday the whole story will be known.

When I leave tomorrow, I will go back to the United States and to our continued effort at renewal at home. You should know that your country's coming back at home as well. In the last year and a half, about 3.8 million new jobs have come into our economy. The unemployment rate has dropped about a point and a half. There is a serious effort underway at rebuilding our communities, our neighborhoods, our families, a serious attempt to address the

crime problem, a serious attempt to address the welfare problem. And I also want to say that since I have been here in Europe I have met many American service families already, and the one issue that they have asked me about, dwarfing everything else, has been health care. And I promise you we're going to try to address that as well, and I think we'll be successful.

But let me also say this: Part of the reason our economy has recovered, a big part of it, is that after years of talking about it, we began to do something about our budget deficit which was imposing an unconscionable burden on the children who are here and on their children, running up our debt year in and year out. Next year we will have had 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States and America's troops first came to defend Germany.

Most of the military reductions have gone to fuel reductions in the debt, but I want to say this as well: We must have enough money in the military budget to fulfill our mission and to support the people who do it in a humane and decent and pro-family way. And I will resist further cuts that would undermine our ability to have you do your job for the United States of America.

Not a day goes by that I do not express my thanks in my heart and to our God for the service you render. In many ways you and I are in exactly the same business, doing the same work. I will do my best to support you as your Commander in Chief, and what you have done here is a credit to every American back home. They know it. They are proud of you. We honor your service. We thank you for it, and I am very glad that we all had the chance to be together this evening.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:10 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Chief Master Sgt. Wayne Bailey, senior enlisted adviser for the U.S. Air Force in Europe; Gen. George A. Joulwan, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; Gen. Robert C. Oaks, Commander, U.S. Air Force in Europe; Minister President Rudolf Scharping of Rhineland-Palatinate; and Col. Steve Caine, Vice Commander, 86th Wing.

Remarks on Arrival in Berlin, Germany

July 11, 1994

Thank you very much. Mr. Mayor, Mrs. Diepgen, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to be the first American President to visit a united Berlin in a united Germany. For so long this great city was the symbol of our quest for freedom everywhere. Today it is the symbol of the most fundamental fact of modern times, the unstoppable advance of democracy.

Goethe wrote, "That which you inherit from your fathers you must earn in order to possess." The German people hardly need a reminder that freedom can never be taken for granted. You have earned it many times over. But we cannot simply celebrate what has already been won. Now we must spread the bounties of freedom. Today's changing world must lead to tomorrow's prosperity. It is fitting that tomorrow's summit of the United States and the European Union is being held here. Berlin is at the center of Europe, the center of its culture, its commerce, its hopes, and its dream for a united and free Europe.

For 50 years, Americans and Berliners have forged the bonds of friendship. Even though our American military will soon leave Berlin, America's ties will continue, through the rest of our troops in Germany, through thousands of American civilians, businessmen, students, and artists who will remain and who will contribute to your life and your prosperity.

Mr. Mayor, on behalf of all the American people, we congratulate you again on your freedom and your unity, and we stand with you as we walk together into the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 p.m. at Tegel Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Eberthart Diepgen of Berlin, and his wife, Monika.

The President's News Conference With European Union Leaders in Berlin, Germany
July 12, 1994

President Kohl. Mr. President of the United States, Mr. President of the European Commission, ladies and gentlemen, first I would like to welcome you all very cordially in the Reichstag building in Berlin. I am very happy, indeed, that the joint transatlantic dialog was conducted here in Berlin with the delegations of the two gentlemen I just welcomed.

This meeting, this dialog has taken place right after the G–7 meeting in Naples, the G–7 meetings which were attended by four member states of the European Union and the President of the European Commission. So, a number of issues we talked about today were, in fact, issues that had been touched upon in Naples already to raise the issue of Bosnia. In Naples we talked at length about the report of the contact group, and we did, at the time, publish a number of statements.

The transatlantic partnership, that is the close cooperation between the European Union and the United States of America, takes on special importance at a time in which Europe is undergoing radical change. And I think it's symbolic, indeed, that they're meeting today at the Reichstag and that we talked about this topic today at the Reichstag, a site within Germany where you just have to look out the window in order to realize that a few yards away from where we are, the division of Germany and Europe was reflected in the Wall, which is now gone. On this side of the Wall we always felt, by contrast, a special closeness between and among the Western democracies, a closeness, an affinity without which the Wall would never have come down.

At the end of the cold war, with the fall of the Wall, Central and Eastern Europeans now have a chance to determine their own fate freely and openly. And that is why we shall call out to them from Berlin, saying that the European-transatlantic community is not a closed group. It depends on its effort and its sharing its free democratic ideas with all who want it. And therefore, closer cooperation with the countries of Eastern and Central Europe is a natural outgrowth of our talks today.

We resolved, therefore, to set up a working group which, by the time of the next transatlantic summit, which would be less than 10 months from now, this summit would be chaired by the French Presidency, which by that time would submit a draft containing coordinated procedures for the United States and the European Union in intensifying relations with the Central and Eastern European states.

All of us—and we talked about that today—must jointly remember that there remains a great deal to be done, and we must ask ourselves what can we do in order to secure the free and democratic ways of the United States and the European Union and to protect them from the increasing stress emanating from organized crime and the drug mafia. We talked about that, too, today. And we talked about setting up a working group that will deal with these issues. And at the end of our meeting this morning we asked our staff to go right ahead and not only review the situation but submit important programs as soon as possible.

And in conclusion, I would like to say that we plan to further deepen and intensify the cooperation between the European Union member states and the United States of America. We want to do it in every possible way.

Yesterday I talked about the German-American relations, and I said something which I could repeat with a somewhat different emphasis.

For decades we talked about the transatlantic bridge ensuring our security. We know today that we have to add a couple of components to that bridge. We have to add the components of economic cooperation, cooperation in the cultural area, and cooperation also in the area of bringing our young people closer together. And in that sense I think today's dialog has opened up a number of prospects for our future work, and we're going to act accordingly.

President Delors. Ladies and gentlemen, as the Chancellor has just said to you, this meeting which is taking place in the context of the Transatlantic Declaration has made it possible for us, I hope, at least, to inject a more practical and operational substance into relations between

the United States and the European Union and this, of course, without creating any new bureaucracy.

Chancellor Kohl has indicated to you the two points on which there will be a joint followup: first, the development of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and, secondly, the fight against organized crime and drug trafficking.

Moreover, we shall pursue our dialog on economic matters which we began with President Clinton in January on the occasion of our last meeting. We shall continue this. Thanks to the successful holding by the American authorities of the Detroit conference, we shall seek to fight against unemployment, making possible for everyone to have a worthwhile job in society so that there should also be a greater prosperity in what is an increasingly interdependent world. We have to work together, and we shall do this in the followup to the Naples summit by organizing in Brussels a new conference, on the Detroit model, devoted to the information society: what we, the United States and Europe, can expect of this in terms of the creation of jobs, in terms of the consequences on the organization of work and on the very organization of society. And of course, in order to prepare for this, we will have to look at what we have to do in terms of education and lifelong training, in terms of the organization of our towns and cities in particular, as well.

And finally, you know that in Naples, at the request of President Clinton, the 7 decided to devote particular attention to Ukraine. An amount was even set at the request of President Clinton, an amount evaluated as being what should be given in the form of aid. And today, we decided to monitor the situation together as a result of the Presidential elections so that on the basis of a joint examination we should be able to help this country get out of its serious economic, political, institutional, and social difficulty.

So you see that the Transatlantic Declaration has got to a new phase, a more operational phase, and one of more friendly and tighter relations.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you very much, Chancellor Kohl and President Delors. Ladies and gentlemen, the United States strongly supports the European Union. Throughout my entire administration I have advocated the cause of European union. I believe our best partner, as we look toward the 21st century for prosperity and for peace, is a Europe united in democracy, in free markets, in common security. We have supported that, and we will continue to support it.

We agreed here today to try to do something that is potentially of real significance in terms of this developing partnership between the United States and the EU and that is to set up a group of experts who can put some framework, some meat on the bones of our declarations on two areas. And you've heard them mentioned already, but I want to reemphasize them.

The first is the need to strengthen our cooperation and coordination in our support for reform and democracy in Central and Eastern Europe. That is all the more important, I think, to all of us in view of the difficulties and challenges these nations are facing, and certainly it's been vividly impressed upon me on my recent trips to Latvia and to Poland.

The second thing that we agreed to do is to coordinate better our efforts in dealing with security issues and especially with organized crime, drug trafficking, money laundering. These things now know no national borders. The FBI Director from the United States, Mr. Freeh, just recently made what was a highly acclaimed trip, first to Berlin and then going on to Moscow. President Yeltsin was very intent on following this up when we met with him in Naples. We think this is one area that we can work together on and really do something that will benefit the citizens of our nations, in Europe and in the United States.

Finally, let me just say that I want to particularly applaud President Delors for the white paper he issued on jobs and growth in the European Union that complemented and gave so much energy to the jobs conference we held in Detroit. We talked quite a bit today about how we can further develop our cooperation to generate more jobs and higher incomes.

And I will just close with this point. There are a lot of people who really believe that there is simply a limit to the ability of wealthy countries to generate jobs and incomes as we move toward the 21st century and there's so much more global economic competition. I do not believe that, not if we're committed to adapting our work forces, not if we're committing to expanding the barriers—I mean, tearing down the barriers to trade and expanding trade—and to

the new technologies that will permit exponential growth, like the information superhighway and environmental technology. So we had a very good meeting; I'm very satisfied with it. I feel finally now we have not only recognized the fact of European union in our cooperation but actually developed a system in which we can do things together that will make a difference to the ordinary citizens of our countries.

German Armed Forces

Q. [*Inaudible*]—how they feel about the decision just handed down by the German high court permitting German armed forces to participate in peacekeeping operations outside the country?

President Kohl. First, I'll have to ask your understanding for the fact that I can't really assess the ruling because, after all, in Berlin here I don't know all the details involving the ruling. But I'm very happy about that ruling; there's no doubt about it, because it indicates very clearly that the highest German court, which is the guardian of our constitution, has determined that one of the missions would be in accordance with our constitution. I've always argued that; my government has always argued that.

We were given an indication by the court that such a mission would require a simple majority in the Bundestag. That's not very surprising to me, either, because I cannot imagine how any head of government of the Federal Republic would initiate such a mission without having the appropriate majority in the Parliament.

So I think what was decided there is fully in accordance with the constitution and with the view of the federal government. What's going to come out of that in the future is something that we'll have to examine in each individual case on a case-by-case basis.

If you look at the history during this century, especially German history, you'll have to pay some attention to that. But we are members of the United Nations. And if we claim the rights that membership entails, we will have to live up to our responsibilities. I think it's unacceptable and not in line with the dignity of our country for us to stand aside and refuse to take on responsibility. So I'm happy about the ruling. But that's really not the main issue for the press conference.

One more question and then we will ask our guests.

Q. Mr. Chancellor, couldn't you say a little more about the criteria which the federal armed forces will base its missions on? France has requested that the Eurocorps might be sent to Africa. Is that something you have in mind? What would be the concrete repercussions as far as German foreign policy is concerned?

President Kohl. I've given a great deal of thought to this; I've thought in concrete terms. But please understand this is a very fundamental and important question, and I would prefer to talk with my colleagues in the Cabinet about the ruling as a whole, and then we'll make a public statement. It makes no sense for you to keep on asking questions as to "What will you do if"; I won't say anything on that. There you go.

Haiti

Q. Then, Mr. President, may I ask you about what your administration has called a serious escalation in Haiti and whether you feel that this now moves us closer to a military option, whether this makes it much more difficult for international observers of any kind to know what is really happening on the ground there?

President Clinton. Well, let me say, first of all, that what happened in Haiti yesterday puts in stark relief the human rights abuses that we have been talking about for some time now, the killing, the maiming, the rapes. Throwing the monitors out is just the latest expression of the desperation of that illegal regime and their desire to hide their conduct.

All I can say today is that I hope that this action will stiffen the will of the international community to support the United States in the strongest possible enforcement of the sanctions, including freezing the assets of the military and the elites supporting them. We have got to bring an end to this, and I think that, surely to goodness, the throwing out of the monitors will illustrate to the whole world that what we have been saying all along is true: This is not only an illegal but a highly oppressive regime, and we have to keep the pressure up.

Q. Mr. President, to follow, do you think that that will make it easier to make your case if it turns out that you do have to take the military route?

President Clinton. Well, I think it certainly validates the position I've taken so far, that that is an option we shouldn't rule out.

Q. Regarding Haiti, as you know, most of the generals at the Pentagon say it would not be a difficult operation to go in and overthrow the military regime there. What they're concerned about is an exit strategy, that the U.S. would not have to keep forces there for a prolonged period of time, that there would be other countries willing to participate in some sort of peacekeeping operation. Do you have any assurances there are other countries that would be willing to go in after a U.S. invasion to help out, and did you get any assurances from the European allies?

President Clinton. Well, let me just say that there are two issues; there have always been two issues there. One is the one you have just outlined, which is that the last time the United States went to Haiti we stayed for, I think, 19 years. And that is a totally inappropriate thing to do in a world in which international organizations exist and, particularly, a United Nations exists for the purpose of working with countries in trouble that need help.

Are there nations who have said that they would be a part of a United Nations mission? Yes, there are. But that leads you to the second question, which is that the United States has always—and we talked about this way back in May—the United States has always been basically moving back and forth between a Monroe Doctrine-type approach, for 200 years, in the Caribbean and Latin America and a good neighbor-type approach.

The people of Latin America, the people of the Caribbean obviously want us to cooperate with them; they want us to be friends and neighbors. They know we're the biggest country in the region. They want any kind of unilateral action by the United States to come only as a last resort. And they have reservations about it as you would expect they would. So Mr. Gray, one of the things that he has been doing so well is to try to consult with all of our partners and friends in the region and to try as far as we possibly can to, first of all, explore all alternatives and, secondly, have everyone going in lockstep and let everyone know what the United States intention and objective is. Our only objective is to restore democracy in Haiti and stop those poor people from being killed and tortured and raped and starved and basically deprived of the decency of an ordinary life.

German Leadership

Q. Mr. President, please permit me, a German journalist, to revisit a question that has to do with Germany taking on a greater role, taking more responsibility in the world. On that point, you are in agreement with Chancellor Kohl. Now, does the idea of German armed forces being involved in peacekeeping missions outside NATO, does that mean that you are totally comfortable with that? Aren't you the least bit uncomfortable thinking about that? And could it also mean that you could imagine German forces being involved in missions of the kind we had 2 years ago in the Gulf, for instance? Would that be all right?

President Clinton. I am completely comfortable with that. And of course, I can envision German forces being involved in something like the United Nations effort in the Gulf. Why? Because of the leadership of Germany, because of the conduct of Germany, because of the role Germany has played in developing the European Union, because of the values Germany has demonstrated in taking hundreds of thousands of refugees from Bosnia. Germany, now united is—yes, it's the largest country in Europe in terms of population and its economic strength. But Germany has been the leader in pushing for the integration of Europe, for the sharing of power among the European nations, and for setting a standard for humane conduct and support for democracy and diversity. So, the answer to that question is, yes, I am comfortable with that.

President Kohl. One minute, I would like to add something, if I may. I feel a tendency here among you to somehow apply the constitutional court decision to the Gulf war. Since that is so, I would like to say that we will be deciding on the case-by-case basis with the majority in Parliament and that following the court's ruling, we are not feeling that the Germans are now rushing to the front. I'd like to say that emphatically because I know my fellow citizens, some of my fellow citizens, and I think it's therefore an important statement for me to make.

President Clinton. Maybe I could make one little statement about this. I think all of us want to play a constructive role where we can. But we have learned not only the potential but also the limits of military power in the 20th century. And the United Nations is trying to work

through what can be done on a humanitarian basis, what can be done in the way of a peacekeeping mission, what conditions have to exist in countries in order for peacekeeping missions to succeed. So I think it is important that the German people, the American people, any others paying attention to this press conference, not believe that there is some cavalier eagerness to use military power in an undisciplined way which might cause a lot of problems.

President Kohl. Thank you.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, I wanted to ask if you have any news for us today on the situation in North Korea, if anything has changed, and whether you have any response to comments that have been made in the U.S. that there possibly is a sense by some in North Korea that the idea of progressing toward progress on communication with the outside world should be halted.

President Clinton. Well, we are watching it very closely. We are concerned about what might happen, obviously. My position on that is the same that it has been from the very beginning, that that is a decision for them to make and their future is in their hands.

But we believe it is in their interest and in our interest for them to continue to freeze the elements of their nuclear program and for us to resume the talks. We hope that is what they will do. In the meanwhile, we will monitor the facts in North Korea on the nuclear program. That is where we are. The next move basically is in their court.

Q. Do you have any feelings at all from anyone in the government at this point, sir?

President Clinton. No, only the communications we've had in Switzerland with regard to the talks. And those so far have been satisfactory and not out of the ordinary. So we basically have no indication one way or the other at this moment. So what we need to do is to simply be vigilant, to simply—to look at the facts. And it's not useful to speculate, I think, certainly not in a naive way that would be excessively hopeful but also not in an unduly negative way. Let's just look at the facts and judge this situation based on the facts as they develop.

Partnership For Peace and NATO

Q. You agree then that relations with the Central Eastern European countries should be improved. Given that fact, do you think the timeline of Poland being a member by 2000 is realistic? Do you think that's a realistic prospect to hold out?

President Clinton. I'd like to make two points in response to that question. First of all, Chancellor Kohl and I have discussed this a bit and in our personal meetings. The NATO members themselves will have to get together and begin to discuss what the timeline ought to be and what the criteria for membership ought to be.

But the first and most important thing to do is to make a success of the Partnership For Peace. The Partnership For Peace, I think it's fair to say, has succeeded already beyond the expectations of those of us who proposed it at the first of the year. We have 21 nations signed up, 19 from the republics of the former Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries; two, Sweden and Finland, that were previously neutral are not involved in NATO.

In order to sign up, all those countries agreed to respect each other's borders and agreed to cooperate militarily to preserve the integrity of those borders. We will have our first military exercises in Poland in September. So that's my first point. I think we have to strengthen the Partnership For Peace and discuss a timeline.

To the Poles, I will say to you what I said to them directly: They have certainly shown the greatest interest in this issue, the greatest determination to do their full part, and I think have virtually assured that they are at the front of the line as NATO will be expanded, which it surely will be. We just have to get together and work out the details. It's not for me as the American President to say what the details should be.

Baltic Nations and Russia

Q. Mr. President, are you happy with the result of your visit to the Baltic countries? What do you think the next step should be there for that country getting rid of the Russian troops at long last?

President Clinton. Well, yes, I was very happy with my trip to the Baltics and with the meeting I had with all three Presidents. I am comfortable that in Latvia the Russian troops will be withdrawn by August 31st and that the controversy over the citizenship law there is being worked out, at least worked on.

In Estonia, I have passed along a message from President Meri to President Yeltsin. In Naples, we discussed it in considerable detail

in our private meeting, and President Yeltsin promised that for the first time he would actually meet personally with President Meri and make a good faith effort to work this out. I still think that the troops could be able to be withdrawn from Estonia, as well, by the end of August if the last remaining disputes—there are three areas of disputes—could be resolved. And we will continue to stay on top of that. We have agreed to work together on encouraging a resolution to that, and I think it can be done.

NOTE: The President's 66th news conference began at 11:15 a.m. in the East Hall at the Reichstag where he met with Chancellor Helmut Kohl in his capacity as President, European Council, and Jacques Delors, President, European Commission. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and President Delors spoke in French, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Remarks to the Citizens of Berlin
July 12, 1994

Citizens of free Berlin, citizens of united Germany, Chancellor Kohl, Mayor Diepgen, Berliners the world over, thank you for this wonderful welcome to your magnificent city.

We stand together where Europe's heart was cut in half and we celebrate unity. We stand where crude walls of concrete separated mother from child and we meet as one family. We stand where those who sought a new life instead found death. And we rejoice in renewal. Berliners, you have won your long struggle. You have proved that no wall can forever contain the mighty power of freedom. Within a few years, an American President will visit a Berlin that is again the seat of your government. And I pledge to you today a new American Embassy will also stand in Berlin.

Half a century has passed since Berlin was first divided, 33 years since the Wall went up. In that time, one-half of this city lived encircled and the other half enslaved. But one force endured: your courage. Your courage has taken many forms: the bold courage of June 17th, 1953, when those trapped in the East threw stones at the tanks of tyranny; the quiet courage to lift children above the wall so that their grandparents on the other side could see those they loved but could not touch; the inner courage to reach for the ideas that make you free; and the civil courage, *civil courage* of 5 years ago when, starting in the strong hearts and candlelit streets of Leipzig, you turned your dreams of a better life into the chisels of liberty.

Now, you who found the courage to endure, to resist, to tear down the Wall, must found a new *civil courage*, the courage to build. The Berlin Wall is gone. Now our generation must decide, what will we build in its place? Standing here today, we can see the answer: a Europe where all nations are independent and democratic; where free markets and prosperity know no borders; where our security is based on building bridges, not walls; where all our citizens can go as far as their God-given abilities will take them and raise their children in peace and hope.

The work of freedom is not easy. It requires discipline, responsibility, and a faith strong enough to endure failure and criticism. And it requires vigilance. Here in Germany, in the United States, and throughout the entire world, we must reject those who would divide us with scalding words about race, ethnicity, or religion. I appeal especially to the young people of this nation: Believe you can live in peace with those who are different from you. Believe in your own future. Believe you can make a difference and summon your own courage to build, and you will.

There is reason for you to believe. Already, the new future is taking shape in the growing chorus of voices that speak the common language of democracy; in the growing economies of Western Europe, the United States, and our partners; in the progress of economic reform, democracy, and freedom in lands that were not free; in NATO's Partnership For Peace where 21 nations have joined in military cooperation and pledge to respect each other's borders.

It is to all of you in pursuit of that new future that I say in the name of the pilots whose airlift kept Berlin alive, in the name of the sentries at Checkpoint Charlie who stood face-to-face with enemy tanks, in the name of every American President who has come to Berlin, in the name of the American forces who will stay in Europe to guard freedom's future, in all of their names. I say, *Amerika steht an ihrer Seite, jetzt und fur immer.* America is on your side, now and forever.

Moments ago, with my friend Chancellor Kohl, I walked where my predecessors could not, through the Brandenburg Gate. For over two centuries in every age, that gate has been a symbol of the time. Sometimes it has been a monument to conquest and a tower of tyranny. But in our own time, you, courageous Berliners, have again made the Brandenburg what its builders meant it to be, a gateway. Now, together, we can walk through that gateway to our destiny, to a Europe united, united in peace, united in freedom, united in progress for the first time in history. Nothing will stop us. All things are possible. *Nichts wird uns aufhalten. Alles ist moglich. Berlin ist frei.* Berlin is free.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 1:15 p.m. at the Brandenburg Gate.

Remarks to the Departing United States Troops in Berlin
July 12, 1994

Thank you, General Maddox, Chancellor and Mrs. Kohl, Mayor and Mrs. Diepgen, General Joulwan, General Yates, Ambassador Holbrooke, members of the Berlin Brigade.

Let me first say a word of appreciation to those who have spoken before: to General Yates for his moving statement of commitment and a shared experience you have had here in protecting freedom and in your work since the end of the cold war in Iraq and Turkey and Macedonia and elsewhere; General Maddox for his leadership and continuing commitment to our presence in Europe; and especially to my friend Chancellor Kohl, for it is what has happened in the last few years since the Wall fell which has proved that your enduring sacrifice was worth it. We are marking the end of a half a century of sacrifice on freedom's frontier. But we are celebrating a new beginning. Chancellor Kohl, I thank you for being America's great friend and for proving in the inordinate sacrifices made by the German people and the German Government since the Wall came down that unification can be a reality, that Germany can be whole and one and a full partnership in leading the world to a better tomorrow. America is in your debt, sir.

In 1945, at the dawn of the cold war, President Truman came here to Berlin. From atop the American headquarters he raised high the Stars and Stripes and stated then his hope that one day Berlin would be part of what he called a better world, a peaceful world, a world in which all the people will have an opportunity to enjoy the good things in life.

Well, today Berlin is free; Berlin is united; Berlin has taken its rightful place in that better world. The symbolic walk that the First Lady and I and Chancellor and Mrs. Kohl took through the Brandenburg Gate and the symbolic ceremony held for the first time with an American President on the eastern side of that gate, gave full evidence to the success of those efforts.

And now, with the cold war over, we gather to honor those Americans who helped to bring it to an end, who helped to unite Berlin, who helped to make it possible for us to walk through the Brandenburg Gate, the men and women of the Berlin Brigade. Few moments in the life of a nation are as proud as when we can thank our sons and daughters in uniform for a job well done. Today we share such a moment. We case your colors as you prepare to bid farewell to this place you have done so much to secure. And I say to all of you, the members of the Berlin Brigade, America salutes you; mission accomplished.

From Checkpoint Charlie to Doughboy City to Tempelhof Airport and beyond, more than 100,000 American men and women have served in Berlin. More than anyone, they showed the patience it took to win the cold war. More than

anyone, they knew the dangers of a world on edge. They would have been the first casualties in the world's final war, yet they never flinched.

They were people like Colonel Gail Halvorsen, who dropped tiny parachutes carrying candy to the children of Berlin during the 1948 airlift and Sid Shachnow, a Holocaust survivor, who became an American citizen after the Second World War. Here in Berlin, he became better known as Brigadier General Shachnow, the brigade commander; and Edward Demory, one of the heroes of Checkpoint Charlie who commanded a unit that for 16 tense hours looked straight into the guns of Soviet tanks in 1961; people like a brave private named Hans Puhl, who stood sentry one day in 1964, when a young East Berliner dashed for freedom. East German guards fired, and the youth fell wounded. And that's when Private Puhl jumped the Wall and carried him to freedom.

Few of them are here today, but some are. Many of them will not see their beloved Berlin again. But when their nation and the world called, all stood ready to take the first fall for freedom. I ask you now, all of us, to thank them with applause for their acts of courage over these decades. [*Applause*]

Now we leave, but the friendship between Germany and America and the thousands and thousands of personal friendships between Germans and Americans live on. And our commitment to the good and brave people of Berlin and Germany lives on. Together, we are building on our vision of a Europe united, pursuing a common dream of democracy, free market, security based on peace, not conquest. We stand ready to defend the interests of freedom against new threats, and I am committed to keeping some 100,000 troops in Europe to make sure that commitment is good.

Today our troops are strong. They have what they need to do the job; they deserve it and they must always have it. The lessons we have learned for 50 years tell us that we must never let the forces of tyranny rule again.

In the long struggle to free Berlin, no one ever knew for sure when the day of liberty would come, not when Harry Truman raised the flag in 1945 or when the first airlift planes landed in 1948 or when the hateful Wall went up in 1961. But in all those years, the defenders of Berlin never gave up. You stood your ground; you kept watch; you fortified an island of hope. Now we go forward to defend freedom and, strengthened by your devotion, we work for the day when we can say everywhere in the world what you made it possible for us to say here today in Berlin: Mission accomplished.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:08 p.m. at the Fourth of July Platz at McNair Barracks. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. David M. Maddox, commander in chief, U.S. Army in Europe; Gen. Ronald W. Yates, Air Force Materiel Command; and U.S. Ambassador to Germany Richard Holbrooke.

Memorandum on the Presidential Awards for Design Excellence
July 12, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Presidential Design Awards Program

As the largest purchaser of design services in the world, the Federal Government should be a leader in fostering design excellence. Good design can profoundly affect our lives by beautifying our surroundings, improving our productivity, and helping to effect social change.

Over two decades ago, the National Endowment for the Arts was asked by the White House to assist Federal agencies in improving the quality of design in the Federal Government. Over the years, the efforts of the Endowment's Federal Design Improvement Program have helped agencies to make significant progress in the pursuit of design excellence. I am committed to furthering those efforts.

The Presidential Design Awards Program was established in 1983 to honor successful achievement in Federal design and encourage excellence throughout the Federal Government. I recently announced the call for entries for Round Four of the Presidential Design Awards and

asked Jane Alexander, Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, to implement the Presidential Design Awards Program. I am confident that she will have your full support. Please designate an individual with an appropriate background and position to serve as your liaison with the Endowment to ensure the success of this important program. Please be advised that there will be a Presidential Design Awards Program briefing at the National Endowment for the Arts on July 18, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Nomination for a District of Columbia Court of Appeals Judge
July 12, 1994

The President today announced the nomination of Vanessa Ruiz to serve on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. The President is authorized by statute to nominate D.C. Court of Appeals judges from a list of individuals recommended by the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission.

"I am confident that Vanessa Ruiz will serve with distinction," the President said. "Her skills and dedication will be strong assets to the District of Columbia and to this court."

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

Remarks Announcing Federal Flood Relief for Georgia, Alabama, and Florida in Albany, Georgia
July 13, 1994

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I have just had the opportunity to tour what is a small portion of the nearly 200 miles of the State of Georgia along the river that has been damaged. From here in Albany, down to Newton and back, I saw many things, lots of houses and businesses underwater, the terrible devastation of Albany State College. When I leave here, I'll have the opportunity to fly down across Bainbridge and into north Florida to see some more of the damage as it has occurred in Florida, Alabama, and Georgia.

I know there are other things which have occurred that I haven't seen in Macon and Warner Robins. And Americus suffered terrible loss of life; Montezuma's business district has been very badly damaged. And all through middle and southwest Georgia and in Alabama and Florida, we've had over a million acres of farmland damaged. This is a very serious disaster.

I want to thank FEMA and James Lee Witt for the work that they have done, and Mr. Witt came down with me today. Mr. Panetta and I flew down here today with James Lee Witt, with Senator Nunn and Senator Coverdell and Congressman Bishop and Congressman Rowland. And we met Secretary Espy when we got here, and I thank him, also Secretary Pena and Rodney Slater from the Transportation Department and Secretary Cisneros.

We've had Senator Heflin and Senator Shelby and Senator Graham and Senator Mack on the phone with us. And of course, we have the three Governors here, Governor Miller, Governor Chiles, and Governor Folsom, along with the Lieutenant Governor; the secretary of state and the agricultural commissioner of Georgia; Mayor Keenan and the county executive here, Gil Barrett; and the emergency service officers of Georgia and Florida.

Let me say that in a flood like this—and I've been through them as a Governor and as President, when we had the 500-year flood in the Midwest last year—that the biggest tragedy is always the human tragedy. You have 50,000 evacuees, already over 6,200 applications for assistance. We want to be most sensitive to that. But today, I would like to announce a com-

prehensive package of assistance that we can make available today and also explain what happens after today.

Today we will provide an additional package of relief funds and loans to Georgia, Florida, and Alabama totaling over $60 million. FEMA will free up from its existing budget over $11.5 million to clean up the kind of debris that I saw so much of today, to provide emergency shelter and clean water, which is terribly important, and to utilize sandbags where they're necessary to hold back waters.

We'll allocate $4 million from the Department of Labor to provide jobs for workers who have been dislocated by this flood who are willing to participate in the cleanup and the other work that will be necessary to recover from the flood. The Secretary of Transportation will be able to provide over $12 million immediately to help to rebuild the damage to the Federal highways. HUD will provide $38 million in loans to repair some of the housing that has been destroyed so that we can help those families who can return to these houses go back as quickly as possible. In addition to that, HUD will set aside up to $10 million in housing vouchers for those who qualify for them if they are needed.

The Secretary of Agriculture, who is here, understands what it's like when there are 100,000 acres of farmland under water, as there are in this county alone. We have agreed that we will ask Congress to approve crop loss disaster assistance for this area on the same basis as that which was provided for the agricultural victims of the Middle West flood, that is, so that they can receive full reimbursement. The United States Department of Agriculture will also provide relief for Farmers Home Administration borrowers who are affected by the flood and who are having difficulties meeting their obligations.

One of the things we do not want to do, with the decline in farmers already so evident all across our country, is to allow this flood to become a reason for more good farmers to leave the land. So we're going to do everything we can through the Department of Agriculture to keep the farmers who have been hurt by this, farming.

Two other agencies I want to mention who may come into play here: One is the Small Business Administration, which has emergency very low interest loans for businesses and for homeowners, if needed; and the Department of Health and Human Services may be required to provide some assistance because of the health and safety implications of this flood. We're obviously very concerned about the water treatment plants and the other public facilities that have been damaged by the flood and that still could be damaged as the crest moves southward.

So that basically summarizes this. Let me also end where I began. The most important thing here is to help people to put their lives back together. We already have over 5,000 trailers here to try to help people get back to some normal, healthy, decent living condition, who have been displaced in their homes.

It was one of the people here in our meeting—I think it was Gil—said that right now a lot of good people are just going on adrenaline, and neighbors are helping neighbors and church groups and civic groups and the Red Cross and the National Guard. People are just pouring their hearts out and working together. But in the end, it sinks in on people that a lot of them have lost everything they had. Fewer than 10 percent of the people who have been displaced have any flood insurance. The per capita income of a lot of these counties is way below not only the national average but the average in the States involved. A large percentage of the people who have been totally devastated here are eligible for public assistance.

So our first priority is going to be to try to help these people get their lives in order. And we ask them, and through you, all of you in the news media, we ask you to help us to make sure that if there is some glitch, some foul-up, some delay, some problem, that we know about it as quickly as possible so we can put the hammer down and solve it as quickly as possible.

This essentially concludes what I have to say. I do want to give these letters of commitment. We don't have checks anymore, we do electronic funds transfer as part of our reinventing Government program in Washington. But these are commitment letters that will support the funds transfer to the Governors here. I want to give Governor Miller his, Governor Folsom his, and Governor Chiles his.

And let me make just this one last point to all of you. A lot of the work that's going to be done here will be done after these waters go down. A lot of the damage that will be done to crops will not become apparent until after the waters go down. And a lot of the agony

that people will have in their businesses and these little towns that have had all their business districts wiped out will not become apparent until after the waters go down.

Our commitment is to stay in this for the long run and to do whatever is necessary. Mr. Panetta told me on the way down here today that we can make all these commitments we've made today and make good on them with the budgets that we have. We don't need—except for the farm assistance that I just mentioned, we don't need to go back to the Congress and ask for any more legislation on appropriations now. But we may or may not in the future, depending on what the facts are. And I just want to reemphasize to all of you, we will stay in this for the long run.

We are still working with Governor Chiles in Florida on the aftermath of Hurricane Andrew. The bad news is, we have to do it; the good news is, we are doing it. So we know that this will not be done overnight. And we want a clear message to go out to the citizens in Georgia, in Alabama, in Florida that we will stay in this for the long run; we will stay until the job is done. We know this is going to be a personal agony for tens of thousands of people. But we will do the best we can to help you put your lives back together.

Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:58 p.m. in the Ayres Corp. Building at the Southwest Regional Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida; Gov. Jim Folsom of Alabama; Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia; Lt. Gov. Pierre Howard of Georgia; Max Cleland, Georgia secretary of state; Tommy Irvin, Georgia agriculture commissioner; and Mayor Paul Keenan of Albany.

Statement on the Report on the American Helicopter Tragedy in Iraq

July 13, 1994

I have been briefed on the report prepared by Major General Andrus of the 3d Air Force on the accidental downing on April 14 of two U.S. Army helicopters that were flying over Iraq as part of Operation Provide Comfort. The men and women on these helicopters were serving their countries in a humanitarian effort to help ensure the safety and welfare of the Iraqi-Kurdish people in the aftermath of the Gulf War.

I commend Secretary Perry, General Shalikashvili, and General Andrus for producing a thorough analysis of what went wrong on that terrible day and for ordering a sensible program of corrective actions to help prevent such tragedies in the future. I intend to ensure that these actions are implemented, and I look forward to receiving progress reports from Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili on this process.

In considering this report, we necessarily are drawn to the errors of commission and omission that produced the tragedy. At the same time, we must keep in mind that Operation Provide Comfort has been and continues to be a very successful coalition effort that has effectively deterred Iraq from disrupting peace and order in the UN-established security zone. Because of Operation Provide Comfort, human rights abuses against the Kurdish population of northern Iraq have been curtailed.

The 26 brave Americans, allied and Iraqi-Kurdish personnel who died in the crashes served with courage and professionalism, and they lost their lives trying to save the lives of others. The important work they were doing must, and will, continue.

To the families and loved ones of those who were killed, I offer my sincere condolences and, on behalf of the United States of America, the gratitude of our entire Nation.

In remarks at the memorial service for the victims, I said that it is our duty to find the answers to this tragedy that these families rightfully seek. The report Secretary Perry is releasing today is an important step toward fulfilling that pledge.

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
July 13, 1994

The President today announced the nomination of Michael D. Hawkins to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The President also nominated William T. Moore, Jr., for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Georgia.

"These nominees have records of distinction and achievement in the legal profession and in public service," the President said. "They will make valuable contributions on the Federal bench for years to come."

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

Remarks Announcing an Israel-Jordan Meeting at the White House
July 15, 1994

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to announce today that King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel have agreed to my invitation to meet at the White House on July 25th.

I am also pleased that Speaker Foley, after discussions with Majority Leader Mitchell, has invited both leaders to address a joint session of Congress. And Hillary and I are delighted that both of them have agreed to join us at a dinner at the White House on that day.

This historic meeting is another step forward toward achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. The meeting will build on the dramatic progress made in the trilateral U.S.-Israel-Jordan meetings here in Washington last month and King Hussein's recent declaration in Parliament that he was prepared to meet with Prime Minister Rabin. It reflects the courageous leadership and the bold vision with which both King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin have displayed as they work together to create a new future for their people and for all the region.

On behalf of all Americans, I salute their commitment to peace. I have pledged my personal dedication to the goal of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Accordingly, Secretary Christopher will be traveling to the region next week. I want to compliment him on his tireless efforts to achieve peace in the region and the contribution he has made to the announcement today.

He will continue our efforts to achieve progress in the Israel-Syria negotiations. That also is a very, very important thing for us. I am committed to working to achieve a breakthrough on those talks as soon as possible so that we can make the dream of a lasting peace of the brave a reality.

Secretary Christopher will follow up on the discussions that the President and King Hussein have had on this initiative, and he will proceed and participate in the U.S.-Jordan-Israel discussions. He'll also meet with Chairman Arafat to review progress in implementing the Declaration of Principles on Palestinian self-rule.

The Middle East is entering a new era. I'll do everything I can to make certain that all the peoples of the region realize the blessings of peace that have been denied too long to them. This meeting on July 25th will be another important step on that long road. Now I have to go to Pennsylvania. I'm running a little bit late, and I want to turn the microphone over to Secretary Christopher.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:57 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Health Care Rally in Greensburg, Pennsylvania
July 15, 1994

Thank you very much. Mayor Fajt, Congressman Murphy, Senator Wofford, ladies and gentlemen: I must say, when I knew I was coming to Greensburg, I never dreamed that all of you would show up. And I am delighted to see you here. From the time we arrived at the Latrobe airport, and then driving all the way in, I felt so comfortable in this part of the country. I saw all these small towns, and we were coming in here—we must have gone about 2 miles where every last place of business was either a car dealership or a muffler shop or something else. [*Laughter*] When I was 6 years old, the first thing I ever did was try to fix a car that was burned up, and I've been struggling ever since. I got into public life so I wouldn't have to work that hard for a living. [*Laughter*]

I love seeing all the smiling faces. I even enjoy the honest debate we've got here in the crowd about the health care system. But most important of all, I want to thank you for coming out here today to give democracy a chance to work, and to listen to the two people who were here before me, Louise Mastowski and Lynn Hicks, because they're really what this struggle for health care is all about. They're really what the struggle for the future of America is all about.

If you look at the people in this crowd, almost all of you are hard-working middle class people who have obeyed the law, paid your taxes, and played by the rules your entire life. And I ran for President because I was sick and tired of seeing this country talk to you and say one thing and then go to Washington and do another. I watched the deficit—[*applause*]. I'm running today as President—every day, back and forth from meeting to meeting and town to town and issue to issue—to do just what I said I would do back in 1992, to try to move this country forward and make it work for middle class America again.

And when I took office I had seen years and years in which the deficit exploded, our country was getting deeper and deeper in debt, the wealthiest people had their taxes cut, the middle class had their taxes increased, and we avoided facing the tough problems that every country in the world that wants to go into the 21st century has got to face. And I want you to know that this health care issue is in some ways the toughest of all. And I came here today to have a neighborly talk about what the real facts are and to ask you to help the United States Congress to make a decision that is in your interest.

But let me back up and say every time we try to change something, the same old arguments and the same old rhetoric keeps coming out to try to paralyze people from moving this country forward. Last year, last year, after 12 years in which the deficit of this country had exploded, we were driving ourselves into debt, the Congress adopted an economic program by the narrowest of margins, with the help of your Congressman and your Senator Harris Wofford.

And now we've had a year to see it work. We had $255 billion of spending cuts. We had a tax increase on 1.5 percent of Americans, the wealthiest Americans. Fifteen million working Americans got a tax cut—families. Ninety percent of the small businesses in this country were eligible for reduced taxes. And guess what? We're going to have 3 years of reduction in our Government deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President. And we've got 3.8 million new jobs.

Just this week, just this week it was reported that our Government deficit is now smaller as a percentage of our income than it's been since 1979. We are moving this country in the right direction, creating jobs, reducing the deficit. We have taken $700 billion of debt off our children's future that was projected to be there when I became President of the United States. And you know, all the talk in the world and all the things that you hear in Washington will not change the fact that we stepped up to it and we did the right thing to move this country forward. Now the question is, what are we going to do to guarantee that the people that work hard have a future?

We made a good beginning. We created some jobs; we reduced the deficit. But we've got to educate and train people for tomorrow. We've got to guarantee that every American working family can change jobs and always know that they've got a good education. We've reformed

the college loan program now so that 20 million Americans are eligible for lower interest rates on their college loans, so people can go to school. The Congress has before it a crime bill which will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, pass the "three strikes and you're out" law, and give our kids some things to say yes to as well as to say no to, so we can keep more kids out of trouble. Yesterday hearings began on our welfare reform law to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life, and to move people from welfare to work. We are moving forward.

And I am proud of what has been done. But I have to tell you that unless we face up to our responsibility to reform health care, the future of middle class America and the ability of our administration to continue to move this economy forward is in doubt. And here's why: because more and more Americans are losing health care coverage.

In the last 5 years, 5 million more Americans are without health care coverage. We are the only major country in the world where we've got fewer people with health insurance now than we did 5 years ago. Ten years ago, 88 percent of our people had health insurance. Now we're down to 83 and dropping. Meanwhile, we are spending more money on health care than anybody else in the world. We spend 14 percent of our income on health care—nobody else spends more than 10—so that we have fewer people. And the politicians have it; the wealthy have it; the poor have it; if you go to jail, you've got it. Only the middle class can lose it. I don't think that makes much sense in the United States.

You know, you hear all this rhetoric—and I want to answer some of the charges on some of the signs out here today. People say, oh, we're rationing health care; that's what my plan does. Well, it doesn't, but I'll tell you something. You tell me how you can justify in the United States of America rationing health care to a dairy farmer like Louise. How can you justify rationing health care to a fine woman and her husband and their five children? We say this is a pro-family country. There's a man, his wife, and five children; we have just rationed health care to them. No other advanced country in the world would cut them off without any health care. Only the United States does it. I think we can do better.

When I arrived at the Latrobe airport, I met three more people just like these two women who talked today. One of them was Patricia Courson; she lives in Ellwood City, near here. Until last year her husband had a good job at a hospital that came with a quality health care plan. He can't get any coverage through his new job. She works part-time at a supermarket; she's not covered either. For a year they've paid their own cost out of pocket, with a kind of a carry-forward policy that some of you have had before, too. But it's about to run out. And she's got a respiratory ailment, and she has to have treatment every night. So it looks like they're going to lose this coverage. Now, they've worked all their lives; they've paid for their health care all their lives. They haven't done anything wrong. There are 600,000 people in Pennsylvania alone in the same boat. And their health care has been rationed. They are not on welfare, they are working, and they do not have it. This woman wrote me the following: She said, "I don't want to die. I've got things to do, grandchildren to help grow up. We're going to fall between the cracks." That's right. They're not poor, they're not rich, they're not politicians, and they're not in jail, so they can lose their health insurance.

Now, that is the issue, folks. And even though everybody knows we need change, even though everybody knows we're the only advanced country that doesn't cover everybody, even though you now know we're actually losing ground, we're having a hard time. Well, let me tell you, don't feel bad, we've been trying to do this for 60 years. We never have been able to do it. Why? Because every time we tried to cover all the middle class working people in the country for 60 years, the same crowd got up with the same arguments and said this is socialism, this is rationing, this is the Government taking over the health care system.

And you know what? We didn't do it. Now, the Harry and Louise ads are just the 21st century, the latest example in the last part of the 21st century, what's been going on for 60 years, scaring you to death about what we're trying to do. Now, let me just talk about this. When I put my plan out—let's just go through what it said—I said I didn't want a Government plan, I wanted private insurance for everybody. The only thing I wanted the Government to do was to require everybody to have private insurance, to ask employers and their employees to split

the cost, and to give a break to small business people and farmers so they could buy insurance at affordable rates. That's what I wanted to do.

Now, I then went around the country, and I listened to people who actually read it. And they said, "Look, there are some problems with that." So we came back and said, okay, we need improvements in our plan. There ought to be less bureaucracy, less regulation, even more choice and flexibility for consumers so they could pick their own doctors, and an even bigger break to small business. So we said, okay, we'll do all that. And then they said, "Well, there are still three things wrong with it. It's socialism, it's rationing, and it's bad for small business." So I want to just tell you something, folks. Socialism is when the Government runs a health care system. We don't have socialized medicine in this country, and my plan is for private insurance and private doctors. So when they say it, they are not telling the truth.

Now, nobody thinks Medicare is socialism, I take it. You know how Medicare is paid for? How many of you know how Medicare is paid for? Raise your hand if you know. You pay for it every month in a payroll tax. Is that socialism? No. I don't want to raise—I don't even want to pay for it like Medicare. I just want people who don't have insurance to have it.

The second thing they say is rationing. You saw rationing up here today. There are 39 million Americans like Louise and Lynn and their children and their grandchildren that don't have any insurance. That is rationing. Under our plan you get to choose your doctor, we keep the same private health care system, and we protect people. Let me tell you this. You all think about this, everybody in this crowd today: More and more and more working Americans are insured at work under plans that give them no choice of doctor. They are losing their choices today. More than half of the American people have no choice today. Under our plan you get more choices than you got today, not less. So the rationing argument is a bum rap. We're rationing today.

Now, the last argument, and the one that's really gotten everybody in a tizzy in Washington, is that it is fair and right and just to ask all people to have health insurance and ask employers and employees to split the difference, but if you do, it will be too tough on small business. Now, that's an important argument because most of the new jobs in this country are being created by small business. Congressman Murphy and I talked on the way in about how even though the economy's pulling out in America, you need more jobs here. The last thing in the world we need to do is to do anything that will undermine the job base here. So what's the answer? The answer is to give a break to small business in two ways: cut their costs and allow them to go into pools where they can buy insurance more cheaply.

But let me say this, and I want you to listen because I would not—I ran for President to create jobs, not to cost them. We passed an economic program that gave 90 percent of the small businesses in this country an eligibility for increased tax cuts, not tax increases.

But you think about this: There's only one State in America, one State, Hawaii, that's got the same system I recommended. And you know what? For 20 years they said here's the deal: Every employer and employee have to buy health insurance, and they're going to split the deal. They have to do it, at least 50–50. Guess what? In Hawaii people live longer, the infant mortality rate is lower, and the small business insurance rates are 30 percent lower than they are in the rest of the United States of America. It is cheaper there, not more expensive.

Now, so, the people in Washington are saying, "Well, just make a few little reforms." Let me tell you what I do not want to do. Under the guise of saying we're making progress on health care but we're not making any tough decisions, I don't want to see us pass a bill that will one more time give more help to the poor, raise middle class insurance rates, and leave more people like Louise and Lynn without insurance. And I don't think you want me to do that either. Let's cover everybody and make America work.

Folks, all over America the airwaves are full of a lot of rhetoric. This has gotten to be about politics. I don't know whether Louise or Lynn or those three people I met at the airport today are Republicans or Democrats or independents. I don't have any earthly idea who they voted for for President, and frankly I don't care. They're Americans. They work hard. They're entitled to health insurance. That is the issue. This is not a political issue. This is a practical problem.

Let me just say this in closing. I just got back from a very moving trip to Europe. I went to the Baltic countries, the first American Presi-

dent ever to be there, as the Russian armies are withdrawing, thanks in large measure to our efforts. I went to Berlin and was the first American President ever to be able to speak in the Eastern part of Berlin, with over 100,000 people there. And I met with three big groups of our military men and women and their families, their spouses, and their children, three big groups, enthusiastic crowds. And I was shocked. They only asked me about one issue, one, our military families. They said, "Please, Mr. President, a lot of us have to leave the service; a lot of us are coming home. We had health care in the service. Don't let us come home to America that we served that won't give our children health insurance. Don't let us do that." That's all they talked about.

So I tell you, folks, we've made changes in our plan. We've made it better for small business, more flexibility, guaranteed even more choices. And I want to challenge the people in Congress, especially the Members of the other party, not to pass a program that claims to do something it doesn't do. Let's don't burn the middle class one more time. Let's help the middle class. Let's help small business. Let's provide health care to all Americans. We can do it. Other nations have done it, and we can do it, too.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:28 p.m. at Greensburg Courthouse Square. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Daniel Fajt of Greensburg, and residents Louise Mastowski and Lynn Hicks.

Statement on the Closing of the Embassy of Rwanda
July 15, 1994

The United States cannot allow representatives of a regime that supports genocidal massacre to remain on our soil.

NOTE: This statement was included in a statement by the Press Secretary announcing the closing of the Embassy of Rwanda and ordering all personnel to leave the United States.

Memorandum on Employee Absence Due to Tropical Storm Alberto
July 15, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Excused Absence for Employees Affected by the Flooding Caused by Tropical Storm Alberto

I am saddened by the devastating losses caused by the flooding that has resulted from tropical storm Alberto and the impact on the well-being and livelihood of our fellow Americans. Many parts of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this disaster and to begin a massive effort to recover from the ravages of this flooding.

As part of this effort, I request heads of executive departments and agencies who have Federal civilian employees in the areas designated as disaster areas because of the flooding to use their discretion to excuse from duty, without charge to leave or loss of pay, any such employee who is faced with a personal emergency because of the flooding and who can be spared from his or her usual responsibilities. This policy should also be applied to any employee who is needed for emergency law enforcement, relief, or clean-up efforts authorized by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Nomination for United States District Court Judges
July 15, 1994

The President today announced two nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court: Stanwood R. Duval, Jr., for the Eastern District of Louisiana and Catherine D. Perry for the Eastern District of Missouri.

"I am proud to nominate Stanwood Duval and Catherine Perry to the Federal bench," the President said. "I know they will serve with distinction."

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

The President's Radio Address
July 16, 1994

Good morning. My radio address this weekend is being hosted by Philadelphia station KYW.

When I was running for President, I met Americans all over our country who were uncertain about their future, worried about a tough economy in which every new day made it harder and harder to make ends meet, worried about a sudden health care crisis that could drown them in a sea of debt, and most often, worried about the surging tide of crime and violence that has become a familiar threat in almost every neighborhood in our country.

We've made real progress toward renewing the American dream since I took office a year and a half ago, putting our economic house in order with $255 billion in spending cuts, tax cuts for 15 million working families, an increase for the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our citizens, all of it going to deficit reduction. Our deficit will go down 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. And we've got 3.8 million new jobs and record numbers of new businesses to show for it.

Expanded trade, real progress on health reform—we're moving in the right direction. But no matter how impressive these lists of accomplishments is, we will have failed to do our jobs if this year ends and Congress hasn't passed legislation to answer the urgent call of the American people to do something about crime and violence. For many millions of Americans, this is our number one concern. The random violence violates our values, our sense of family, our community, our whole hope for the future.

For 6 long years, the American people have waited while Congress and the President have debated on what to do about crime. The American people have asked for action, but all they've gotten is gridlock. As Americans have waited, children have been killed, terror has flourished. That waiting has to end and end now.

Both Chambers of Congress have now passed sweeping anticrime bills. Both versions will provide the most significant Federal attack on crime in the history of the United States. They include every major element of the crime fighting program I first called for when I was running for President: 100,000 more police officers on our street in community policing units; a ban on the most serious assault weapons that make our police officers often out-gunned by the gangs they face; a ban on ownership and possession of handguns by minors; a very tough penalty law, including a "three strikes and you're out" law; and prevention programs to help give kids something to say yes to.

The crucial task before Congress now is to prevent few remaining differences in the House and the Senate bill from threatening the whole bill. Congress is close to finishing this bill. Hard work by Members of both parties has resolved all the major differences.

In the past, Congress has been stymied by an either-or debate over the false choice between tougher punishment or smarter prevention. One of the first things I noticed during the Presidential campaign was that every place I went Americans, and police officers, especially, rejected that argument. Our citizens want crimi-

nals to be punished. They want young people, particularly in our poorest communities, also to have something to say yes to, to turn away from a life of crime.

The crime bill before Congress does both. It provides tough punishments for violent criminals, like "three strikes and you're out," and it provides about $8 billion to build prisons to ensure that violent criminals can be locked up. But it also provides about $8 billion for effective prevention programs, like the youth employment and skills program that will give youth in high-crime areas a chance to learn skills on the job, midnight basketball programs, after school programs, summer jobs programs, things that our young people can do to avoid getting into trouble.

After passing the Brady bill last year, we also worked very hard to earn an impressive victory that guarantees the bill will include a ban on deadly assault weapons that don't belong on our streets or in our schoolyards. And perhaps most important of all, this crime bill will put 100,000 new police officers on the streets of America, walking the beat, getting to know the neighborhoods, providing a strong role model for local youth, the best protection, toughest enforcement, and smartest prevention you can find.

In Philadelphia today, I have nearly a dozen of Philadelphia's finest police officers. This city has an effective community policing program, but like all cities, they need more help to do the job right.

So don't let anybody fool you. This crime bill will make a real difference across our country in every neighborhood, every city, and every town. It will help to lower the crime rate. It's what the American people are waiting for.

Let me close with a terrible story about a little boy who understood why we can't wait any longer. James Darby, a 9-year old from New Orleans, wrote me on April 29th. "Dear Mr. Clinton," he said, "I want you to stop the killing in the city. I think somebody might kill me. I'm asking you nicely to stop it. I know you can do it." Just 9 days later, walking home from a Mother's Day picnic, James Darby, age 9, was shot in the head and killed.

I can't tell you that our crime bill would have saved James' life. But I can tell you with absolutely no doubt that it will save other lives and without it we have no hope of giving a new sense of purpose and safety to our people.

Like thousands of children across our country, James Darby was terrified of the violence ravaging his own neighborhood. He knew it wasn't right, he knew it shouldn't continue, and he knew it could endanger him. His letter to me was just the best way he knew to ask for help. Well, we can help. This crime bill will help. All the major elements of the bill have been endorsed by the United States Conference of Mayors, by every major law enforcement organization in the country, including the Law Enforcement Steering Committee, with over half a million police officers in its membership, and by countless local police chiefs, sheriffs, community leaders, elected officials.

Join them. Together, the American people will be a mighty coalition with a simple but essential demand: Congress, pass the crime bill and pass it now. Remember what James Darby wrote. I know you can do it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:20 p.m. on July 15 at the Public Ledger Building in Philadelphia, PA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 16.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring Senator Robert Byrd

July 17, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you. Senator and Mrs. Byrd, Senator Rockefeller, Congressmen Mollohan, Rahall, and Wise, and Governor Caperton, and friends, I am glad to be here with all you folks from West Virginia, a small State with a lot of mountains. I identify with it.

I'm mostly glad to be here to speak for Senator Byrd tonight. You know, one of the first things I did on coming to Washington as President was to go by Senator Byrd's office and

pay a visit. And on that visit, he gave me a copy of his "History of the Senate," which I actually proceeded to read, fearing he would one day give me an examination on it. [*Laughter*] Now, in this book, among other things, he has a very moving autobiography in which he expresses his respect for Senator Richard Russell and for Senator John Stennis because of the advice and kindness that they gave to him. I feel the same way; I've learned a lot from Senator Byrd. He's always been unfailingly kind, and he's given me a lot of information I've needed and a lot of wise counsel.

Senator Byrd also expresses in this book his friendship for the late President Johnson, and he describes his relationship with President Johnson. And I can identify with that, too. There's a particularly moving part of this autobiography where he describes how he talked L.B.J. into appointing a Federal judge he didn't really want to appoint, but Senator Byrd did. And then he turned around and voted against President Johnson on the next major issue in the Senate. [*Laughter*]

I will say this, though, for all of his principles, Senator Byrd believes in our democratic system enough to advocate compromise on occasion. The other day I was trying to persuade him to change his position on the space station, from "against" to "for." And he said he couldn't do that, unless I were willing to move the Capitol to West Virginia. I'm still considering it. [*Laughter*]

It took me about 8 months here to at least be in a meeting with Senator Byrd and pretend not to be intimidated. [*Laughter*] That's different from not being intimidated. This is a town where, when people get a free moment, they go jogging, they play golf, they play tennis. He reads Thucydides. [*Laughter*]

On the Senate floor, he's the only person ever with the memory and the talent to discuss the line-item veto in the same breath with the conspiracy against Caesar—and with equal accuracy. [*Laughter*] And it works, you know, I've always been for the line-item veto, but when I realized I was in league with those guys who did Caesar in, I had to revise my position. [*Laughter*]

In all seriousness, now, I must tell you, I admire Robert Byrd. And based on my own family's history, I identify with him so much. You know, our two States, Arkansas and West Virginia, actually have a great deal in common. In the 1980 census, the counter said that our two States had the highest percentage of people living within our borders who had been born there. That roots, that attachment to the land, the beauty of the land, the history of the land, even the toil, the poverty, the excruciating and backbreaking work, all of it creates a strength of character that is very much needed in this country today.

In an era where it's fashionable to bemoan the breakdown of the American family, Senator and Mrs. Byrd have been married for 57 years. That's something all the rest of us would like to emulate.

In an era in which the American people are so sensitive about their need to know things, to create the ability to compete in a global economy, that I was actually able to be elected President in part by pledging to create a system of lifetime learning, I realize what an example he set, getting his college degree when he was in his thirties, being the only sitting Member of Congress ever to earn a law degree while in the Congress, at a time when he already knew more about the law than 99 percent of the lawyers in the country. He is an example of lifetime learning. The rest of us will have to do as well.

Senator Byrd once said, "The achievement of difficult goals under adverse circumstances is still very much a part of the American dream." Well, I believe that, and I think all the rest of us do. And I want to thank Robert Byrd for helping us to achieve some difficult goals under adverse circumstances.

After years of talking about the danger of the Government's deficit to our children and grandchildren and years of recognizing we still needed to invest more in the education and training of our people, Senator Robert Byrd has helped us to provide 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President and still increase our investment in the education and training of the American work force. And it's a great tribute to his leadership that that has been possible.

I don't think anybody could acknowledge the importance of Senator Byrd to our Nation's life without seriously treating, not just in a humoring way but seriously treating his voracious love of history and his devotion to its lessons. Cicero once spoke of "history: the evidence of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the directness of life, the herald of antiquity, committed

to immortality." In the 20th century in the United States, no American leader has shown more reverence for history, no greater commitment to integrating its lessons, no greater reverence for the historical truth embodied in representative government than Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia.

His career was born in a time when mothers still dreamed that their children could grow up to be a Governor or a Senator or a President, when people were taught that citizenship was serious, that this was a wonderful country because, in part, we had a good system of Government capable of bringing out the best in people and solving our problems and seizing our opportunities. Senator Byrd's whole life is a testament to the idea that public discourse and public life can be things of very high honor.

Sometimes I think one of the greatest troubles of modern life is not the problems we have, for every age and time has its problems; not the fact that we have no absolutely perfect leaders—the Scriptures said that we'll never have any of them. But instead, the fact is that we seem so often to have lost faith in the institutions of our country and our capacity to solve our own problems. Sometimes we seem almost compulsive in our collective efforts to find the worst, even in the silver lining. And I say to you tonight, Robert Byrd's life is a rebuke to that.

It still ought to be that we would raise our sons and daughters to believe that not only citizenship but public life is an honorable and good thing and that if this weren't a pretty fine country, we wouldn't be around here after 214 years—218 years—otherwise I'd get corrected here. [*Laughter*] And I want you to think about that tonight, because too often today, I think, when the glass is half-full, we say it's half-empty. When somebody is giving 95 percent, we focus on the 5. And when other people look at us with envy, we talk about ourselves with great cynicism, as if all is lost when much is being won every day. If this were not a truly astonishing country, faithful to its roots, its principles, the dreams, and the institutions of its Founders, Robert Byrd could not have become what he has.

There could be no better tribute in this time, on the dawn of the next century, to honor Robert Byrd than this endowment to help educate more Americans on the workings of democracy. I tell you tonight, my fellow citizens, this is not a luxury. Understanding our system, believing in it, and being willing to sacrifice to work within it to make things better for the people of this country, that is a matter of our survival. We have not been around all this time because our people sat on the sidelines and complained. We have endured and triumphed because our people threw themselves into the breach in every age and time until the work was done.

No citizen of America in our time has done this with greater zeal, greater energy, greater constancy, and greater conviction than Robert Byrd. For his long and distinguished service to our country, it is my honor to say a simple thank you, sir, we are in your debt.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. in the Independence Ballroom at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Gaston Caperton of West Virginia.

Remarks to the Executive Committee of the Summit of the Americas in Miami, Florida

July 18, 1994

Thank you so much. Senator Graham, Governor Chiles, Lieutenant Governor MacKay, all the members of the committees who have worked so hard to make this a success, I'm delighted to look out there and see so many friendly faces. I thank all the Members of Congress who are here: Congresswoman Meek and Congresswoman Brown; Congressman Deutsch and his wife and two children went jogging with me on the beach today; Congressman Diaz-Balart; Congressman Shaw. Congressman Fascell, we miss you in Washington. I am delighted to see so many of my friends from the Florida Legislature and from State government, and Mr. Hawkins and all the people from the county government, and all the mayors who are here.

I thank you all for working together and for working together across party lines, regional lines, governmental lines to make this a great success.

When I ran for President, I was obsessed with the idea that we had to do something to bring our country together, to face the major challenges here at home and abroad that would be barriers to our people living up to their full potential as we move toward the 21st century. And it seemed to me then, it seems to me now even more strongly, that there are three or four things that we have to do. One of them is embodied in this great meeting.

First, we had to get our economic house in order, bring the deficit down, get the economy going again at home. That's happened. We're on the verge of passing a budget which will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President and, by 1999, the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President and has produced about 3.8 million new jobs. So that's the first step.

But the second thing we have to do is to train and educate our people for the 21st century. And we're working on that. Lifetime learning must become the law of the land.

The third and the fourth things we have to do, it seems to me, both relate to this summit, but especially the third one: We have to find more partners. We have to expand the frontiers of trade and investment. That's what NAFTA was about; that's what the GATT agreement is about; that surely is what the Summit of the Americas is about.

Finally, we have to find ways to continue to grow in a world of limited resources, sustainable development. We have to find it through environmental technologies. We have to find it through the information superhighway that the Vice President talks about. We have to prove in other words that the skeptics, who believe that in the 21st century technology for the first time in all of human history will reduce total economic opportunities, are dead wrong.

And if you think about the Summit of the Americas and what it means not just to Miami and Dade County in Florida but to all of the United States as we move toward the 21st century, in that context you can see the historic importance of the endeavor in which you are engaged. We have got to find a way to capitalize on the fact that all but two nations in this hemisphere are now governed by democracy.

When we consulted with all of our friends and partners and all the other nations that will participate, there was a consensus that we ought to focus on three things: first of all, how to strengthen democracy in these nations. All of us know, as we argue and fight and struggle, that democracy, as Churchill once said, is the worst form of government in the world except for all the others. [*Laughter*] But it requires a lot of management. It's not an easy, clean, neat thing. And it requires a lot of infrastructure. So the first thing that our partners wanted us to discuss is how we can keep democracy alive in all these nations and how we can make it function better, what kinds of systems do they need to develop in various countries to help that. The second thing, obviously, that everybody wanted to discuss was how we can continue to integrate the Americas economically, to expand the frontiers of trade and investment and to help all the nations to grow. The third thing that they all wanted to discuss was what now has become known as sustainable development; how can we preserve the environment and promote the economy? And interestingly enough, it is not just an issue for the developing nations; it is not just an issue for Amazonia. It's an issue for the United States and Canada as we struggle to preserve the salmon population in the Pacific Northwest and still make it possible for our people to make a living up there.

So these things will be the focus of this summit, the political focus, the economic focus, the sustainable development focus. And if we do it right, if we prepare well, if we organize well, if we listen to our friends well, and if then we have a real system for following up on this, this will not only be a phenomenal thing for all of you here in this region, but 20 or 30 years from now, people will look back on it as a truly historic event for the United States. I think some evidence of that is the importance we attach to it.

I want to thank two people in particular who are here today. First of all, Congressman Esteban Torres of California doesn't represent Dade County, but he showed up today because he supports what we're trying to do, and he is a very good man. And secondly, I would like to thank my Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, who has also

come to Miami to make an important announcement later today.

The last thing I want to do is to say, if I might, a simple "Thank you, and go get 'em," because I am well aware that this conference cannot succeed without the kind of enthusiasm that you've already expressed here this morning being sustained between now and December.

I just last night had an interesting talk with the coach of the Brazilian soccer team. But one of the things he said that will leave a lasting impression on me, he said, in quite good English—once again, impressed upon me that I couldn't speak Spanish very well, much less Portuguese—he said, "When we came to America, no one quite knew what to expect because your country was not supposed to be the home of soccer. But it's the best World Cup we ever had."

Now, we are the home of democracy. We are the home of expanded trade. We are the country that, of all the great democracies of the world, has the most racial and ethnic and cultural and religious diversity. And we must make these nations feel that we are their true friend and partners and that we are going into the next century together, not just for our children but for theirs as well.

That is your mission. If you can do it, I will say again, 20 or 30 years from now, the entire United States, indeed, this entire part of the world, will look back on this event and thank you for setting us on the proper course to the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12 p.m. in the Cypress Room at the Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles and Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida, and Dade County Commissioner Larry Hawkins.

Remarks to the National Council of La Raza in Miami

July 18, 1994

Thank you so much, Secretary Cisneros, for that stirring set of remarks, for your kind and generous introduction, but more importantly, for your creative, vigorous, and effective leadership in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a department that is now known as a source of innovation, well run, efficiently run, but also a place where values count, where ideas count, on the cutting edge of change. Henry Cisneros, whether he is trying to integrate a housing development in Vidor, Texas, or trying to give safety and security back to the children in the public housing in Chicago or donning a hard hat to try to take some buildings down and make public housing more humane all across the country, he's the model of what we all ought to be in public service today. Let me also say, only half jokingly, he also has just demonstrated Clinton's third law of politics, which is whenever possible be introduced by someone you've appointed to high office; they will brag on you every time. [*Laughter*]

To President Raul Yzaguirre—we were just reminiscing that he has been a leader of La Raza now for 20 years. I'm very glad you don't have term limits. [*Laughter*] He's been a good thing for your organization. To your board chair, Audrey Alvarado; to all the Members of Congress who are here, Congressman Pastor and Congressman Esteban Torres, who came from Washington with me and represents California and all the Members of the Florida delegation who are here, Representatives Meek and Brown and Deutsch, Diaz-Balart, and Shaw; and to my good friend Senator Bob Graham and Lieutenant Governor MacKay—and I think Governor Chiles is here; I know he was here: I am delighted to be here in Florida and most especially with La Raza.

I want to say that when Henry and I were discussing what I should say today, he said I should say—let's see if I do it—*Si, se puede*, Yes, we can. That has been the model of my Presidency, and in some ways it was the model I was raised with by my wonderful mother who never spoke a word of Spanish but understood that message. I want to especially recognize, too, the honored guests you have here for Seniors Day. They know the meaning of those words, and they have done so much for us.

As we gather here today, looking into a future that will begin a new century and a new millennium, I think it is important that we view all the specifics that we discussed, those that you have already discussed and the things I am about to say, in the larger context of the challenges of this time. I asked the American people for this office because I believed that we had to do much more to restore our economy, to restore the American dream, to help to create a world of peace and prosperity in which Americans could live up to their full potential, because I believed that we could not do that unless we made a great strength of our diversity, unless we were a country coming together, not coming apart, and because I believed we could not do that unless the Government of the United States worked for ordinary citizens again.

The future of the 21st century, the America that I want to see us build together, will be an America where Hispanic leadership anchors its place in boardrooms, schoolrooms, and all the halls of power, in which Hispanic-Americans will be sought out as leaders among opinion shapers and policymakers. In the America that's not just around the corner, in all our futures, Hispanics running for mayor, Governor, Congress, and yes, for President won't be running against the tide but with it. They will be leading the rebuilding of America and a renaissance of community, family, and work from the grassroots up.

Of course, much of this is happening already. More than 5,000 Hispanics hold elective office in America today, a world away from the numbers of a generation ago. The Hispanic Congressional Caucus has grown to 18 members and will surely grow more.

Up and down the Americas, as we nurture democracy and expand trade, Hispanics are the bridges between our different countries and our cultures, bridges that will lead us to tomorrow.

There is no doubt that in the unity of Hispanic-Americans there is great strength and that in the diversity of America there is great strength if we will but develop it and nourish it.

In the last 18 months since I took office, we have followed that course, a course set in a long campaign and before that in a long public life, a course of change that you deserved. One of the things I have tried to do, and Secretary Cisneros referred to that, is to try to make this administration look more like America.

Henry Cisneros and Federico Peña have become household names. But there are 288 other Hispanic-American appointees, 2.5 times as many as in the previous administration, many at the senior level. Eleven percent of the judicial appointments are Latinos, compared to just two appointments in each of the last two administrations. They are people who may or may not be well known, but they are making a difference every day, people like Aida Alvarez and Nelson Diaz at HUD; Norma Cantu and Mario Moreno at Education; Fernando Torres-Gil at HHS and Jack Otero and Maria Echaveste at Labor; Joe Valasquez, Suzanna Valdez, Carolyn Curiel, and many others in the White House. I have recently nominated Gill Casellas to head the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We've been joined by Polly Baca as Director of Consumer Affairs at the Department of Health and Human Services and by General Ed Baca as head of the National Guard, the first Hispanic ever to head the National Guard in the history of the United States.

If you ask me do we need to do more and better, I would say yes. But we are doing better than people have done before. You just keep urging and working, and we'll keep doing better, broadening the base of America's Government.

The whole purpose and strategy of everything that I have tried to do as your President is to make the American dream a real possibility for all of our citizens in a dramatic, even breathtakingly, changing world.

The first thing we had to do was to get our economic house in order, to end the drift of the economy. Last year, Congress voted by the narrowest of margins for the economic plan that I proposed that included $255 billion in spending cuts, tax breaks for 15 million working American families, making 90 percent of our small businesses eligible for tax reductions, increasing income taxes on the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people.

When that budget, combined with this budget, which eliminates over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, and reduces the Federal work force by over a quarter of a million, giving us the smallest Federal Government in 1999 that we've had since Kennedy was President, when these two budgets are put together, we will have reduced the Federal deficit for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States.

The Federal debt we will pass along to our children and grandchildren will be $700 billion less than it was estimated to be when I took office as President. We're also trying to grow this economy through expanding exports, through trade agreements like NAFTA and GATT, bringing down foreign barriers to our products and services, eliminating our own barriers to the exports of a lot of our high-tech products.

Already because of NAFTA, we're exporting autos to Mexico at more than 5 times the rate of a year ago. And overall exports to Mexico are growing faster than to any other country with which we trade. Mexico's exports to the United States are also up, too. Both of us are winning, because we did the right thing on NAFTA last year.

And I have just come from a meeting of distinguished citizens of south Florida who are working to make the Summit of the Americas, near the end of this year, a success. You know, this meeting that we're going to have will include the Democratic leaders of this entire hemisphere, the Caribbean and Central and South America as well as in North America. We are going to talk about what we can do to strengthen democracy, what we can do to continue to integrate all of the Americas economically, and what we are going to do to help to build a system of sustainable development so that we can preserve our precious natural resources and grow our economies at the same times. It will be an historic meeting, and we are having it right here in Miami.

I told the folks who were there that I had the opportunity last night to talk to the coach of the Brazilian soccer team and the head of the Brazilian Federation of Soccer, once again reminding me of some of the things we have to do as Americans, because he spoke very good English, and I didn't speak his language. But he said an interesting thing to me. He said, "You know, when we all came here we wondered about this World Cup because we knew soccer was not your game. And yet, we've had wonderful attendance. We've had an open door to all of our people coming from other countries to see your games. The American people have made this the best World Cup ever." Well, it put me to thinking, soccer may not be our game, but democracy is; enterprise is; diversity as a strength is. We can make the Summit of the Americas a truly historic event for all of you in this room and all you represent. Twenty years from now we'll look back on what is happening in Miami at the end of this year as one of the most important events, paving the way to the right kind of future in the 21st century.

Let me say this strategy is working, bringing the deficit down, investing more in education and training, investing more in new technologies, opening new trade opportunities, it's working. In the last 18 months, our economy has generated more than 3.8 million jobs, the unemployment rate has dropped 1.7 percent. Last year we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States than any year since the end of World War II. We are going in the right direction.

But we know we need to do more. We know we have to give our citizens the confidence they need to grow. We know that among Latinos there has been stronger support for the idea of education and hard work through education as the way out of poverty and the way to the American dream than perhaps any other community in the United States. But we also know that we have not yet provided our people with the kind of lifetime learning opportunities that we now know are necessary to succeed and win in the global economy. The average person, after all, will change jobs seven times in a lifetime. So we need a world-class system that starts from the day someone enrolls in kindergarten or preschool to the day they finish high school, to the day they go to college or go into a job-training program or go into work for the first time, until the day they retire. And we are working on that.

This year the Congress has provided, largely on a completely bipartisan basis, perhaps the most important education reforms we have had in a generation, a total reform of the Head Start system serving more children at a younger age; expansion of childhood immunization; the Goals 2000 bill, which sets international educational goals for all of our schools and encourages grassroots reforms to meet them; the school-to-work transition bill, which trains young people who don't go on to college but who do need at least 2 years of further training to get good jobs with a growing income. We must do that for every one of our non-college-bound young people. And we are now considering a way to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system so that when people

lose their jobs they can immediately begin to retrain for the jobs of tomorrow.

Now, when you put all that with what the Congress did last year in the economic program, which was to reform the college loans so that—listen to this, we made 20 million Americans eligible for lower interest rates, better repayment on their college loans, so that no one should ever not go to college again because of the cost of a college education. We are on the right track to the future.

We are trying to do things that honor your values: opportunity, responsibility, community, and the soul of the Hispanic culture, our families. Last year we enacted the family medical leave law, and we cut taxes on 15 million working families to encourage people to stay in the work force, not to slip back into welfare. We established a White House commission on Hispanic educational excellence, chaired by Raul. And I am confident that he will find even more ways for us to help the people who need help.

Our program of national service, AmeriCorps, has benefited from the guidance of La Raza. This year we will have 20,000 young Americans all across the country working in their communities to deal with problems and earning money to continue their education. Year after next we can have 100,000 young Americans rebuilding America from the grassroots up. In Texas alone, the community service program helped to immunize 100,000 extra children in the first year it was in place.

To give you an idea of the dimensions of what national service can do for America, in your communities, in the largest year of participation of the Peace Corps, the largest number we ever had participating was 16,000. We'll have 20,000 this year in national service, 100,000 the year after next. It can help to rebuild America. And the spirit of La Raza should be there in project after project after project after project.

There are two issues I want to speak with you about in closing today, without which we cannot make America what it ought to be. The first is crime. It is tearing our country apart, costing us too much in money and in humanity. And we have to take control of our streets and our neighborhoods again. Right now we are very close to winning passage of an historic crime bill that would put 100,000 more police officers on the street, a 20 percent increase in the number of police officers on the street. It would ban assault weapons that too often make gangs better armed than the police who are supposed to be protecting the American people. And I might add, for those of you who come from rural sporting constituencies like mine, it would identify over 600 sporting and hunting weapons that could not be banned or restricted in any way. It is a law enforcement measure.

It would provide tougher penalties for repeat offenders, more money for local governments to build jail cells but, for the first time ever, $8 billion in prevention, to give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.

But we've been slowed down in the last few weeks, and we need to speed up to pass the crime bill. If anybody doubts why we need it, notice your morning papers. Yesterday, the Department of Justice released a study that showed that in America children between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely to be beaten, raped, and robbed than adults in America. Children are the new victims of crime in America. Our children are the most common victims. And the trends are not good because our children are also more and more likely to be the most common perpetrators. Violent crimes committed against children are up 23 percent since 1987, even in many cities where the overall crime rate is going down. We are allowing our children to be terrorized, a generation of children to be lost in place after place in America, and we must stop it.

And this problem is infecting people without regard to their race. I'll never forget meeting the parents of Polly Klaas, who was kidnapped from her bedroom in Petaluma, California, and subsequently killed. And then there was the letter I got in late April or early May, which a lot of you remember, from 9-year-old James Darby of New Orleans. He wrote me this letter and pleaded with me to do something about the crime problem. He said, "I think somebody might kill me, and I'm asking you nicely to do something about it." Nine days later he was gunned down—9 years old, writing the President, pleading for help. Then yesterday we get the statistical horror that our children are 5 times more likely to be victimized than the rest of us.

The names of Polly Klaas and James Darby and all the others we're going to lose if we don't act—it's time, it's time to put all of our differences aside, to work out the problems we have to work out and pass that crime bill. Every

day, every week, every month that goes by is another period of time when the police aren't on the street, when the assault weapons ban is not in place, when the tougher penalties on repeat offenders are not in place, when we don't have the prevention programs on the streets in every neighborhood in the United States. This is the best and biggest and most significant fight on crime in the history of the United States, and we ought to act on it and do it now.

The other problem I need your help on and I have to thank you for is health care. I want to thank first La Raza for issuing its statement in favor of universal coverage and shared responsibility. But I also want to talk frankly about this. You know, for 60 years our country has tried under Presidents of both parties to reform our health care system, to provide health security for all Americans. And we have never been able to do it.

There are reasons for that. But first, let me ask you to look at the system we have now. What is good about it? The doctors, the nurses, the technology, the medical research: If you can get it, it is the finest in the world. And there are a lot of selfless people. I have been to a public health clinic here in Miami that I will never forget, treating people without regard to their means and giving the best health care they possibly could.

But if you look at our system and compare it to others and if you want America to compete and win in the global economy, we must be willing to rigorously compare ourselves to others, both our strengths and our weaknesses. Here are the facts: We spend a bigger percentage of our income, 14.5 percent, on health care, than any other country. Nobody is over 10. Canada spends 10 percent; Germany and Japan spend about 8.5 percent. But we are the only nation that simply cannot figure out how to cover everybody; in fact, we're going in reverse. Ten years ago, 88 percent of our people were covered with health insurance or covered by Government programs. Today we're back to 83 and dropping.

States have struggled with reforms. Forty States have enacted various kinds of insurance reforms. Of the States which have acted, 30 of those States have still had an increase in the number of people without insurance. You say, "Well, 83 percent, that means only one in six Americans don't have health insurance. That's not too bad. Even though nobody else would tolerate it, it's not too bad." But it is bad. Why? Because nearly everybody can lose your health insurance. Who can't lose their insurance? If you're rich, you can always buy it. If you're poor, the Government will give it to you. If you're in jail, you'll get it. If you work for the Government, you'll get it. Anybody else can lose it, even if you've got it. And we simply have to find a way to deal with this.

The second big problem we have is—I saw all of you nodding your heads when I was talking about education and training out there, identifying with what I said. Most Americans without regard to their party would say the United States today should be spending more investing in our future, more on education and training, more on airports, more on roads, more on technology, more to build a powerful economy. You ought to look at your Federal Government budget.

Now, I am proud of the fact that we're eliminating 100 programs and cutting over 200 others. Proud of the fact that I gave the Congress the first budget in 25 years, if it passes this way, that will actually reduce domestic spending, excluding health care and the other things we've called entitlements. But if you look at what we're doing, we are cutting defense, and I don't believe we can cut it much more. We are right at the edge, below which we shouldn't go. We've cut it dramatically.

We're holding all other domestic spending constant, and health care is exploding. We're exploding health care costs at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, paying more for the same health care. You're going to be listening to Presidential campaigns from now til kingdom come if we don't do something about health care where the people running will be standing up and telling you something that's not so because they won't be able to spend a nickel to see the cow jump over the Moon. They will have to spend all the money, pay more every year for the same health care.

Small businesses in America are paying 30 percent more on average than big business and Government. And more and more people are going without health care coverage. Now, this is the biggest issue, a bigger issue to Hispanic-Americans than any other group. Why? Because more working Hispanics are uninsured than any other group of Americans. More than 32 percent of the Hispanic population is uninsured, compared to 13 percent for Anglo-Americans and 20 percent for African-Americans.

Why is that? Is that because more of you are on welfare? No. If you were on welfare, you'd have health insurance. It's because you are working for small business people or part-time for jobs that do not have health benefits, often for employers that honestly cannot afford health benefits in the current environment.

Now, one of the real problems we have with this debate is that the people who want to stop us from fixing it say they're sticking up for small business. They say that small business can't afford one percent of payroll or 2 percent of payroll to provide for health care. The problem is that most small businesses today are trying to provide health care, and they're paying too much for two reasons: number one, because they're having to carry the burden for those who won't do anything for their employees and, number two, because they're small, they can't get the same good rates that people who work for Government and big business can. And it's not right.

We have always believed that the States were the laboratories of democracy. I'm supporting the State of Florida now in a very innovative thing they want to do with health care. But we do have one State, Hawaii, who 20 years ago decided that there ought to be shared responsibility, a 50–50 deal, employers pay half of health insurance and employees pay half of it and everybody gets covered. They have about 98 percent coverage. Their infant mortality rate has dropped by 50 percent. Their average longevity is more than the national average.

You say, "Well, Hawaii is a healthy, happy place. We all go there to play golf, or whatever." The truth is that 20 percent of their health burden are poor native islanders. And the most important thing is that small business premiums there are 30 percent below the national average. Why? Because nobody is refusing to do their part and because the little guys can join together in big pools and get the same costs that bigger employers can.

My fellow Americans, the Hispanic community has always stood for work over welfare, for holding families together against all the odds, and for the notion that the community was important, that we all became more by working together and being loyal to one another than we could just pursuing our individual destinies. And yet we are living in a country that is the only advanced country in the world that cannot figure out how to cover all of its people. We are punishing the small businesses who try to do the right thing. We are spending 40 percent more of our income than anybody else. We are losing ground on coverage every day. And a lot of people say that what we ought to do is put a Band-Aid on the present system.

I say to you, this is one issue where the political rhetoric is divorced from the reality. The right thing to do for small business that will generate more jobs is to ask everybody to be responsible, give small business a break, give small business the voluntary opportunity to join a buying cooperative so they can get better rates, but cover everybody. Cover everybody.

We have experience. We know what works and what doesn't. This is a very tough fight because we are spending so much of our money on health care on things that relate to the financing of health care, not keeping people healthy or treating them when they're sick. And a lot of people don't want to change the status quo. But if you look at the trends, it is truly frightening. Thirty-two percent of Hispanic-Americans, working people—of all the people in America without health insurance today, 85 percent of them get up every day and work for a living. And if they would quit and go on welfare, we'd give them good health care.

Is that the message we want to send to our people? Is that the message we want to send to our children? Do you want health care for sure? Go on welfare, go to jail, get elected to Congress, or get rich. [*Laughter*] I'm not criticizing the Congress; be a Federal employee, be the President. Be President. I've got it, and I'm not going to lose it. And it's not right. And we know what to do. Do we have the will, do we have the courage, do we have the vision to do it?

I ask you this because it isn't just that one in six Americans don't have health insurance; it isn't just that one in three Hispanics don't have health insurance; it's that the two and three who do have it could lose it. Eighty-one million of us live in families like Henry Cisneros' family, where his young son, who means more to him than anything in the world, has fought a heroic battle against a tragic health problem. And he works for us, so he's got health insurance. What if Henry Cisneros were a traveling salesman? What in God's name would have happened to his son?

There are 81 million of us that live in these families. We owe it to them to be able to work,

to grow, to flourish, to take care of their children. Or if their wives get premature breast cancer or a man has a heart attack at 40, we cannot shut them down. And unless you cover everybody, if you try to fix their problem, the only thing you're going to do is raise everybody else's insurance and have more middle class people losing their insurance. We know what to do. Do we have the courage to do it?

La Raza is here after 26 years because you kept pushing people to change, because you did not deny the existence of real problems but instead embraced the exhilaration of dealing with them. Now, I know a lot of the things I do as President aren't always popular, but I'll tell you what, I show up for work every day and I ask people to face real problems. This is a real problem. Crime is a real problem. Welfare is a real problem. Continuing to make this economy go forward is a real problem. They are also enormous opportunities. This is the greatest country in human history. I believe we can deal with this if you'll give us the energy and support we need to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. at the Miami Beach Convention Center.

Statement on the Attack on the Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires

July 18, 1994

The United States deeply regrets the loss of life caused by the cowardly attack Monday against the Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires.

This terrible loss of innocent life must not deter civilized society from opposing the enemies of peace.

The United States will redouble its efforts on behalf of peace in the Middle East and elsewhere and offers its full assistance and cooperation in helping to identify and locate those responsible for this brutal act.

Statement on Flood Assistance to Georgia, Alabama, and Florida

July 18, 1994

The people in the flooded areas face a difficult task in recovering from this major disaster. Our first priority is to help them get their lives in order. These funds will help farmers to clear their property and get their operations running again. They will also help elderly, low income homeowners to restore their damaged homes.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing additional assistance to States affected by flooding in the Southeast.

Message to the Congress on Economic Sanctions Against Libya

July 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of February 10, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c);

section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA"), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Corporation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. As previously reported, on December 2, 1993, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. In addition, I have instructed the Secretary of Commerce to reinforce our current trade embargo against Libya by prohibiting the re-export from foreign countries to Libya of certain U.S.-origin products, including equipment for refining and transporting oil, unless consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 883.

2. There have been two amendments to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on February 10, 1994. The first amendment (59 *Fed. Reg.* 5105, February 3, 1994) revoked section 550.516, a general license that unblocked deposits in currencies other than U.S. dollars held by U.S. persons abroad otherwise blocked under the Regulations. This amendment is consistent with action by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 883 of November 11, 1993. The Security Council determined in that resolution that the continued failure of the Government of Libya ("GoL") to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular the GoL's continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in Resolutions 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. Accordingly, Resolution 883 called upon Member States, *inter alia*, to freeze certain GoL funds or other financial resources in their territories, and to ensure that their nationals did not make such funds or any other financial resources available to the GoL or any Libyan undertaking as defined in the resolution. In light of this resolution, FAC revoked section 550.516 to eliminate a narrow exception that had existed to the comprehensive blocking of GoL property required by Executive Order No. 12544 of January 8, 1986 (3 C.F.R., 1986 Comp., p. 183), and by the Regulations. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

On March 21, 1994, FAC amended the Regulations to add new entries to appendices A and B (59 *Fed. Reg.* 13210). Appendix A ("Organizations Determined to be Within the Term 'Government of Libya' (Specially Designated Nationals of Libya)") is a list of organizations determined by the Director of FAC to be within the definition of the term "Government of Libya" as set forth in section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, because they are owned or controlled by, or act or purport to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the GoL. Appendix B ("Individuals Determined to be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Libya") lists individuals determined by the Director of FAC to be acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of the GoL, and thus to fall within the definition of the term "Government of Libya" in section 550.304(a).

Appendix A to part 550 was amended to provide public notice of the designation of North Africa International Bank as a Specially Designated National ("SDN") of Libya. Appendix A was further amended to add new entries for four banks previously listed in Appendix A under other names. These banks are Banque Commerciale du Niger (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Nigerienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), Banque Commerciale du Sahel (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Malienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), Chinguetty Bank (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Mauritanienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), and Societe Interaffricaine du Banque (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Togolaise pour le Commerce Exterieur). These banks remain listed in Appendix A under their former names as well.

Appendix B to Part 550 was amended to provide public notice of three individuals determined to be SDNs of the GoL: Seddigh Al Kabir, Mustafa Saleh Gibril, and Farag Al Amin Shallouf. Each of these three individuals is a Libyan national who occupies a central management position in a Libyan SDN financial institution.

All prohibitions in the Regulations pertaining to the GoL apply to the entities and individuals

identified in appendices A and B. All unlicensed transactions with such entities or persons, or transactions in which they have an interest, are prohibited unless otherwise exempted or generally licensed in the Regulations. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 69 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (33) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent GoL interest. The largest category of denials (18) was for banking transactions in which FAC found a GoL interest. Four licenses were issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 126 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than $14.7 million, were blocked. Four of these transactions were subsequently licensed to be released, leaving a net amount of more than $12.7 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 15 civil monetary penalties totaling nearly $144,000 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Twelve of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. The other three penalties were received for violations involving letter of credit and export transactions.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. Open cases as of May 27, 1994, totaled 330. Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies, primarily the U.S. Customs Service. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well as the utilization of international diversionary shipping routes to and from Libya. The FAC has continued to work closely with the Departments of State and Justice to identify U.S. persons who enter into contracts or agreements with the GoL, or other third-country parties, to lobby United States Government officials and to engage in public relations work on behalf of the GoL without FAC authorization.

On May 4, 1994, FAC released a chart, "Libya's International Banking Connections," which highlights the Libyan government's organizational relationship to 102 banks and other financial entities located in 40 countries worldwide. The chart provides a detailed look at current Libyan shareholdings and key Libyan officers in the complex web of financial institutions in which Libya has become involved, some of which are used by Libya to circumvent U.S. and U.N. sanctions. Twenty-six of the institutions depicted on the chart have been determined by FAC to be SDNs of Libya. In addition, the chart identifies 19 individual Libyan bank officers who have been determined to be Libyan SDNs. A copy of the chart is attached to this report.

In addition, on May 4, 1994, FAC announced the addition of five entities and nine individuals to the list of SNDs of Libya. The five entities added to the SND list are: Arab Turkish Bank, Libya Insurance Company, Maghreban International Trade Company, Saving and Real Estate Investment Bank, and Societe Maghrebine D'Investissement et de Participation. The nine individuals named in the notice are: Yousef Abd-El-Razegh Abdelmulla, Ayad S. Dahaim, El Hadi M. El-Fighi, Kamel El-Khallas, Mohammed Mustafa Ghadban, Mohammed Lahmar, Ragiab Saad Madi, Bashir M. Sharif, and Kassem M. Sherlala. All prohibitions in the Regulations pertaining to the GoL apply to the entities and individuals identified in the notice issued on May 4, 1994. All unlicensed transactions with such entities or persons, or transactions in which they have an interest, are prohibited unless otherwise exempt or generally licensed in the Regulations. A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

The FAC also continued its efforts under the Operation Roadblock initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January

7, 1994, through July 6, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately $1 million. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the GoL continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The United States continues to believe that still stronger international measures than those mandated by the United Nations Security Council Resolution 883, including a worldwide oil embargo, should be enacted if Libya continues to defy the international community. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorists acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 18, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Lithuania-United States Fishery Agreement
July 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania Extending the Agreement of November 12, 1992, Concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States, with annex. The agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Vilnius, Lithuania on February 22, 1994, and May 11, 1994, extends the 1992 agreement to December 31, 1996. The exchange of notes, together with the 1992 agreement, constitutes a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of section 201(c) of the Act.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Lithuania, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 18, 1994.

Remarks at a Democratic Campaign Reception in Portland, Maine
July 18, 1994

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you all for that wonderful welcome, and thank you, Senator Mitchell, for your introduction.

You know, I came here today—having left Washington, which is very hot in the summertime, and I flew to Miami, which is much hotter in the summertime—and I thought I would feel out of place when I got up here in the northern climate of Maine. But you kindly put these lights up and made us all feel right at home. [*Laughter*] Of course, I may be the only person up here who is still standing when this event is over—[*laughter*]—but I like the warm welcome you have given.

I want to say, too, how glad I am to be here with your State chair, Victoria Murphy. She's providing great leadership. She's got a lot of energy. I like that. We've got a real ethnic blend up here tonight on this ticket: Senator Baldacci—I would do more for him if he'd brought me a little pasta tonight so I could eat—[*laughter*]—Senator Dutremble. I want you to send them to Congress because it matters whether they're there. You know, if a President doesn't want to do anything, it doesn't make much difference who's in Congress. If you get elected to do things to move the country forward, you can't do it unless there are people in Congress who will help. I need them there. More importantly, you need them there, and I want you to send them there.

I love hearing Joe Brennan remind you that, when we were much younger, we served as both attorney general and Governor together. And he said he had notes—you know, I've gotten to the point where I can't remember anything. Joe, I'd like to have those notes back. [*Laughter*] I will say this: I loved serving with Joe Brennan. And I got to know him pretty well. And there's a kind of nice and unusual camaraderie that often develops among the people who serve in the Governors group. I've been for him every time he's been on the ballot up here, and I'm glad to see that you're going to send him back to the Governor's office where he belongs.

I'd like to say something about Tom Andrews and this Senate seat in connection with George Mitchell. Most of you know from my last trip to Maine what I think of Senator Mitchell and how much I feel indebted to him and how much I think the country is indebted to him. On the night that he called to tell me that he was going to announce the next day that he would not seek reelection, first of all, I accused him of dealing with it on the telephone because he couldn't stand to see a grown man cry. [*Laughter*] And secondly, I talked to him a second time and a third time, and finally he said, "Look," he said, "Tom Andrews will run, and he'll win, and he'll be just great."

But I want to try to put into some sharp relief what Senator Mitchell said about the voting patterns of the parties. You know, I ran for President as the Governor of my State because I was worried about our country. I was worried about what our future would be like. I was worried about what my daughter would grow up to live in. I thought the economy was going in the wrong direction, the people were coming apart when they ought to be pulling together, and that Government was not working for ordinary people. And I believed that in order for us to go into the 21st century at this moment of enormous opportunity—the end of the cold war, the emergence of a real global village on this planet of ours—in order for us to go into that century strong and healthy and robust, giving every boy and girl the chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities, in a world that was more peaceful, more prosperous, more sane, we had to get the economy turned around, we had to pull the American people together, we had to get this Government to work for ordinary folks again—straightforward, simple, direct objectives.

And the first thing we had to do was to get our economic house in order. It was amazing to me the difference between the rhetoric and the reality of the politics of the last dozen years. When the other crowd was in, they always talked about how much they hated Government and they hated tax-and-spend, they hated this, that, and the other thing, and how evil the deficits were, and how they were trying to be tough. I looked at the facts and I realized that whatever you want to say about Congress, they actually appropriated slightly less money than the previous two Presidents asked them to spend but not enough to overcome the recommendations they made, which cut taxes on the wealthy, raised them on the middle class, exploded the deficit, and drove the economy downhill.

And so I asked the Congress to do something hard, not something easy; not where we would talk one way and do another but where we'd actually do what we said we were going to do: make the tax system fair and bring the deficit down. And the Congress voted by the narrowest of margins—literally by one vote in both Houses—for a plan that had $255 billion in spending cuts; provided tax cuts for 15 million American working families, including almost 61,000 families in Maine; asked the wealthiest 1½ percent of our population, including about 3,700 families in Maine, to pay a tax increase; provided a tax reduction for 90 percent of the small businesses in this country that would invest more in their businesses—90 percent of them—and basically brought about the biggest deficit reduction package in history.

Then this year, we followed up with a budget that eliminates 100 Government programs out-

right, cuts over 200 others, continues to reduce by attrition the size of the Federal work force, so that by 1999 it will be the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was President of the United States. These are things that the Democrats did. And at the same time we increased our spending on Head Start; we increased our spending on education and training of the work force; we increased our spending on defense conversion like the project that the Bath Iron Works got here to develop commercial shipping; we increased our spending on new technologies for the future; we reformed the student loan laws and made 20 million American students eligible for lower interest rates and better repayment terms.

And we got, as George Mitchell said, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States of America. And what are the results: 3.8 million new jobs; in Maine, 17,000 private sector jobs in a year and a half, after 4 years in which you lost 30,000 jobs; last year the largest number of new business starts in America since the end of World War II. That is the record. And the record was established by one vote in both Houses, because the rhetoric, the forces against change, hanging on—so they're coming back one more time talking about tax and spend. When you hear it in a Senate race, you just remember this: When the chips were down, Tom Andrews didn't blink.

When he went up there and cast that vote, he didn't do it for me; he didn't do it for the Congress; he didn't do it for the Democratic Party. He did it for you. He did it for you. And believe it or not, a higher percentage of citizens in the other congressional district in Maine got a tax cut than the ones in his own. But he said yes, and his opponent said no because the other party gave marching orders that no one who wanted to stay in good graces could vote for this plan—no one. They were told no, no, no. Well, we said yes to America. We got 3.8 million new jobs, a point and a half off the unemployment rate, a growing economy, a declining deficit because of that one vote. You need to swell those numbers. Send these men to the Congress. Send him to the Senate, and send a message to America.

Now, we got the same thing all over again on issue after issue after issue. Now we're trying to get a crime bill out of the Congress. It will have bipartisan support if we can just get it to a vote because no one will vote against crime now. This is a big deal. This administration and our allies in Congress are going to provide a 20-percent increase in the number of police officers on the street, not just to catch criminals but to deter crime.

Violent crime has increased by 300 percent in the last 30 years. The number of police officers on the street have increased by 10 percent. It's not hard to figure out what's going on here. We're also going to provide billions of dollars in Maine and all across the country for prevention programs, so that young people will have something to say yes to, not just something to say no to—never been done before in a crime bill, ever in the history.

We are trying to do things. And now, in the last great battle of his career in the Senate, Senator Mitchell's trying to help me pass health care reform. And I want to tell you exactly what we're up against. You know, 500 years ago the Italian political philosopher Machiavelli said, "There is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things," because the people who will lose what they have will fight you tooth and nail. That's Arkansas, not Machiavelli. [*Laughter*] But that's what he said. They'll fight you tooth and nail, and the people who will benefit will always be a little hesitant, being unsure of the benefit of change.

Now, what have we achieved already? For the first time ever in the history of the Congress, we have three congressional committees that have voted out plans to provide health care for all Americans. That's never happened before. We never even got a bill out of committee in 60 years of trying.

But again, in this issue, just like on the budget, there's been this huge disconnect between the rhetoric and the reality. All those television ads they ran against our plan, they said, "They're going to take your choice of doctor away." Folks, you're losing your choices of doctors now. We're going to give it back to you. They said we're going to ration health care. There are 39 million Americans without health insurance today. They're being rationed right now.

They said that we were going to totally mess up this system with bureaucracy and regulation. Well, let me tell you what we've done. We've made our plan less bureaucratic and less regulatory. We've given small business the option to join big buyers cooperatives. But most of

them will do it so they can buy health insurance cheaper instead of more expensive now. Under the present system, small business pays 30 to 40 percent more than big business and government. We provided more help to small business so they can afford to cover their employees more. We have met every criticism that's been leveled against us, except we haven't walked away from trying to provide full coverage to all Americans and trying to constrain the cost of health care and trying to help working families and the elderly with prescription drug benefits and long-term care. We haven't walked away from that. We're still trying to do the things that America needs.

Now, our opponents say this is bad for small business. But let's look at the facts. Most small businesses insure their employees today and they're paying an enormous price for it. Why? Because they pay for everybody that doesn't cover their employees; because, keep in mind, if you get real sick, you show up at the emergency room, you get health care, the rest of us pay the bill; and because small businesses don't have the bargaining power that big business and Government does.

Now, what has happened? We're the only country in the world that this has happened to. In the last 10 years—10 years ago 88 percent of the American people had health coverage; today only 83 percent do. We're going in reverse. That's more than one in six Americans. You think, well, I'm not one of the one in six. Well, let me tell you, if you're very wealthy or you're very poor or you're a politician or you're in jail, you'll always have health care. Otherwise, you might lose it. So just because you're not one of the one in six now doesn't mean you won't be.

Who have we guaranteed health care to in America? Our elderly on Medicare. If you tried to repeal Medicare today there would be a riot, wouldn't there? There would be a riot in America, and there ought to be. Don't working class, middle class Americans deserve the same thing? I think they do.

Now, we have people that say, "Well, let's just tinker around, do a little here, a little there." The problem is that in good conscience I'm not against doing a little, but I want it to be a good little, not a bad little. The truth is there's a lot of evidence that if you just tinker around with some of these recommendations that our opponents have put out, you might actually raise insurance rates more, not help working people at all, and have more people lose their insurance.

Now, this is amazing. We spend 14 percent of our income on health care. Canada spends 10 percent, Germany spends 8½ percent. Nobody's even close to us. Yet everybody else covers 96, 97, 98 percent of the people, and we cover 83 percent. And we're supposed to defend this.

Yes, our doctors are great; our nurses are great; our medical schools are great. We can pay for all that. We can even pay for all the terrible tragedies of increased violence, high rates of AIDS and things like that, and have money left over if we have the courage to reorganize the way health care is financed. This is about finance. This is not about anything else.

So I say to you, we need to complete a battle that was begun by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman that has never been completed. And to show you how far our friends in the other party have gone, in 1972—'71—President Richard Nixon recommended that all Americans be covered by health care and that employers and employees split the bill. They now think that is a radical, liberal idea. [*Laughter*] Every time George Mitchell has reached out to compromise, they have moved further away. This must not be about politics. It must not be about rhetoric. It must not be about party. It should be about health care, the human beings of the United States of America.

I just want to tell you one thing. You know, my wife and I have gotten about a million letters from Americans. And when I go places, normally we'll call some of the letter writers and ask them if they'll come meet us, just so the press and the public in communities can see these people. I was in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, the other day, a little town in western Pennsylvania, and I was introduced by two women. One of them's name was Louise. She's not the one on the ad. [*Laughter*] The other one's name was Lynn. One woman was a 62-year-old dairy farmer.

And you know, I grew up in a farming State, once lived on a farm, and that's why I got into politics, I didn't want to work that hard. [*Laughter*] There is nothing more difficult than being a dairy farmer. You've got to do it 7 days a week. You can't tell the cows to stop growing milk. [*Laughter*] It's a very tough thing. At the age of 62 this woman and her husband lost

their health insurance. They just simply couldn't afford it anymore. They just kept exploding the price over and over and over again. What are we to say to her, "Here's a country that believes in work, family, and community; it's tough luck for you"? The other woman, the mother of five children, had her husband stand up, we looked at him. We thought they were fine people. They had five kids. She had cancer and is recovering, but you know he lost one job, changed it, lost their insurance. What do we say to them? What I want you to know is it's not just one in six; it can happen to nearly anybody.

I'm trying to get all these people to leave welfare and go to work. They leave welfare, go to work, start paying taxes, lose their health care, and pay taxes for somebody else's health care. What do we say to them? You know, a lot of these people that demonstrate against me at these health care meetings say I'm trying to have socialized medicine and all this bull. It's not true. It's private insurance we're advocating. They think they ought to put Harry Truman on Mount Rushmore. But, now folks, I come from one of those families that was for Harry Truman when he was living. [*Laughter*] And I am telling you, the same crowd used the same arguments against Harry Truman. And they bad-mouthed him, and they said he was a rube, and he didn't deserve to be President, even though he had finished the Second World War and led the world in organizing the institutions of the post-cold-war era. They talked about how he was incompetent and in over his head and didn't know what he was doing. And they demeaned him with the same arguments they're using today.

It has always been difficult to change. But we turned this economy around. We're opening up the global economy. We're laying the foundations for peace and security in the 21st century. But if you want us to have money that you pay to the Federal Government to invest in education and training and new technology and hope for the future, we've got to do something to restrain health care costs and to provide health security to all Americans. We have got to do it.

Now, there is one thing you can do to get it done. You can make your voices heard and you can elect these two fine men to the House of Representatives. You can elect Tom Andrews to the Senate. You can elect Joe Brennan to the Governor's office. You can send a message to America that you are on the side of change.

Thank you. And God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 p.m. in the Eastland Ballroom at the Sonesta Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to John E. Baldacci, Maine State senator, and Dennis L. Dutremble, Maine Senate president.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National Governors' Association in Boston, Massachusetts

July 19, 1994

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor Campbell. Governor Dean, Governor Weld, thank you for hosting the Governors in your latest expression of bipartisan support, showing up at the Democratic Governors' party last night. That's broadening your base here.

I want to join many others here in saying a word of best wishes to Governor Edgar as he continues his recovery and to say to all of you who are leaving the Governors conference this year who served with me, how much I wish you well and how much I enjoyed serving with you over the years.

I always look forward to this day every year. I feel that I have in many ways come home whenever I come back here. There are many ways in which I miss being a Governor, because Governors are so much less isolated from real life than Presidents. Neighbors stop you on the street and talk about their jobs and businesses, about their children and their parents, and the things that we in Washington call issues take on a very human face. And I must say I have worked hard to try to find ways to keep the human face on the issues with which we all deal.

It was as a Governor that I learned and lived the idea that the purpose of public life is actually to get people together to solve problems, not to posture for the next election with rhetoric. In my time in the NGA I was proud to work in a bipartisan fashion on issues of education and welfare reform, on trade and economic development and, yes, on bipartisan suggestions we Governors had for reducing the Federal deficit.

I ran for President because I did not want us to go into the 21st century without a vision of how we could restore our economy and unite our people, make Government work for ordinary Americans again because I thought that our politics was too burdened by partisan rhetoric and too little concerned with practical progress. In the last year and a half I have set about to implement the vision that I brought to that campaign, one that grew directly out of the experiences I had with most of you around this table. We worked to get our economic house in order, to reverse the trend of exploding deficits and declining investments in America.

The economic plan the Congress adopted last year contained $255 billion in spending cuts, tax cuts for 15 billion working families, made 90 percent of the small businesses in American eligible for tax cuts, increased taxes on the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people, reduced the Federal payroll by a quarter million, and will give us—along with this year's budget which eliminated over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, and takes the payroll deduction to 272,000, meaning that in 1999 the Federal Government will be below 2 million for the first time since John Kennedy was President—these two budgets will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

In the aftermath of that, our economy has produced 3.8 million jobs in 18 months; the unemployment rate is down 1.7 percent. In 1993 we had the largest number of new businesses incorporated in America in any year since the end of World War II. In the first quarter of this year, it was the first time in 16 years we'd gone for a quarter without a bank failure in America. So I believe that we are moving in the right direction.

I want to thank the Governors, in particular, for your continued and consistent support for expanding trade, for NAFTA which is working superbly, by the way. Our trade to Mexico is growing dramatically. Mexico's trade to us is growing as well, but our trade to Mexico is growing more rapidly than that with any other country. We have already sold 5 times more automobiles to Mexico this year than last year.

I thank you for your statement of support on GATT. We must muster through the bipartisan majority we need in Congress to ratify the GATT this year. It will create a half million high-wage jobs in America between now and the end of the decade.

I thank you for your support of the Asian-Pacific initiative we began in Seattle, Washington, last year. And I was with Governor Chiles yesterday in Florida to meet with the committee on the Summit of the Americas which we will have with all the democratic governments in this hemisphere in South America at the end of this year.

These are things which will make a huge difference in our economic future. There are many of you who have also helped us to invest more in defense conversion and new technology, saving the space station, trying to move from a defense to a domestic economy, trying to develop technologies which clean the environment and produce jobs at the same time.

I want to especially thank you also for the work we have been able to do, probably the most in education and training that's been done in any single year in the last 30 years. And the Governors, on a bipartisan basis, have supported that. We have expanded and reformed the Head Start program, increased immunizations, passed the Goals 2000 bill which ratifies your national education goals in Federal law with bipartisan support, passed the school-to-work bill, which will support your efforts to help young people who leave high school and don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need 2 years of further education and training. We also have reformed the student loan laws which will make 20 million young Americans eligible for lower interest and better repayment schedules under the student loan program of the United States.

And finally, we have still pending in the Congress this year the reemployment bill which will change the whole focus of the unemployment systems in ways that will benefit the economy of every State represented around these tables because for too long our unemployment system has been just that. It has paid people while they exhausted their unemployment on the assumption they would be called back to their

old jobs when as a practical matter few of them, one in five Americans, are called back to their old jobs these days. They need to begin immediately retraining for the new jobs of the future. That's what the reemployment system will do. And I look forward to working with you on that, the last leg in this revolution in the lifetime learning system of the United States.

Let me just mention a couple of other issues, if I might, before moving to health care. The Governors have been concerned, some of us almost obsessed, with the question of welfare reform for many years now. Our State was one of the first States selected to be a demonstration project for a lot of these ideas way back in 1980, in the last year of the Carter administration.

The work the Governors did together on the Family Support Act of 1988 is still the best example of anything that's been done in the welfare reform area. Now we are seeking to go beyond that. Many of you with your State initiatives—we have granted several welfare waivers and expect to grant some more, and with the debate about to start in the Congress, I just want to say a couple of words about it. It is important that we pass a new welfare reform bill that builds on what we did in 1988 and what those of you who have worked hard to do right in your States are doing. It is important that we dramatically increase the national efforts to do what you need the National Government to do, including adopting some national rules on tough enforcement of child support. Some of you have done remarkable things there, but if we have some national systems we can do a much better job in collecting billions and billions of dollars in overdue child support, the absence of which drives people into welfare.

It is important that we provide maximum leeway for continuing State experimentation. I have said over and over again to members of both parties in the Congress, no one understands how to fully solve this riddle. So, whatever we do in the national welfare reform legislation, it is imperative that we still leave the States some room to continue to experiment.

Finally, I hope that all of us will support the notion that there ought to be some period after which we end welfare as we know it. Yesterday I was in Florida, and I shook hands with a lot of people who came to this reception. We were talking about the Summit of the Americas, after which these two young women who were born in another country, I think—they spoke English with very pronounced accents—but they were working at the hotel. They said they were American citizens. They wanted to know if they could have their picture taken with the President, and they wanted to tell me something about the welfare system, these two young women that were working at the hotel. And both of them said, "Take all that money and spend it on child care and training and incentives and whatever, but make all those folks go to work if they can go to work," two people at the hotel, just spontaneous.

So, I say to you, we need to act on that. Both Houses have had hearings: there's a great deal of bipartisan support. I think we have a chance to do it. We have some chance to do it this year, although no one really thinks we can. If we don't, we certainly ought to pass it early next year.

Let me mention now the crime bill. This crime bill is the most important anticrime legislation ever considered by the Congress. It has broad bipartisan support. There are one or two areas of continuing disagreement, but let me mention what's important about it. It puts 100,000 police on the street over the next 5 years. That's a 20 percent increase. There's been a 300 percent increase in violent crime in the last 30 years and a 10 percent increase in the number of policemen in America. It shouldn't surprise anybody that we have problems dealing with this. We now know that violent crime has shifted downward along the age scale and that people between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely to suffer from violent crime than older people. We need community policing. It is in many ways the most important part of the crime bill.

The crime bill has tougher punishment, including the "three strikes and you're out" law. It bans assault weapons but protects hunting weapons in an innovative and I think very important piece of Federal legislation. It provides more money for prisons, but it also provides billions for prevention.

I must take some exception to what the Republican leader of the Senate said earlier here today on this issue. The prevention money is in there in large measure because the law enforcement officials of the country told us it ought to be in there. It is in there because the people who go out and put their lives on the line every day said to us over and over

and over again, "You've got to give these kids something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. If they do something terrible and you have to put them away for a long time, fine. But if you can prevent that through summer jobs, through job training, through midnight basketball, through more people in the Boys Clubs, through these things which work, to give kids who live in neighborhoods that are burdened by the lack of family structure, community structure, and the structure of work, do it. Give them something to say yes to again."

It is a very serious prevention effort. And I think it ought to be supported along with the tougher punishment. And since the law enforcement officials—the law enforcement coordinating committee represents half a million law enforcement officials in this country, I think that we ought to have that kind of support on a bipartisan basis for continuing the prevention initiative as well.

Let me just mention one other subject before I go on to health care. A big part of reinventing Government to me—and you've heard the Vice President use that slogan. We're coming up on our first anniversary of our reinventing Government kickoff, and he and I will be trying to give you a progress report at the end of the summer when we do that. But let me just say that we've done some things that I think are very important. We're paying for this crime bill not with a tax increase but with a savings which will be achieved by reducing the Federal payroll by 272,000 people, taking people out of the Federal bureaucracy and putting them on the streets of our cities and towns. I think that's reinventing Government at its best. We'll give the money to you, and you spend it to keep the American people safer.

We are trying to make agencies work that for too long were political and ineffective, like the Federal Emergency Management Agency—and I was just with the Governors of Georgia, Florida, and Alabama in the aftermath of their terrible floods—and the Small Business Administration, which I think is commonly recognized as probably at its most effective state in its history.

We have tried to deal with the fact that you bear a disproportionate share of the cost of immigration, those of you with high immigrant populations, and we have increased by one third funding to the States for dealing with immigration problems in the last year and a half. I support the modified Glenn-Kempthorne initiative, and I agree with Senator Dole we ought to pass it, we ought to pass it now, and we ought to put the issue of unfunded mandates behind us. I think it's a very important thing to do.

Finally, let me make this statement and ask for your help, I very strongly support the continued issues of comprehensive waivers in the areas of health care and welfare reform. We have issued, by my last count, 21 comprehensive, sweeping waivers, a lot of little ones but 21 very large ones, 15 or 16 in the welfare area and 5 or 6 in the health care area, in the last year and a half, slightly more than half of them since I last met with you. I received a report before I came here on all the applications that any of you have pending for comprehensive waivers, and I reviewed them, and I have taken a personal interest in trying to push them through.

I, like you, am concerned by the recent court decision on this issue, and I appreciate your response to that. I just want you to know that we need to work together to figure out what to do about the court decision so we can go on with waivers. I am determined not to permit that court decision to become an excuse to slow down the dramatic increase in experimentation we have at the State level in health care and welfare reform. And I ask you for your support in that.

Now, of course the most politically difficult and politically charged issue we are facing today is the issue of health care. It shouldn't be surprising that for 60 years the American people have seen their leaders periodically try to provide coverage to all Americans and to reform the health care system, only to fail. The most encouraging thing perhaps that has happened today so far is the comment that Senator Dole made that now is the time to act, and he is willing to work all through August and September and October to get something done. That is what we ought to do. We ought to do whatever it takes and work however long it takes on whatever days to takes to get something done.

I would like to set this again into some context. You gave me the privilege of coming to speak with you about this last year, and I don't want to be just going over old ground. But I think it's important, when we decide what it

is we should do or shouldn't do, to talk again about what the problem is.

First of all, in the United States we are the only country in the world with an advanced economy that doesn't provide functional full coverage, that is, somewhere 96, 97, 98 percent. Social security has 98 percent. You've always got a few people just walking around out there, so it's impossible to have 100 percent coverage of anything. But all other major nations do this. We don't.

Secondly, in spite of the fact that we don't, we spend 40 percent more of our income on health care than anybody else. This year we're at about 14.2 percent of our income going to health care. Canada is at 10; Germany is at 8.5. And Germany, as you know, has a very fine pharmaceutical industry, a very fine research industry, and high-quality health care as well.

Because health care costs have been going up faster than the rate of inflation, they have been eating up an ever larger percentage of both national and State budgets. You know this. A lot of you who served for some time have seen your budgets every year go more and more and more for health care, less and less and less for education and for economic development, for tax relief, for whatever else you might wish to do.

If you look at the chart of the Federal budget, it's absolutely stunning. Now, if you start next year and string it out until the end of the decade, we're pretty flat in all discretionary spending. Defense is coming down, and I would argue it's coming down just as much as it can, and it should not be cut more. And health care costs are exploding. The job of being a Congressman or a Senator within 4 or 5 years will amount to showing up in Washington and writing health care checks and going home unless we do something to reverse these trends.

And yet, in spite of the fact that we're spending much more money, we are the only nation in the world that's going in reverse in coverage. Ten years ago, 88 percent of the American people were covered; today, 83 percent are. Now, you may say, "Well, that's just one in six. Well, that's good; 83 percent are covered." The problem is that 16 percent is a lot of folks, for one thing—17 percent.

Secondly and perhaps more importantly, the number of people who are at risk of losing their coverage is far greater. Who's locked into coverage, who's locked in? If you're on Medicaid or you're very poor, you're locked in. If you have Medicare, you're locked in. If you're in jail, you're locked in; you get coverage. If you're very wealthy, you're locked in because you can buy it. If you're a politician or you work for government, you're locked in; you get it. Almost everybody else is at risk of losing their health care. And keep in mind, you have pushed for lifetime learning, you have, because you recognize that younger workers are going to change jobs seven times in a lifetime.

Now, how are we going to provide that kind of security? And let me say there is a human face behind this. I don't want class warfare, but let's look at the facts. Over 80 percent of all the people without insurance in America are people who work for a living; they're working people. This morning I had coffee with a man named Jim Bryant and his wife, Mary, and their two children because I read about him in the Boston Globe. He works 60 hours a week and doesn't have any health insurance. And they talked about how much they worked and said they had a good life and all the extra money they had they were putting away for their kids' college education, but they would be ruined if they ever had an illness.

And I asked him if he could afford to pay something, and he said, "Sure." I said, "Would you like to know how much I pay a month for health care as the President of the United States, or Members of Congress or members of the Federal Government?" He said, "Yes." I said, "We pay about $100 a month, and our employer, you, pays $300 a month. And he said, "I could pay that easy." He said, "I could pay twice that."

I was in western Pennsylvania, Governor Casey's State. And by the way, I appreciate your support for reform and your attempt to resolve the abortion issue, Governor Casey. But I was in western Pennsylvania, Greensburg, Pennsylvania; two women got up and spoke before me. I don't know if they were Republicans or Democrats, don't have any idea who they voted for. One of them was a dairy farmer, 62 years old. And you know, that's about the hardest farming there is. You've got to work 7 days a week because you can't tell the cows to quit producing milk. Sixty-two years old, they finally had to give up health care at the time she needed it most, this woman did, she and her husband, because they just couldn't afford it anymore.

And then, after that, a woman spoke who was a mother of five children, and she introduced her husband. She had had cancer, and he had had to change jobs and didn't have health insurance. And there are lots of people out there like that. We're talking millions of people, not just a few. And the issue is not just them but it's everybody else that could be in that position.

Now, the reason I'm bringing this up is that it is important to understand what the problem is when you analyze what the solution should be. And the problem is not just that one-sixth of the American people don't have health care and that the costs are running out of control but that many, many more Americans are at risk of losing their health care.

So, the question is, what should we do? I recommended a system of private insurance participated in by everybody, with a break for small business that gives them lower cost and allows them to buy insurance, small business and self-employed people and farmers, in big groups the way governments and big employers do, maintaining consumer choice but with cost constraints like managed care. And then I went around the country and listened to people and listened to you all tell me what you thought was wrong with it. And we came back with modifications that had less bureaucracy, fewer boards and commissions, more flexibility for the States, less burden on small business than we originally proposed, more choices for the American people in health care, and a longer phase-in period because there is always a law of intended consequences in everything.

So everybody in this debate agrees we have to phase this in. No one believes we can do it next year. Everybody believes this has to be a multiyear phase-in. Now, that's what we offered, and you can find that in some form or fashion in the bills which are working their way through the Congress.

Now, what is the alternative? If you want to cover everybody, or nearly everybody, near as I can tell there are only three ways to do it. You can do it the way Canada does and the way we do for seniors through Medicare, by having a tax that does it. That didn't seem to me to be feasible, abolishing all private health insurance and replacing it with a tax, although you could do it for even less money than we're spending today and cover everybody.

You can do it the way Hawaii does and the way Germany does and the way most of us do it, by just extending the system we have now and asking employers to pay some portion of their employee health insurance and asking the employees to pick up the rest.

You could ask the employees who don't have insurance to cover their own insurance and give them a break, if they're low-income people, to do it. The problem with that, obviously, is whether you would encourage everybody who is on the margins to dump their employees.

There may be some other way to do it, but I'm not sure what that would be. You could get close to that, maybe, by a system of subsidies to middle class and lower middle class people and by putting all the small businesses, giving them at least a chance to be in buyers' co-ops and doing something like what Governor McWherter and others have done with the Medicaid program to put it in some sort of managed care situation so you can save some money and provide some money to cover others.

But I ask you to look at the evidence. More than 45 States have passed some sort of partial health care reform and insurance reform in the last few years. But State spending has continued to go up, business spending on health care has continued to go up, and coverage has continued to go down. Indeed, in a study I recently saw, only 10 States actually had reduced the number of uninsured people after all their reforms were implemented, and 5 of them only had reduced the number of uninsured working people, mostly States that had provided very generous benefits for people who would move from welfare to work.

So what are we to do? There was a recent Wall Street Journal article which said that even in States that had insurance reforms without universal coverage, fewer people have coverage than under the old system. Now, why is this? Why is this? Because the system we have encourages waste and inefficiency and irresponsibility. Under the system we have, people who cover their employees pay for those who don't, indirectly, because people who don't have coverage when they get real sick show up at the emergency room, they get health care, and the costs are passed along. Because, under the system we have, without more people in managed competition environments, the more you do, the more you earn, whether it's needed or not. Pennsylvania has had a very valuable reform in

this regard by simply publishing the costs of various procedures across the State of Pennsylvania, and the results showing that there is not necessarily a correlation between the most expensive care and the best results care. That's something that can be done everywhere.

And finally, it's very expensive because we're the only country in the world that has 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies so that every doctor's office, every hospital, and every insurance company has to hire a slew of clerical people to figure out who is not covered for what. And we pay for all that. That's 4.2 percent difference in America and Canada. Let me just give you an idea about how much that is: That's about $250 billion a year. That's not chicken feed.

Some of that money is because of medical technology and high quality care; some of that money is because of violence and illness and AIDS; but a lot of that money is pure, old-fashioned inefficiency. And so we have to ask ourselves: What should we do? You have already said no to an alternative proposal that would cap the Federal share of Medicaid, cut Medicare without giving any extra benefits to senior citizens, use money to help the poor, and do nothing for the middle class. I think it is important to take the rhetoric out of this and ask what will work.

I heard again the litany of things that people have said, that we don't want a Government takeover of one-seventh of our economy. No, we don't. That's why I propose doing what Hawaii did. Hawaii is not in control of the health care system, are you, Governor? Private insurance, not a Government takeover.

We don't want job loss. The Congressional Budget Office says there will be job gain if you stop all this cost shifting over a 10-year period. And Hawaii's experience indicates that there will be job gain. We do not want to bankrupt the States, and we don't want to bankrupt the Federal Government. That's why we have to have hard cost estimates. At least we have them on our plan.

Now, I read your proposal, and we have made some changes in our plan to reflect your proposal, to make it more flexible, respect State initiatives more, have less regulation, don't have mandatory alliances. But the question is, what are we going to do that works?

Just yesterday, the Catholic Health Association released a study conducted by Lewin-VHI which says that if you have insurance reforms and low-income subsidies without having coverage for everybody, middle class people earning between $20,000 and $29,000 a year will wind up paying $484 a year more for their insurance.

Why is that? Because if you require everybody to be covered, and you say they can take it from job to job, but you don't have everyone covered, then more single individuals who think they'll be healthy and live forever won't buy health insurance, more small businesses on the margin will drop it, and the cost will rise for everybody that's left.

So I say to you—you know, it was Senator Chafee, a distinguished Republican Senator from Rhode Island, who said that you can't have these insurance reforms without universal coverage. He said that. I didn't. He said it was difficult to conceive of how you could have a right of people to carry their insurance policies from job to job to job unless you had some system in which virtually everybody was covered.

Now, if you look at the Hawaii experience, they have had a program based on employer-employee shared responsibility since 1974, 2 years after it was first proposed by President Nixon and Senator Packwood. They have had it. What's happened? Infant mortality is down by 50 percent. The number of people without insurance has shrunk dramatically. Unemployment has fallen. The cost of living is higher in Hawaii than almost any place in America, with small business premiums at 30 percent below the national average. Why? Because everybody participates, nobody bumps anybody else out of it, and everybody's in big buying pools.

Now, what are we going to do? I will say again, we have to do something that works. We have to do something that works for families like Jim Bryant and his wife and two kids, something that works for the people that are out there in all of your States who are working, who are not.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day, and I talked to a woman who ran a delicatessen. She had 20 full-time employees, 20 part-time employees, and she had had cancer 5 years ago. And she said, "I'm in the worst of all worlds. I cover my 20 full-time employees, and we pay too much because I'm a small business person and I've got a preexisting condition. And I'm at a disadvantage with all my competitors. But I feel guilty that I don't cover my part-time

employees. If you had a system where I could buy insurance at a rate competitive with government and big business and where my competitors had no advantage over me, I would gladly do it."

So again I say, I am open to any solution to this. And I believe the States ought to be the laboratories of democracy, and I want you to have more flexibility. But at a certain time, I heard Governor Romer's comment earlier, we have to look at the evidence. And so I say, if you imagine what the world will be like when the century turns and we start a new millennium, if you'll imagine what it would be like in America and what you want it to be like and what you've worked so hard for it to be like, you want us to have a competitive economy; you want our deficit to be under control; you want our debt to be a smaller percentage of our income; you want us to have a system of lifetime learning; you want us to have a trading system where we can grow in a world economy.

You do not want every Governor and every President of both parties in the future to spend all their time writing checks where they're paying more every year for the same health care, and they haven't solved a problem which has been solved elsewhere. All I ask in these closing weeks of this debate is that we take the political air out of the balloon and ask ourselves what will work for ordinary Americans.

Now, let me close just by asking every one of you to read this letter that was published in the Boston Globe this morning because one thing I think every Democrat, every Republican, every independent in America agrees is that for people who have it, we have the best health care in the world. We have the finest medical schools, the finest medical centers, the best medical research. Everybody agrees on that. Senator Dole and I agree on that. Everybody does.

This is a letter from the people who are providing it in this area. They are part of the 100 people who came to the White House the other day representing academic medical centers who said, if you want to keep what is best about American health care, you will have to fix what doesn't work about it. You will have to find a way to cover all Americans because we are being hurt now. We used to pass our costs on to everybody else, but States are controlling their costs. The Federal Government's controlling their costs. These big companies that used to send their employees to our medical center, they're controlling their costs. And we're left holding the bill for all the poor people we have to care for and all the middle class people with horrible problems that show up without insurance. And please give us universal coverage if you want the medical schools of America to continue to work. Read this.

All I have tried to do, folks, is to consult with everybody from Dr. Koop who was President Reagan's Surgeon General to the heads of our biggest medical schools to the heads of our biggest corporations that can't deal with their medical problems to the small businesses that want to buy insurance who can't to come up with something that works. I have no pride of authorship and no pride of details. I just want to do what will work for people like Jim Bryant and his wife and kids. And I think you do too. If we'll keep that attitude, we'll find a solution in the next 3 months to the problem of health care.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[*At this point, Gov. Carroll Campbell, Jr., of South Carolina opened the floor for questions. Gov. Terry Branstad of Iowa then noted that there was no consensus on employer mandates and asked if a consensus agreement could be reached on reform of the tax system, the medical malpractice system, and the insurance system.*]

The President. Let me—I'm glad you asked the question like you did because it gives me a chance to maybe be a little more direct in what I was trying to say before. If you look at the experience of the States, my answer to you is it depends upon whether in the aggregate, based on the evidence that we have and the best opinion of the medical experts, we increase coverage. And we're moving toward what I think we all want, which is a phased-in deliberate effort to get toward universal.

The evidence is, Governor, that if you do these insurance reforms and you don't do something that you know will increase coverage among working people, the impact of the insurance reforms will be to decrease coverage among working people. That is what happened in a number of States in the last 3 years.

We've got 5 million more Americans without insurance coverage now than we had in 1988, and we only have 1.3 million more people living in America. So the rest of them lost their cov-

erage. And most of them were living in States where insurance reforms occurred.

So I will say again, it depends on what else is in there. There may be some way other than an employer mandate to do this. I heard Governor Waihee say that this morning on television. There may be some other way to do this, but the real issue—the test ought to be the test you apply to yourselves. That's the only test I have. Will it do what we say it's going to do? We could pass a bill and all shout hallelujah and get by the November elections. But there will be real consequences to what happens here. And those consequences will be apparent in '95, '96, '97, '98, '99. The answer is, what will happen to the people.

I just think we have to be careful. We have evidence; we know now what happens. A lot of these insurance reforms very much need to be implemented. But if they're not implemented in the right way, they will simply raise the price of insurance for everybody else, causing more single individuals and more marginal small businesses to drop coverage, which will shrink the pool and increase the rates. And the cycle will continue.

I mean, it's almost unbelievable when you look at it that we've gone from 88 percent coverage, backsliding down to 83 percent as a nation. And I will say again, only five States have been able to show in the last 5 years an increase in coverage among the working uninsured. That's no offense to you; I applaud all of you. I tried to do it, too. I'm not criticizing anybody. I'm just saying at some point we have to look at what the evidence shows. And I don't think we should do something that will not work. But I would not rule out a health bill that didn't have an employer mandate if we knew we were moving toward full coverage and we had some evidence that it would work.

[*Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado advocated a phased-in expansion of the employer-based system for health care.*]

The President. Governor Romer, I'm very much in favor of a phase-in. I don't think anybody—you can't mess with something this big unless you do it over a period of years. And the message I got after meeting with a lot of you and with others and people in the Congress is we ought to lengthen the phase-in a little bit; we agreed to do that.

Let me just say one thing to go back to your question and the question Governor Branstad raised, is, there is some reason to believe that if we—and I'm not for unfunded mandates, but one of the things I think we have to do in this bill is, I think that enrollment in these alliances, purchasing alliances, these buying co-ops should be voluntary, but I think every State should have one. And they don't cost very much; California has only got 11 folks working in theirs, but I think we ought to pay the bill for it. I don't think we should have an unfunded mandate, but I think that every State ought to set some network up.

If you look at what's happened in Florida, for example, where—I wish Governor Chiles were here—they have very restrictive rules on who can get in. I believe you have to be in a business with 50 or fewer employees, and I believe you have to have been without insurance for a year, and they still have very heavy subscription.

In the State of California—I don't think Governor—is Governor Wilson here? In the State of California where they had 2,400 businesses enrolled, which is not an enormous number in a State as big as California, but it's not insignificant, they had 40,000 employees in the pool, and every single one of them got the same or better health insurance for lower premium costs.

So we know that there are certain economies of scale that can be achieved here. The question is, will they be offset by the insurance reforms if you don't also do something to increase the pool of the covered people. That's really what we've got to deal with. As you know, I basically agree with you. I know Governor Lowry—and they wrestled with this in Washington—essentially reached the same conclusion. There are lots of adjustments that can be made: You can make adjustments in the benefit package; you can make adjustments in what's the percentage that the employer and the employee should pay.

But the main thing we have to do is to keep increasing the coverage. If you keep sliding back, you're looking at a system now that's headed toward a financial disaster. And in the end, Government will wind up picking up a bigger and bigger share of the bill, which is just what we don't want to happen, I think.

[*Gov. E. Benjamin Nelson of Nebraska thanked the President for his bipartisan comments and*

requested the maximum amount of flexibility for States.]

The President. I am very open to that, Governor Nelson. For one thing, if you look at it, some States—we've got a couple of States besides Hawaii that are already at or above 90 percent, where they can imagine themselves reaching, through various mechanisms, 95 percent, 96 percent, 97 percent coverage.

As I said, I think we have moved in Social Security. We were at 97 percent Social Security for many years. I think we're just by improvements in bookkeeping, up to a little above 98 percent now. So we know we're not going to get right at 100 percent, but we know that you've got to get somewhere in the ballpark of 95 percent or upwards so you stop the cost shifting and you have economies of scale for all of the small businesses that are participating.

But there are differences. The economic realities and the demographic realities are so different from State to State, I think you're going to have to have some more flexibility. And I'm quite open on that, to doing some more on that.

[*Gov. Brereton Jones of Kentucky stressed the importance of achieving universal coverage at the Federal rather than the State level and questioned the strength of Senator Bob Dole's commitment to the concept.*]

The President. Let me just say—[*applause*]—thank you—the reason I proposed the shared responsibility requirement is the reason—there were two reasons. One is the one mentioned by Governor Romer. It was the natural outgrowth of what we had, and we knew that we could get studies that would show that it would actually lower average costs of small business. We also knew we could afford to subsidize the smallest businesses and the people that were on the lowest profit margins so they could make it. And we knew that if that happened on a national basis, nobody would be at a competitive disadvantage.

I know that these ads that this other health reform group has been running—I didn't even know about it until they were on the air—involving the fast food operations and not covering their workers in America and covering their workers in Japan and Germany have been somewhat controversial, but they make the point, which is that if all your competitors are in the same boat you're in, you don't go broke doing this. They make that point. And so, I did it for that reason.

The second reason I recommended it is that we had evidence. We had the evidence of Hawaii; we had the evidence of Germany which has a mixed system and which provides high-quality care at a lower cost even than the Canadian system. So, we had evidence. We had a system that could be expanded, and we had evidence. I have never ruled out another option. I just have never seen one I thought would work. And I do believe we have to keep working toward that.

And as I said, I keep saying there ought to be a middle ground here. And I always enjoy reminding Senator Packwood that he and President Nixon recommended the 50–50 employer-employee split in 1972, and I don't believe that the Republican Party has moved that far from its moorings in the last 22 years. So, I'm asking them to come home a little bit, and I still think we can do it.

Q. Mr. President, I didn't mean to ask a question, but I cannot let Governor Jones' statement go unanswered. That is not what Senator Dole said. Senator Dole came in, and he indicated a willingness to move. What he said was he didn't think we could get there all at once, and if we couldn't we shouldn't abandon the effort.

The President. I agree with that.

Q. He didn't want you to think he was against "all," and his statement was, "I'm not against coverage for all." He didn't think we could get there, but he didn't think we should abandon the effort if we didn't get 100 percent at once though. And I didn't think it's fair to him to have it depicted that way, and I wanted to correct that, sir.

The President. Let's look at the political context in which we're operating here, the context in the country and the context in the Congress real quickly. I know I have to quit, but you can help to change the context. If you're Democrat, you can help to change it; if you're Republican, you can help to change it if you want us to get together. Let's be fair now to everybody involved, including the leaders of the other party. Let's look at what everybody's up against.

When I put out my plan, the Health Insurance Association didn't like it because the alliances were mandatory, which meant that fewer insurance companies would get to compete for health insurance business, and because we had

premium caps on there, and they didn't want that. They thought it was too regulatory. So, they put Harry and Louise on television. And we didn't have the money to answer that. And so, after the time they've been on television, everybody else has done all their letter-writing campaign, and all that stuff had happened, they made something called the Clinton plan unpopular even though the basic elements still have the support of 60 percent or more of the American people when you strip it away. So, that happened.

Ironically, the Health Insurance Association favors the employer requirement. Who doesn't favor that? The NFIB is against it. They have a lot of insurance agents in their membership, and they have small business people who ideologically don't think they should be required to offer insurance. And the conservative wing of the Republican Party is against it. That's the context in which we meet and bring it to the Congress.

Now, what do we try to do to offset that? First of all, we made some changes in our plans, made it less bureaucratic, more flexible, more open, and responded to you. I explained that. Secondly, we put together a group of small business people, 29 different large groups with 600,000 small businesses to say, "We'd be better off if everybody had to pay and our costs would go down. Please do this."

In other words, what we're trying to do is to get back again to where we can have a debate that's not so politically charged. The problem you have, obviously, in the Congress now is—and the problem and the opportunity—is that under the rules of the United States Senate only the budget can be passed without a filibuster. No other bill can pass the Senate not subject to a filibuster. So that means that if 41 Senators decide that bill X shouldn't come to a vote, it can't come to a vote.

So that's why all the Democrats have been saying all along, we've got to have some sort of bipartisan support here. And again I will say, what I would like us to do is to come back to the principle that we must do what we know will work to provide security, to provide control of costs, to maintain choice and quality. And if we just will be guided by that, we will come up with a bill that the American people will be proud to have us sign without regard to their party.

We have been through a long period here of congressional debate and discussion and everything, and the political atmosphere has been charged and gone up and down. There's a lot of unreality out there. There's been a lot of reality around this table today. If we can bring that back to the Congress, we'll get a good bill, if everybody will just forget about all the rhetoric and do something that will work.

But we must not blind ourselves to what these medical school deans said. I mean there was 100 of them that came to see me. They know what they're doing. They know what works. And we have to do something that works. That's my only bottom line. Let's do not mislead the American people. If we're going to act, let's do something that will leave the people in New Mexico and Utah and Montana better off.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:18 a.m. at the Hynes Convention Center.

Exchange With Reporters on Health Care Reform in Boston
July 19, 1994

Q. Are you now willing to compromise on universal coverage more and on mandates, sir? We're really confused.

The President. Listen, I've always had the olive branch out. I am not willing to do something that doesn't work. Did you all listen to what I said? I said that of the States that have done these modest reforms, only 10 have increased the number of people with insurance. We are losing ground. We must not do something that is a fraud.

I have never said that we had to have the employer mandate, although I think that's the best and fairest way. I do think we have to keep going towards universal coverage. That's what I think we have to do.

Q. But you would accept something less than 100 percent?

The President. Social Security doesn't have 100 percent.

Q. That's the first time we've heard you say that.

The President. Social Security—you cannot physically get 100 percent. There's no way to get 100 percent. Social Security only has 98, and they've just moved from 97 a couple years ago. But I think you have to have a universal coverage goal because if you don't have the idea of trying to essentially have functionally full coverage—whatever that is, it's a very high percentage—then the rest of these reforms will not work.

So my olive branch came because he said he was willing to work every day in August, every day in September, and every day in October, and I liked that.

Q. Maybe he's talking about a filibuster——

The President. All I'm asking you tonight is report this on the merits. Talk about what the doctors said. Talk about what the people said. These doctors, a lot of these doctors might be Republicans that signed this ad in the Boston Globe today. They said what will work is universal coverage. That is the almost universal opinion of knowledgeable physicians. The people who know what will control costs and provide security to middle class America know that unless you cover virtually everybody, you're not going to get that done.

And let's talk about the merits. Let's not turn this into a political story, let's talk about what will work in middle America.

Q. How about a 50–50 split?

The President. I'm open to changes in the split. I'm open to a lot of things. I just want to cover the American people. I've always been open to that from the first day. The only thing I want to do is get everybody covered, deal with the cost, preserve choice.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—fully cover less than 100 percent?

The President. You cannot physically cover 100 percent. It's impossible. Nobody can do that. We don't cover 100 percent of the people in Social Security, and it's universal. Social Security is universal. I want a universal program, but we can't physically get to 100 percent.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 12:30 p.m. at the Hynes Convention Center. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Fifth Anniversary of the Arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi

July 19, 1994

July 20 marks the 5th anniversary of the detention of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the democratic opposition in Burma and a symbol of human rights and democracy worldwide.

The remarkable resurgence of democracy in so many parts of the world in recent years demonstrates that authentic voices of freedom cannot be stilled and ultimately will triumph. Aung San Suu Kyi reflects the fundamental yearning of the Burmese people for freedom and justice. She honors the memory of her father Aung San, the founder of modern Burma, and continues to embody the hopes of the people of Burma for an end to the military dictatorship and the reestablishment of popular, representative government.

I urge the Burmese military regime to heed the will of its own people by releasing unconditionally Aung San Suu Kyi and all other remaining prisoners of conscience in Burma. I also call on the regime to honor the results of the 1990 election and to undertake genuine democratic reform. To this end, the regime should begin a substantive dialog with Aung San Suu Kyi aimed at achieving a political settlement that respects the sentiments of the people of Burma.

This issue remains a priority for my administration. For this reason, we welcome any efforts by the international community and by Burma's neighbors to encourage genuine reforms. The United States also looks forward to discussing these vital issues later this month during the ASEAN Post-Ministerial Conference in Bang-

kok, where we will seek an intensified effort to gain the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners and to promote genuine democratic reform.

Statement on Senate Action on Supreme Court Nominee Stephen Breyer
July 19, 1994

I am deeply gratified by the Senate Judiciary Committee's unanimous vote to forward Stephen Breyer's nomination to the full Senate for confirmation to the Supreme Court. Chairman Biden and Senator Hatch deserve enormous credit for their bipartisan spirit and responsible approach to this nomination.

The Judiciary Committee has now given unanimous, bipartisan support to two consecutive Supreme Court nominees. I hope this is a sign not only of the quality of those two selections but also of a return of civility to the confirmation process.

I am confident that the full Senate will act swiftly to confirm Judge Breyer. I believe he will be an intellectual leader on a Court that respects the Constitution. His brilliant mind and balanced approach will make him a superb Supreme Court justice.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Texas Senatorial Candidate Richard Fisher
July 19, 1994

Thank you very much, Richard, and you and Nancy and your wonderful children. It's a great honor for me to be here tonight even to take a little ribbing by Bob Strauss about how I look in my running shorts. [*Laughter*] Henry looks better in his running shorts. I saw Henry in his running shorts yesterday morning in Miami, and I thought he looked better, too. But I wouldn't have said it in public if Bob hadn't. [*Laughter*] I hope Henry's enjoyed his brief tenure as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. [*Laughter*] Akin Gump is going to hire him for about a half million a year starting tomorrow, Bob Strauss' penance. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Secretary Cisneros for the brilliant job he has done, literally. I mean it's unbelievable what's happened to HUD since he took over, how he's turned it around and made it an instrument of progress: everything from standing up for civil rights of people, the standing up for the civil right of people who live in public housing to be free of crime, what they're doing in Chicago and throughout the country is unbelievable; and now working not only to try to help homeless people get off the street but help them get into the mainstream of life which is, after all, the ultimate answer to the problem of homelessness.

I want to thank Senator Graham, my longtime friend, a former seatmate in the Governors' Association, for his sterling leadership of the Senate Campaign Committee.

And what can I say about Secretary Bentsen—that he hasn't already said? [*Laughter*] I'll tell you one thing, I like to make fun of him because he talks in such a frank way to his President when I need to be frankly spoken to, which is about every other day, you know. [*Laughter*] But in the annals of this century when the history is written, I think that he will be literally remembered as one of the greatest Secretaries of the Treasury we ever had and as someone who dealt with a very rapidly changing world with all kinds of new challenges and had a major responsibility in helping this country adjust its economy to the global economy. He has been absolutely spectacular. I had high aspirations for Lloyd Bentsen's tenure, but he exceeded them in every way, and I am very grateful to him for that.

Let me tell you about Richard Fisher and one reason I'm here tonight, besides the fact

that I want him to be elected real bad—[*laughter*]—is that we met a few years ago when he and I were involved in the Democratic Leadership Council which might be subtitled, Don't Lose Control of the Senate This Year, DLC. But we both got in it because we were worried that the Democratic Party was becoming less relevant to the future of America and becoming alienated from the mainstream of America, but we knew what the Republicans were selling was not going to do much for America over the long run.

And one of the real challenges that I think we've had, particularly in Texas, is to get the voters of the State of Texas to listen not only to the rhetoric but to compare the rhetoric politicians use to the reality of their actions. And I think that Richard Fisher is better positioned to do that than any public figure since Lloyd Bentsen in the State of Texas, and I think he's going to do it.

I appreciate what he said about our administration tonight and the fact that he has embraced the Democratic Party but also been willing to challenge it to change, to take unconventional positions to move toward the future, to grow the economy and keep the American dream alive.

And I'll tell you, there are some very specific reasons that I think he ought to be elected. First of all, I'd like to be in a position to do more for Texas. We passed NAFTA here, and it was deader than a doornail until we got the environmental agreements, the labor agreements, and it came back from the dead. And we did it because of farsighted business people and others up here working. And then San Antonio and other cities in Texas, Dallas, and El Paso, have benefited from things we've done as a result of NAFTA. But most importantly, our trade is growing faster with Mexico than any other country in the world. We've sold 5 times as many cars in Mexico already this year as we did last year, and that's just the beginning. It was the right thing to do. But we need a bipartisan group of people who will work for the best interest of the country.

The second thing I want to say is we just saved the space station. We saved the space station, which was very important to Texas, which passed by one vote in the House last year. We changed 52 Democrats and 11 Republicans in one year. And we did it by tying the space station to America's future, to our cooperation in space with the Russians, and to what we need to do together to build a future. But it is difficult to do—to work when people come up to me all the time and say, "Why are you trying to help Texas? Listen to the way those Senators talk about you. Look how they vote." And, "What difference will it make in the next election? We need the money to spend on education or training or something else." And I tell everybody I'm not trying to help Texas, I'm trying to help America.

I tried to save the super collider last year. And these House Members will tell you that on the day, at the moment the House of Representatives was voting on the super collider and the opponents were saying it was a boondoggle for Texas, the Senators from Texas were on the steps of the Capitol with other citizens of the State screaming at the Congress to cut more spending. And so they did. Isn't that right? At the very moment—their timing was exquisite. And yet I gave them a chance to vote for the biggest deficit reduction package in history, and they both voted no. And they said, "Why, this will bring the economy of America to an end. It'll be terrible for Texas."

But by the narrowest of margins, Congress voted for $255 billion in spending cuts; tax cuts for 15 million working American families; a tax increase for only 1.5 percent of us, including a lot of us in this room—[*laughter*]—that went to pay down the deficit; a tax break for 90 percent of the small businesses in this country; lower interest rates on college loans for 20 million American students; and a bill that will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President; a bill that reduces the size of the Federal bureaucracy, that the Republicans always scream about, by 250,000, and by 1999, we'll have the smallest Federal Government that we've had since John Kennedy was President—the first time it's gone below 2 million—100 percent from votes of Democrats.

And what was the result: 3.8 million new jobs; a 1.7 percent in the unemployment rate; the largest number of new business incorporations last year of any year since the end of World War II; and the first quarter of this year, the first quarter in 16 years there was no bank failure. I plead guilty for fighting for that. It was good for Texas, and I'd like to have some help from people who believed in it.

Now, I'm telling you I have pleaded for bipartisan cooperation in a lot of ways, but they want to go out and use that old tax and spend rhetoric. You just check your hip pocket, folks. It is time. America has got to lead the world into the 21st century. We have difficult challenges ahead. We've got a crime bill to pass here. We've got welfare reform to pass here. We have to come to grips with health care.

I just got back from a trip to Europe in which I had three large meetings with American service families, enthusiastic Americans serving our country overseas, willing to put their lives on the line for you. And do you know in all three meetings, those people only asked me about one issue, health care. They're afraid they're going to be sent home after serving our country abroad to a country in which they won't have health insurance for their children. They know we spend more on health care than anybody else in the world. We're the only country in the world that can't figure out what to do about it.

Now, Hawaii figured out what to do about it. They adopted the solution Secretary Bentsen's always advocating: let employers and employees split the burden, buy private insurance, cover everybody. In Hawaii insurance costs small business 30 percent less than it does in the rest of the country; everybody's covered; and people are healthier. We've got to do something about this, folks.

I went to the Governors' conference today and the Republican leader of the Senate was there, and he said he was willing to work all through August, which I took as a significant olive branch, and all through September and all through October. And I am too, all day and all night long. But if we don't do something about this, what's going to happen to the Federal Government is we'll cut defense too much, we won't be able to invest what we ought in our children's future and our education and training and building the economy tomorrow. And being in the Senate and House is going to be a matter of writing checks for health care because that's the only thing that's going up. Everything else is going down—and not to buy new health care but just more for the same. We can't do it.

There may be other ideas than mine, but I'll tell you one thing: I hired on to solve problems. And I showed up for Richard Fisher tonight not because he will agree with me on every issue, he will disagree from time to time. He will vote for the people of Texas, not for me. But he will hire on to solve problems. He does not want to come up here and warm the seat or have empty rhetoric or just spout empty rhetoric. Public service should be about ideas and ideals and vision and what's good for ordinary people. That's how this country lasted 218 years.

And I believe he's got a chance to win that is better than average. And more importantly, I think he has that chance because he is right for the people of Texas, and that will be good for the United States of America. And I thank you for helping him.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:45 p.m. in the Chinese Room at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Strauss, former chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters on Health Care Reform
July 20, 1994

The President. Let me begin by thanking the Democratic leadership for coming today and saying we have a very active several weeks ahead of us in this session of Congress with action pending on health care, on the crime bill, on GATT, with bills pending on campaign finance reform and lobby reform and several other things. We're going to have a lot or work on our hands.

I would like to restate a few things about health care in light of the meeting with the Governors yesterday. First of all, my goal is universal coverage. It is the only goal that works for ordinary Americans. I have always said, from the time I presented my bill, that I was flexible

on how to get universal coverage and would be willing to compromise on that. I was encouraged that the Senate Minority Leader said yesterday that he was willing to work every day in August, September, and October if necessary to get a good health care bill.

But let me make the main point I was trying to make yesterday. Whatever we do must work for ordinary Americans. We now have a lot of evidence that if we tinker around with the system and don't try to do something comprehensive, we could actually make it worse for ordinary Americans. We could increase the cost to middle class Americans and decrease coverage.

I am very encouraged that today the American Medical Association and the AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, joined the AFL–CIO in coming out for universal coverage and shared responsibility between the employers and the employees. That's a very good sign that they have analyzed this in the same way that we have. And I hope it will contribute to the debate. I believe it will. They joined, as you know, the heads of virtually every medical school in America, the Nurses Association and other doctors' associations, thousands of small business people.

So, we have to do something that works. That's going to be my bottom line. Let's don't do something that won't work.

Q. Mr. President, the confusion seems to be over how you define universal coverage.

The President. I don't think that's right. The only definitional issues that arose in the Congress were definitional issues that some people around this table were involved in on the so-called trigger mechanism, what level of coverage that you're making progress for universal coverage would trigger further action and what wouldn't. That's something that will be up to the congressional people to work out.

The point I was trying to make yesterday is that we have no way of knowing, we have no evidence that there is any available and affordable way to get close to 100 percent of coverage without some sort of requirement that involves everybody paying. That's the point I was attempting to make yesterday, but I'm willing to listen if somebody's got another idea that will work. We mustn't do something that doesn't work.

We have this Catholic Health Association study which shows conclusively that if you just try to do insurance reforms you could wind up with higher rates for middle class people at lower levels of coverage. That is the essence. But let's do something that works for ordinary Americans.

Q. But 95 percent would still leave millions of Americans uninsured, and don't you have the same problem then, if they are uninsured, that there will be the cost shifting that you——

The President. No one ever talked about a law. There's never been a suggestion that we have a law which would set that as a goal. That number only came up in the context of the so-called trigger bill. Nobody did that. And no one has yet found a way to do that without a law that says "universal coverage." The point I made yesterday is we have universal social security, but about 2 percent somehow don't get covered. We have universal school attendance laws in every State in the country, but there are always a couple of percent of the people that fall through the cracks. [*Inaudible*]—write it into law to get this.

Q. Are you sorry——

The President. No. I'm sorry that after all my skills and efforts at communicating, the point I really made yesterday somehow didn't get through, which is that we now have the evidence of the States and another study which shows that the opposing bills, the alternative bills, will not work. That is the issue. We must do something that works.

Q. Are you considering working through August, September, October?

The Vice President. Why are you interested, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]? [*Laughter*]

The President. Let me just say this. I'm sure—Senator Dole offered that yesterday, and I would gladly accept. Of course, I'm sure it's not just up to him and to me. But I think it's worth it for the American people to get a good health bill.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:20 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House, prior to a meeting with congressional leaders. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President-Elect Ernesto Perez Balladares of Panama and an Exchange With Reporters

July 20, 1994

President Clinton. First, I'd like to welcome the President-elect of Panama and congratulate Mr. Perez Balladares on his election and on the successful democratic transition in Panama. I also want to thank him for his interest in the Summit of the Americas and his interest in exercising a leadership role in helping us to work on money laundering, drug trafficking, and a lot of the international criminal problems that we face together. And finally I'd like to thank him for his willingness to help us to establish some safe havens for people who are leaving Haiti. All these things, I think, augur well for his strong leadership not only within Panama but throughout the hemisphere, and I'm looking forward to this meeting.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Richardson is saying that General Cedras is not intransigent, that he's realistic, indeed, that he wants to talk; whereas William Gray is saying time for talking is over, there's nothing to talk about except "When are you going to leave?" Who do you agree with, if either of them? And should the U.S. be talking to Cedras?

President Clinton. You have to ask Mr. Gray about that. But the issue is, if he wants to talk about when he's going to leave, then I'm sure that somebody would talk to him. But they have usurped power. They agreed to go in the Governors Island Agreement, Mr. Cedras and the others; they have not gone, and they must go. That's our position.

Q. Is Panama now offering safe havens for Haitian refugees?

President-elect Perez Balladares. Well, as you know, in a democracy there is only one President at a time. We're willing to cooperate because we think it's a hemispheric duty to bring about democracy in Haiti and also because we think it's humanitarian. Therefore yes, we would be inclined after September 1st, when I start my term, to work some agreement together to bring these two objectives into fruition.

Q. What about the October deadline that Mr. Gray was talking about? Mr. Gray seemed to be indicating that there was a deadline. Is there a——

President Clinton. We don't have a specific deadline. What he said was that he expected that democracy would be returned to Haiti before the end of the year but that our policy has no specific deadline.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Panama

President Clinton. Let me say to all of you, I want to welcome the President-elect of Panama here and congratulate Mr. Perez Balladares on his election victory and on the successful transition to democracy and to express my appreciation for his interest in exercising a leadership role at the Summit of the Americas, which will be held at the end of this year in Miami, and particularly his interest in the whole question of doing more in a cooperative way on the problems of money laundering and drug trafficking. I think that there are many things we can do together. I am very encouraged about the possibility of a genuine partnership, and I'm looking forward to our first meeting.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, the situation in Panama, people are concerned about the Haiti situation, which Panama later on may be getting involved in that. What is the position of the Government in terms of that?

President Clinton. Well, we are, as you know, determined to see that the people who have illegally taken power in Haiti leave there. They agreed to leave last year. They broke their agreement, and we are pushing forward at the United Nations and in consultation with our allies and the friends of democracy throughout the Caribbean and Central America and South America to further that goal. And we'll do what we can to keep pushing it. We have strong sanctions in effect now, and we're going forward.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:09 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to William H. Gray III, Special Ad-

viser on Haiti, and Raoul Cédras, leader of the Haitian military. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the 25th Anniversary of the *Apollo 11* Moon Landing
July 20, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, veterans of the Apollo program, the friends of the space program in America, and most of all, to those whom we honor here today.

Just a day before he died, President Kennedy compared our space program to a boy who comes upon a wall in an orchard. The wall is tall. It looks insurmountable, but the boy is curious about what lies on the other side. So he throws his cap over the wall, and then he has no choice but to go after it.

Twenty-five years ago today, our Nation, represented by these three brave men, made that climb. And so, today we are gathered to celebrate their voyage and, I honestly hope, to recommit ourselves to their spirit of discovery. *Apollo 11*, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins were our guides for the wondrous, the unimaginable at that time, the true handiwork of God. They realized the dreams of a nation. They fulfilled an American destiny. They taught us that nothing is impossible if we set our sights high enough.

Today we're honored to have them and all the other Apollo astronauts who are here with us. For every American who followed your journey, especially for those of us who were young on that fateful day 25 years ago, and for the young Americans who still dream dreams of a future in space, we thank you all.

Looking back on that mission, one thing is clear that we ought to remember today. It wasn't easy. The ship to the heavens measured just 13 feet in diameter. The destination was 3 days and a world away. On the third day as the tiny module descended to the Moon, it came dangerously close to a crash landing—that happens around here all the time—[*laughter*]—but Neil Armstrong took over the controls from the computer and landed safely. Man had not been rendered obsolete by the mechanical, and that hasn't happened yet. Not long after that when he stepped on the Moon, Mr. Armstrong marked the outer limit of the human experiment with those simple words, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

These men and the other astronauts who came before and after have helped us to step into another world right here on Earth. They've shown us that we can harness the technology of space in areas from the economy to the environment, to education, to information and technology. The products and knowledge that grew out of our space missions has changed our way of life forever and for the better. And in our quest we have relearned a sense of confidence that has always been an essential ingredient of our American dream. Today, that journey continues. Our commitment to the space program is strong and unwavering. The best way to honor these men and all the others who have helped it so much is to continue that quest.

Many have risked their lives and some have given their lives so that we could go forward. Today I ask that we remember, especially, the crews of *Apollo 1* and the *Challenger*. On this day of celebration we must never forget the deep debt we owe to those brave Americans. And our thoughts should also be with their families and their loved ones, for the sacrifice they have given helped to bring us all to new horizons.

Our space explorations today are important models for cooperation in the new post-cold-war world. The Vice President described that eloquently a moment ago. Sergei's mission was an important first step toward full Russian partnership in what must be our next great mission, the international space station. This permanent orbiting space laboratory, to be built with help from 14 nations, will hasten discoveries in fields from the environment to medicine, to computers. We should also remember that the space station holds great promise for us here at home,

as it strengthens our largest export sector, aerospace technology.

All these reasons explain why the House has fully funded already the space station. I want to thank many people who are responsible for that bipartisan victory, but let me mention especially George Brown, Lou Stokes, Bob Walker, and Jerry Lewis. I know the Vice President and Dan Goldin and a lot of other people burned up the phone lines before the House vote.

Let me say that we've fought a lot of battles for the future around here in the last 18 months, and sometimes it seems that the most important ones are decided by the narrowest of margins. The economic plan passed by a vote. The assault weapons ban passed by two votes. Last year the space station survived by the vote of a single Member of the House of Representatives who changed his mind on the way down the aisle. But this year, thanks to the common endeavors of all of us and thanks to the promise of cooperation with Russia and with other nations, the House of Representatives voted to fund the space station by 122 votes, a bipartisan commitment to America's future.

I thank the Members of the Senate who are here today who are pushing for passage. I know they won't miss this great opportunity which is coming on them very soon. I thank you, Senator Mikulski, and all the other Members of the Senate who are here, for the work that will be done in the Senate.

As we work toward building a better world, we also have to preserve the one we've got here. William Anders of the *Apollo 8* was the first to see the entire Earth at a glance. He said it looked like a fragile "little Christmas tree ornament against an infinite backdrop of space, the only color in the whole universe we could see. It seemed so very finite." Well, because we are so very finite, our responsibility to our planet must not be limited. That's why NASA's Mission to Planet Earth is also a very important part of our future in space. We have to continue to monitor the global environment from space and to act on what we learn.

Above all, let us never forget that all this work is about renewing our hopes and the hopes of generations to come, about the ability of Americans and the ability of human beings everywhere to conquer the seemingly impossible. I don't think anybody can look at the faces of these young people here with us today, and we ought to take a little while and look at them and welcome them here, without seeing again in their eyes dreams that those of us who are older could not have dreamed. The explorations we continue in space are clear evidence to them that they will grow up in exciting times without limits; times that demand their imagination, their vision, their courage; times that will reward them, too, for believing in themselves and their possibilities.

One of our Young Astronauts, 13-year-old Wayne Gusman from New Orleans, sees a future where being an astronaut will be like, and I quote, "driving a car; everyone will do it." That's a great dream. But that and our other dreams are clearly the natural extensions of the space program which began a generation ago, the direct descendants of the dreams of the three men we are here to honor today. We can get there.

No one who was alive then will ever forget where they were as Michael Collins traveled his solitary vigil around the Moon and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed that tiny craft on the surface. The world was captivated not only by the risk and the daring, although they were risking and daring, they were captivated because the landing meant again that the human experiment in conquering new and uncharted worlds was reborn. In that sense it was not an end but a beginning.

So to you gentlemen, we say: For your valor, your courage, your pioneering spirit, and for being here today to remind us again that all things are possible, we are deeply in your debt.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sergei Krikalev, Russian cosmonaut who flew aboard the space shuttle *Discovery* in February.

Remarks to the American Legion Girls Nation
July 21, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to welcome the delegates from Girls Nation and all the staff here. I would like to begin by congratulating Molly Spearman on being named the National Girls Nation director this year. She is a State representative from South Carolina, I understand, so that's a very good thing to do. [*Laughter*] I would also like to congratulate the president and vice president of Girls Nation, Laura Fernandez and Amanda Plumb.

Thirty-one years ago I came to the White House for the first time as a delegate to Boys Nation. It was part of a memorable week I will never forget. We met President Kennedy here. We got to see a number of members of the Cabinet. There was an eager anticipation in 1963 of the Presidential election that most people assumed would occur in the next year. And I think it's fair to say that most of us who went home from that experience were inspired in one way or another to pursue a career in public service, more than they ever had been before. And I have seen that happen year in and year out to young boys and young girls who come through the American Legion Boys State and Girls State programs to Girls Nation and to Boys Nation.

The Secretary of State of Wyoming, Kathy Karpan, now a candidate for Governor out there, is an alumni of this program. There will be more and more opportunities in national politics for young women in the years ahead. We now have seven women in the President's Cabinet, more than twice as many women as have ever served in the Cabinet of a President at one time, and have appointed a record number of women Federal judges and other women to important positions. By the time you're old enough to be standing here there will probably be a woman standing up here as President saying, "Well, I've done a pretty good job appointing men to my Cabinet. [*Laughter*] I'm up to five and looking for some more qualified people to serve."

But as you go through life, whatever you do, I hope you'll always be involved in public service. And always remember that as an American citizen in the world's oldest and most successful continuous democracy, there's always an obligation to be involved in fighting for the future. And the only way to preserve the greatest traditions and values of this country is to make sure that we get to that future.

I have done my best here to make this bewildering time of change seem more friendly to the American people and, at the same time, to help us together to rebuild many of our traditional institutions that are under fire today, our families, our communities, the very institution of work which is at the heart of the American dream.

Our economic plan has succeeded in reducing the deficit by more than at any time in history. Within 5 years we'll have a Federal Government that will be below 2 million for the first time since John Kennedy was President and I came here, the smallest Federal establishment in over 30 years. And when the Congress passes this year's budget, the two together will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States almost 50 years ago.

The Congress is about to pass a major crime bill that will put another 100,000 police officers on our streets, ban assault weapons, protect hunting weapons, make it illegal for minors to own handguns or to possess them except in the presence of a qualified supervising adult, provide billions of dollars for programs for young people to stay out of trouble as well as tougher punishment once they get in trouble.

We are looking at a welfare reform program that will literally change the institution of welfare as we know it and support parenting, strengthen the family, and strengthen work. And of course, our most highly publicized struggle today is to try to figure out how to join the ranks of all other advanced nations and finally provide health security to all of our families. Only the United States of all the advanced economies of the world has failed to do that. Now one in six Americans has no health insurance, and the majority of the American people are at risk of losing it at one time or another in their lives.

But the main point I want to make to you who are delegates here is that, as important as all these things are, public service here in

Washington is only one way to serve your country. And the things that people do back home every day in the aggregate are still more important. A lot of what we're doing here is designed to empower people in all of your communities and States to do more for themselves. We're about to name communities that are part of a 700-community contest in America to get empowerment zones for their poor areas, so that private enterprise can go in and offer people a chance to get jobs and have a better future. This crime bill, the most important thing is it will add 20 percent to the size of local police forces in America, so they can prevent crime as well as catch criminals. And I could go on and on and on. The things that happen at the grassroots level are the most important.

So I would like to close by just saying I hope you will remember, as I know all of you have, that what you are doing now is a form of public service. What the staff does in supporting this program is a form of public service. And I think over the long run perhaps the most important initiative that our administration has succeeded in putting through is the national service program, which gives thousands of young people a chance to earn money against their further education by simply serving their communities at the grassroots level.

This summer we'll have 7,000 young Americans in our Summer of Safety working on crime-related issues. This fall we'll have 20,000 young Americans working in communities all over America solving problems and earning credit against their college education. Year after next, if the Congress will keep supporting me, we'll have 100,000 young Americans working to make America a better place at the grassroots level. And all those young Americans together can do more to bring our country together and move our country forward than many people who serve in elected public office.

Let me just say one last point. One of the lessons of this time is that there is no longer an easy dividing line between what we do here at home and what happens around the world, between domestic and foreign policy. In the last year we've had more expansion of trade opportunities than at any previous time period like this in a generation because we know we can't grow our economy at home unless we can grow abroad.

We also are affected by the human rights and political and humanitarian events around the world. And I know all of you have been very moved by the terrible travesty of over one million refugees teeming out of Rwanda, being packed into a very small area. I want to say just a word about that because we have some Americans who are there with other citizens of the world trying to serve and trying to make a difference.

Just before I came over here today, I had a briefing from the Administrator of our Agency for International Development, our AID program, Brian Atwood. We have already provided over $120 million to help the refugees, and we are conducting airlifts there as well, flying in needed supplies. But we are very concerned about the new health care problems that are presented by all the refugees that are there. There are a growing number that are dying of cholera and many, many more who are at risk of that. So we are going to participate, indeed, in trying to lead the United Nations in responding to the cholera problem and in dealing with the other aspects of this human catastrophe. And I have asked the National Security Adviser and Mr. Atwood and the Pentagon to implement quickly a practical plan of action that can make a difference on the ground in these camps in Zaire. And I will be talking more about it in greater detail tomorrow, but I did want to say something about it because that's an important part of what it means to be an American as we move toward the 21st century as well.

Let me just say one thing in closing. There is a lot of speculation today about what the character and attitude of young Americans are. There was a cover of one of our major news magazines not very long ago showing a lot of young people and speculating about this so-called Generation X, the people who are just a little older than you, in their twenties. Well, I've got some of those Generation X folks who work here, who have worked here, and I spend a lot of time with young people. And I do not find the cynicism, the pessimism that I keep reading about.

What I find are young people who believe in this country, who believe in themselves, and who believe in the future. And I guess what I would say is, after more than 30 years, since the time I was here and the time you're here, if you ask me to summarize what I have learned, it might be an embarrassing short list. But I can say this: You cannot build a future unless you believe in it and unless you believe in your-

selves. And if you do believe in yourselves and you believe in this country and you believe in your future, you can do anything you wish to do. And I wish you well in doing it.

Thank you very much, and I'd like to ask Molly to come up now. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Statement on the National Security Strategy Report
July 21, 1994

Today I signed and forwarded to Congress the National Security Strategy Report for 1994, as required by Section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1986. The report outlines the national security strategy of engagement and enlargement my administration has developed to meet the challenges and opportunities of the new era.

Protecting our Nation's security—our people, our territory, and our way of life—is my administration's foremost mission and constitutional duty. The central security challenge of the past half century, the threat of communist expansion, is gone. The dangers we face today are more diverse. At the same time, we have unparalleled opportunities to make our Nation safer and more prosperous. Never has American leadership been more essential.

The new national security strategy elaborated in this report charts a course for American leadership that has already begun to produce tangible results with respect to our security requirements, as shown on the attached fact sheet. Our foreign policy rests on 3 pillars:

—*Security*. Our security depends upon our willingness to play a leadership role in world affairs, but we cannot sustain our leadership role without maintaining a defense capability strong enough to underwrite our commitments credibly.

—*Economics*. For America to be strong abroad it must be strong economically at home; at the same time, domestic economic renewal depends on the growth and integration of the global economy.

—*Democracy*. The best way to advance America's interests worldwide is to enlarge the community of democracies and free markets throughout the world.

These goals are mutually supportive. Democratic states are less likely to threaten our interests and more likely to cooperate with us to meet security threats and promote sustainable development. Secure nations are more likely to maintain democratic structures and to support free trade. And even with the cold war over, our Nation's security depends upon the maintenance of military forces that are sufficient to deter diverse threats and, when necessary, fight and win against our adversaries. While many factors ultimately contribute to our Nation's safety and well-being, no single component is more important than the men and women who bear America's uniform and stand sentry over our security.

Our national security requires the patient application of American will and resources. We can only sustain that necessary investment with the broad, bipartisan support of the American people and their representatives in Congress. The cold war may be over, but the need for American leadership abroad remains as strong as ever. I am committed to building a new public consensus to sustain our active engagement abroad. This document is part of that commitment.

NOTE: The report and a fact sheet on the national security strategy were attached to the statement.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the National Security Strategy Report
July 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, I am transmitting a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 21, 1994.

Message to the Congress on Trade With Bulgaria
July 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On June 3, 1993, I determined and reported to the Congress that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This determination allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status and certain United States Government financial programs for Bulgaria without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Bulgaria. You will find that the report indicates continued Bulgarian compliance with U.S. and international standards in areas of emigration and human rights policy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 21, 1994.

Remarks Announcing Assistance to Rwandan Refugees and an Exchange With Reporters
July 22, 1994

The President. Good morning. I have just met with my national security team, and I want to tell you about the new steps I have ordered to respond to the situation in the border regions near Rwanda.

The flow of refugees across Rwanda's borders has now created what could be the world's worst humanitarian crisis in a generation. It is a disaster born of brutal violence, and according to experts now on site, it is now claiming one life every minute.

Today I am announcing an immediate and massive increase in our response. These efforts will be directed from the White House through my National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, working with Deputy Secretary of Defense Deutch, AID Administrator Atwood, and General Shalikashvili, and Brigadier General John Nix of our European Command will command a joint task force to head our efforts on the ground.

From the beginning of this tragedy, the United States has been in the forefront of the international community's response. As the crisis has gotten worse, our response has also grown.

In May, when the first wave of Rwandan refugees fled to Tanzania, I ordered the release of $15 million in aid. These monies helped to prevent the kind of problems in Tanzania we are now seeing in Zaire. Since that time, we

have authorized an additional $135 million in relief in the area. Beginning in May, I ordered an airlift of relief supplies. Since then, we have flown over 100 missions.

On May 10th, the Vice President met with the United Nations Secretary-General and the head of the Organization of African Unity in an effort to expand the U.N. peacekeeping force in Rwanda. The following week, the Security Council approved a resolution authorizing that expansion. Then I ordered the Department of Defense to provide equipment, including 50 armored personnel carriers to aid the peacekeepers.

Throughout June and July, I ordered increases in our relief efforts as the crisis escalated. I sent senior administration officials to the region, including Brian Atwood, the Administrator of AID.

Today I have ordered an immediate massive increase in our efforts in the region in support of an appeal from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. I've ordered the Defense Department to establish and manage an airlift hub in Uganda, which will be used as a staging area for around-the-clock operations for shipments of relief supplies to the refugees in the Rwandan border regions. Consultations are underway now with the Government of Uganda.

I have directed the Defense Department to assist in expanding airlift operations near the refugee camps in Goma and Bukavu. We will provide personnel and equipment to enable these airfields to operate on a 24-hour basis. I've ordered our military to increase the capacity to receive, transfer, and distribute goods at these airfields. Our aim is to move food, medicine, and other supplies to those in need as quickly as possible.

I've directed the Pentagon to establish a safe water supply and to distribute as much water as possible to those at risk. Safe water is essential to stop the outbreak of cholera and other diseases that threaten the refugees.

Today and tomorrow, about 20 million oral rehydration therapy packages will be delivered, packages that were purchased through AID and delivered on U.S. military aircraft to the refugees in order to try to stem the cholera outbreak.

Our task in Rwanda is twofold: First, to alleviate the suffering as quickly as possible; second, to take steps to establish conditions that will enable the refugees to return home. To achieve the second objective, I have ordered the State Department and our Ambassador to the United Nations, who is here with us today, to take immediate action to help create those conditions. The United States will support and urge the immediate deployment of a full contingent of United Nations peacekeepers to Rwanda to provide security for the return of the refugees.

We are making clear to the new leaders of Rwanda that international acceptance, including American recognition, depends upon the establishment of a broad-based government, the rule of law, and efforts at national reconciliation. We're taking action to counteract the propaganda of the extremist Hutu elements who continue to urge Rwandans to flee. Taken together, these steps will help to relieve the suffering of the Rwandan refugees and create conditions for their return home.

As I said yesterday, we face here a growing human catastrophe. The United States not only supports the efforts of the international community, but is and will continue to take a leading role in those efforts. In the days to come as Americans see this heartbreaking unfolding tragedy, the suffering must not only touch our hearts, it must move Americans all across our Nation to reach out with their own private contribution to relief organizations. And it must move us as a Nation to take the practical actions that this crisis demands.

Refugee Assistance

Q. Mr. President, how much will all of this cost? And how many U.S. troops will be engaged in this operation?

The President. Well, I'd like to leave the details on that question to those who will brief you. It will be in excess of $100 million. We'll have modest commitments of American manpower, but enough to do the job.

Health Care Reform

Q. The leadership came here last night and told you that your health care plan for all intents and purposes is dead and that they are going to start over with something very different from what you had proposed. How do you feel about that? Are you willing to accept this turn of events?

The President. First of all, I want to tell you—I had a prediction last night. I said to the leadership—they said, "What should we say?" I said,

"Well, I have been saying for 4 weeks we have agreed to dramatically change this plan. We're going to string it out. We have to have a longer phase-in. We have to have less bureaucracy. We have to have totally voluntary small business alliances, and we have to give a bigger break to small businesses to get them to buy into it. I'll bet if you go out there and say it, it will be treated as news." And that is exactly what happened. That is exactly what I said to the Governors. That is exactly what I've been saying for the last 3 or 4 weeks.

And I'm glad that it finally is going out to the American people. We listened to the American people, all of us did. So we said—when I sent my plan to the Congress, I implored the Congress to go out and offer suggestions for changing it, for improving it, for making it better. I did that from day one. I am still waiting for someone else to produce a bill who believes there's another way to achieve universal coverage.

I thought it was a very good meeting because the leaders reaffirmed their belief that our objectives should stay the same: universal coverage, so that we can provide security to those who have health insurance and cover those who don't. Now, one-sixth of our people—remember, America is going in the wrong direction. Only the United States is reducing the number of people with health coverage every year. Secondly——

Q. But are you going to accept anything——

The President. Secondly, our goals are the same. We reaffirmed them; the leaders reaffirmed them: universal coverage, quality and choice, an emphasis on preventative and primary care, and discipline in constraining costs, not only for the Government so that we don't increase the deficit but also for people in their private insurance plans. And we will have a bill in the Senate and a bill in the House that will achieve those objectives.

The burden is then on others. Finally, the burden must go to others. I would remind you now we have the American Medical Association, several other physicians groups, the Nurses Association, the nonprofit hospital association, virtually every medical center in the country, a huge group of small businesses, a huge group of large businesses, and a wide array of others who support these four goals. The bill that we will come out with, I am confident, will reach these four goals. How we reach them is now up to the Congress working with the White House. But the burden is on those who think they have a better idea to come forward with it.

Someday we are going to have to focus on those who have other alternatives. That is my objective. I think we will reach those four goals. I thought it was a great meeting, and my prediction was that if they would go out and say what I've been saying for a month that it would make news. And sure enough, it did. And I feel very, very good about it.

Now I have to turn this over to them to answer more questions about Rwanda.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Boutros Boutros-Ghali, United Nations Secretary-General; Salim Salim, Secretary General, Organization of African Unity; and Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Statement on Proposed Crime Legislation

July 22, 1994

For over a year, Congress and others have worked to pass a tough, smart crime bill. I am very grateful to Chairmen Jack Brooks and Joe Biden for their leadership throughout the crime bill debate, and I am heartened to know that the House-Senate conference will convene next Tuesday to begin its final work on the proposal.

We have put together a tough and serious legislative remedy to reduce violence and prevent crime. But until a bill is passed by Congress and signed into law, our work is not finished. I am confident that committee members will act quickly on the conference and that we will see a final bill passed.

The American people have asked us to help in our Nation's fight to curb the problem of violence and crime. We can meet this common goal by putting aside differences and partisanship. By working together, we will enact an historic crime law before the end of this legislative session. The American people demand and deserve no less.

Statement on Signing the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995

July 22, 1994

Today I have signed into law H.R. 4454, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995. H.R. 4454 provides fiscal year 1995 appropriations to fund the Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Technology Assessment, the Architect of the Capitol, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress.

In signing the bill into law, I note that this Act, the purpose of which is to provide appropriations for the legislative branch, also contains provisions affecting the operations of the executive branch. As a matter of comity, legislative branch appropriations acts historically have not contained provisions affecting the executive branch, and the executive branch has not commented on provisions of these acts. Since this Act contains provisions that depart from that standard, it is appropriate to express my views on these provisions. These provisions concern the involvement of the Public Printer and the Government Printing Office in executive branch printing related to the production of Government publications. Specifically, the Act includes amendments to existing law that expand the involvement of the Public Printer and the Government Printing Office in executive branch functions.

The Act raises serious constitutional concerns by requiring that executive branch agencies receive a certification from the Public Printer before procuring the production of certain Government documents outside of the Government Printing Office. In addition, the Act expands the types of material that are to be produced by the Government Printing Office beyond that commonly recognized as "printing." In light of these concerns, I will interpret the amendments to the public printing provisions in a manner that minimizes the potential constitutional deficiencies in the Act.

In this regard, the exclusive authority of the Government Printing Office over "the procurement of any printing related to the production of Government publications" will be restricted to procurement of documents intended primarily for distribution to and use by the general public. Additionally, in light of the substantial expansion of the role of the Government Printing Office that would be occasioned by a broad reading of the term, "duplicating," that term will be read to encompass only the reproduction inherent in traditional printing processes, such as composition and presswork, and not reproduced by other means, such as laser printers or photocopying machines.

The concerns raised by this Act reinforce my eagerness and resolve to accomplish a comprehensive reform of Federal printing in accordance with constitutional principles, an effort that began last year with the Vice President's National Performance Review. Reform legislation can improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of Government printing by maximizing the use of private sector printing capability through open competitive procedures and by limiting Government-owned printing resources to only those necessary to maintain a minimum core capacity. Reform of Federal printing practices can also serve to enhance public access to public information, through a diversity of sources and in a variety of forms and formats, by improving the printing and information dissemination practices of the Federal Government. I look forward to pursuing this effort in the next Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 22, 1994.

NOTE: H.R. 4454, approved July 22, was assigned Public Law No. 103–283.

Nomination for United States District Court Judges
July 22, 1994

The President today announced three nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York: Frederic Block, John Gleeson, and Allyne R. Ross.

"These three individuals have demonstrated a profound commitment to the law," the President said. "I know they will be of great service to the State of New York and to this Nation."

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

The President's Radio Address
July 23, 1994

Good morning. Ever since Franklin Roosevelt, seven Presidents of both parties have worked to reform our Nation's health care system to provide health coverage to all Americans. That's always been the goal, to make sure that hard-working middle class families had the medical and the economic security they need to build good lives for themselves and their children.

Now, for the first time in more than a decade, the American people are again insisting that we reform health care to contain costs and provide coverage for everybody. With your votes across the country in the last couple of years, you've told Washington in clear terms that you want guaranteed health security. And as your President that's exactly what I've been fighting for.

It's more urgent today than it has been in years, not only because America pays far more of our income for health care than anybody else but because we're going in the wrong direction. Ten years ago, about 88 percent of our people had health insurance coverage. Today, it's below 83 percent and dropping. In just the last 5 years, 5 million Americans have lost their health insurance. But my clear and unchanged goal is universal coverage that will protect hard-working Americans.

We've already come a long way in this debate. Both Houses of Congress will soon begin their historic floor debates because, for the first time in American history, committees of Congress have actually voted out bills that will guarantee coverage to all Americans.

Yet many interest groups are still fighting against it. Already, over $100 million has been spent by interests trying to persuade you to back away from real reform, trying to persuade you that it can't work. Fortunately, I think most people see through these ad campaigns. Eight in ten Americans insist they still want universal coverage. And fortunately we've got an example of where it works in the State of Hawaii, where employers and employees share responsibility and all are required to purchase insurance. There is coverage for all workers and their families, and small business insurance rates are 30 percent below the national average. That's right, in a State like Hawaii where everything else is more expensive than the rest of the country, health insurance is cheaper, because everybody does their part and everybody's covered.

Still, at this moment of decision, you're going to be bombarded with a last-ditch special interest media blizzard aimed at derailing reform and frightening you. That's why it's so important right now that you keep your focus on what matters most: How are we going to guarantee health security for all Americans? And don't let anybody convince you it can't be done. Every other advanced country has done it. And in our own country, one State's been doing it for 20 years now.

One of the things a lot of people will say to you is that we ought to have some modified half measures to make things a little better. Unfortunately, a lot of these half measures may not work.

Let's just take the case for insurance reforms. Here's why it won't work. One of the proposed insurance reforms that all of us would agree with is that people ought to be able to buy insurance, even if someone in their family has

been sick and has a so-called preexisting condition. And if they change jobs, they ought to be able to carry the insurance with them and not lose it.

Here's why just doing that is not enough. If you don't require everybody to have insurance, if you don't require universal coverage, that means low-risk individuals, younger people, single people, aren't necessarily included in these insurance pools, which means that the pool has relatively more sick people. Higher risk insurance pools means that premiums go up for those that are currently insured. What happens then? That means some more healthy individuals drop out because they don't think they'll get sick, and small businesses that are on the margin of profitability, well, they also often drop out. That means the pool is even smaller, which means the risk is even higher, which means the rates get raised again, which means even more younger healthy people drop out and more small businesses drop out. It's a vicious cycle.

To make matters even more complicated and tougher, when the uninsured low-risk people do get sick or have accidents, they still get health care, but it's too late, too expensive at the emergency room, and very often they can't afford to pay for it themselves. So their costs get passed on from medical providers back through the insurance system, back onto the Americans who are still paying insurance. And the premiums rise again. And again, it becomes harder for working people to afford insurance.

A recent study by the Catholic Health Association demonstrates how all these forces work together to hurt the middle class. Every year, according to the Catholic Health Association, these limited reforms would pick $27 billion from the pockets of working Americans and their families who do pay for insurance, $800 apiece for families earning between $30,000 and $40,000 a year. Can you imagine the outcry if Congress tried to impose a direct tax of that kind on working families? But that's exactly what these nonuniversal plans will wind up doing.

Right now we're hearing from the same kind of critics we hear from every time this country fights to help middle class families with efforts like Social Security and Medicare. They say small business will be hurt by this. They say it's too bureaucratic, that it's too costly, that Americans will lose their choice.

But the truth is, this is not a Government plan, it's private insurance for all Americans. We phase it in on a period of several years, there's less regulation than when it was originally proposed, choice is protected, and we contain costs.

And remember, most small businesses do insure their employees, and they pay 30 to 40 percent more for it than they would if they were buying in big pools like Government or big business. Only Hawaii has required all small businesses to participate, and their rates are lower.

These are the kinds of objections that we've heard every time we've tried to do something like Social Security or Medicare. President Johnson heard these objections during the Medicare debate until the very end of the vote. But 29 years ago next week, he was able to sign legislation creating a system that has helped hundreds of millions of older Americans and their families. The American people made it clear then that they wanted reform. And today, the pen President Johnson used to sign that legislation is mounted in a position of honor in the White House, just down the hall from where I'm speaking. And if you tried to repeal Medicare, Members of Congress from both parties would never let it happen.

Your concerns and your voices have carried us this far in this historic debate. Now we have to keep our focus for a few more weeks so we can win a battle that has been fought for 60 years. Together, America can join the ranks of other countries. America can do what we have needed to do a long time, create a health care system that guarantees health insurance for all Americans. And in doing that, we can make sure our middle class has a chance to keep growing for another generation of American children.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 12:10 p.m. on July 22 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 23.

Exchange With Reporters in Hot Springs, Arkansas
July 23, 1994

High School Vietnam Memorial

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Yes, very proud. And I'm grateful to all the people who worked on it and made it possible. I'm glad some of my closest friends could be here on the day it was unveiled and dedicated. I'm grateful to them, all the people who did all this work. You know it really means a lot to me because I haven't been able to be here or be a part of it. So I'm really happy about it.

The Presidency

Q. Do you wish you could just be here for a long period of time?

The President. Absolutely. I get very homesick, homesick for my friends and for the place and also for the ability to communicate directly with people. You know, it's very frustrating. It's hard to avoid being isolated, and it's hard to avoid just kind of a distance and almost a miscommunication from the nature of the Presidency, where so many things are happening at once and so many things are cascading in on people and so much information is flying back and forth and occasionally misinformation. I miss the whole lifestyle that Hillary and Chelsea and I had down here.

But we're doing fine, and I feel good about what's happening to the country. We got the economy going back in order; we're facing a lot of our serious problems. I think the crime bill will pass soon. It'll be the most important crime bill in history. We're taking up health care—for the first time in the history of the country we've ever even considered providing health care to all Americans—on the floor of both Houses of the Congress. So I'm very happy about what's going on.

And things are going pretty well in the world. We've got our problems, to be sure, but we're working, trying to work to avoid a crisis in North Korea. We've got peace in the Middle East developing. The trip to Europe went very well. So I feel good about where we are in the world as we move toward the 21st century. And I feel very good about the fact that we're being able to change some things here at home and are being able to face some of our problems. So I feel good about it.

Whitewater Hearings

Q. One of the editors of your home State paper, the Arkansas Gazette, has said that the upcoming Whitewater hearings could, in his view, undermine your Presidency. Would you give us a reading of those hearings that are to start next week——

The President. Well, first of all, if my home State paper were the Arkansas Gazette, I don't believe that opinion would be in there. [*Laughter*]

The hearings, I think, will go about the way the Special Counsel's inquiry did. After all, we've got a lifelong Republican that is the Special Counsel. And he concluded that there was no legal violation in any way, shape, or form in all these contacts. He concluded that Vince Foster's death was a suicide and that all these hysterical, politically motivated efforts to twist it into something else were wrong. And the ethics counsels of various departments, many of them are lifetime Republicans, too. I feel quite comfortable that the hearings will be seen as just a rehash of what's already been looked into in detail.

Q. Are you—[*inaudible*]—campaign getting in full swing for the fall? Is that bad timing for Whitewater hearings?

The President. No, the question—I think the American people are going to wonder why the Congress is spending so much time and money on something that has already been looked into in great detail, excruciating detail, at great cost to the taxpayers by the Special Counsel. But if they want to do it, that's fine. We'll cooperate just as we have with the Special Counsel.

I think the most important thing is that the Congress be seen as dealing with the problems of the country and that this not be seen as distracting from their obligations to deal with crime and health care, expanding trade, and the other important things that will affect the lives of the American people. All of us need to turn our attention every day as much as we can away from politics and toward the interests of the ordinary American citizen. And I think if we do that, I think we'll be all right.

Rwanda

Q. [*Inaudible*]—help Rwanda?

The President. Well, I think—yesterday I think we answered that. The United States has provided 40 percent of the total aid to Rwanda to date. And we have been working on this for 2 months, and we are doing the best we can. But we're going to do more.

I think if you look at the record, I think it's very difficult to point the finger at anyone. It's a very tragic thing which has happened there. The previous government slaughtered large numbers of people, and so those who survived fled. And now the war is over in Rwanda, and the present winners of that conflict are trying to persuade the Rwandans to return. That is the ultimate answer.

But this is a horrible humanitarian tragedy of massive proportions. And I think now is the time, again, to concentrate on those people there and what we as Americans and as citizens of the world can do to keep as many of them alive as possible and to get them to come home under safe conditions.

And when that is over, when the crisis has passed, there will be plenty of time for the critics to point the finger and time for rational assessment if something more could have been done at some different date. But I'm confident. We've been working since May, and I have done all I knew to do. When the crisis has passed and somebody thinks there is something else I should have done, there will be time then to assess that.

Arkansas Gubernatorial Race

Q. Any words for Governor Tucker against your old nemesis, Sheffield Nelson, in the Governor's race this year?

The President. Well, I think he's done a very good job as Governor. And I think the people of Arkansas know that. And they don't need my help to figure out what to do. You know, I vote here in this State, and I'm a citizen of this State, and I certainly intend to vote for him. But I think—I don't need to get involved in that. He knows what to do. He's done a good job as Governor, he's doing a good job as a candidate, and I think he'll do just fine.

Hillary and Chelsea Clinton

Q. How's Chelsea doing?

The President. She's doing very well, thank you. She's had a good year in school; she had a wonderful summer with us. She went to Europe with us on this last trip, and it was quite wonderful for her. And so I'm really happy.

Like me, she misses her friends here. She just got home last night. She and her grandmother went to Europe together, and they're coming home to Arkansas next week. So Chelsea is going to have a chance to spend some time here, too, and she's real happy about that.

Q. What about Hillary? Is she with you this weekend?

The President. No, because she's out pushing health care. And Chelsea's been gone for a couple of weeks, so we try never to be gone at the same time, you know, so one of us is always there with her. So I stayed last night to see Chelsea come home from Europe, and we stayed up real late last night talking about her trip. And then Hillary's coming home today so she can be with Chelsea this weekend while I'm here, and Chelsea will be here next week.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:15 a.m. at Memorial Field. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters in Hot Springs
July 23, 1994

President's High School Reunion

Q. What are your thoughts as you return to the State, Mr. President?

The President. I'm very happy to be—I'm gratified that I can be here. So many of my classmates and I have survived these last 30 years in reasonably good shape. We're here together; we're having a wonderful time. We just did a lot of reminiscing. I got to go through the high school and see some of the wonderful new things that are being done at the technology

center here. But mostly it's just a time for getting together with family and friends.

Q. What did you do inside at the ceremony?

The President. We listened to one of our classmates who is a minister compare our class to a family and talk about family reunions and what family values are really about, about our shared stories and experiences. It was a wonderful thing. We remembered the classmates that we had who are no longer with us. And we sang a lot of old songs.

Q. Mr. President—spotlight on your reunion this year—[*inaudible*]

The President. Well, I hope most of them don't mind, you know. I just want them all to have a good time and be relaxed and have a wonderful time. It's really been, I think, a good thing for all of us. I've never missed any of my reunions. When I was Governor we always had a gathering on Saturday night, and then Sunday afternoon after church I would have everybody over at the Governor's mansion. So they may be regretting that I'm not Governor so we can't go to the Governor's mansion.

Q. What are you going to be doing the rest of the weekend, Mr. President?

The President. I'm just going to be here with my family and friends. And you know, tonight we have an event, and tomorrow I'm not sure. I have to go back a little earlier than I wanted because on Monday we're having Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein at the White House. It's a very big day——

Q. Mr. President, what's your fondest memory of high school?

The President. All my friends, no question about it. We had a—you know, it was a different time, I think, although I think kids today are trying to get back to it. We were basically a close class, and we believed in our country, and we believed in our future, and we were kind of, I think, rosy in our outlook, not necessarily unrealistic. And my memories of those days are deeply personal, almost like family; just like the minister said today, it's almost like a family.

Q. Mr. President, what kind of person were you in high school? Were you a jock, a—[*inaudible*]—or a nerd?

The President. Well, I wasn't a jock. I was probably—a lot of people probably would have said I was a nerd. But I liked my friends, I liked music, I liked the activities, but I liked to study, too. I had a normal childhood.

Whitewater Hearings

Q. Mr. President, I know it's a weekend of reflection for you, but Whitewater hearings are getting ready to come up. What concerns do you have there, because there's a lot of people in Arkansas that are paying close attention to it?

The President. Well, I think they should know that we'll do just what we've been doing all along. What I said is that we've been fully cooperative, and we will be. And the only thing I ask of the Congress, the only thing I've ever asked of them, is not to let any of this stuff interfere with the business of the people.

We're up there to do the people's business, and we've turned this economy around, we've got the deficit cut in half, we've got 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Truman because we're working on those things. We've got unprecedented expansion of trade and new training opportunities.

So now, we've got to face our challenges. We've got a crime bill to pass, we've got a big trade bill to pass, and we've got a health care reform, an issue that's been on the floor of the Congress in both Houses, for the first time in the history of America we've ever considered it. So we've got big work to do, and my only concern is let's just keep putting the people of this country first. And I'll be cooperative; we'll see what happens.

Health Care Reform

Q. Are you confident with the health care compromise?

The President. Well, we're working on it, you know. It's no accident that seven Presidents of both parties in 60 years have not been able to figure out how to cover all Americans. But it's important to know that Hawaii has—and in Hawaii small businesses pay 30 percent lower rates, and they cover everybody. So we can do it. We can do it, and I think we will.

Rwanda

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Well, let us just say one word about that. I think, at the moment, rather than characterize that effort I would say that there are a lot of countries who wish to participate in a Rwanda peacekeeping force who may not have the capacity to do so. And one of the things that we, those of us with a lot of capacity, need to examine is whether there's something—

this is over the long run—whether there's something we can do to help countries who want to give men and women to these kinds of projects have the training, have the support, have the things they need.

I think the whole world is now focused on Rwanda; I think the hearts of the world are with these people who have suffered. I think that we're moving very quickly to try to save lives from the cholera outbreak, and I think we'll have progress there. I think that a lot of these African countries will do the very best they can. And if they're trying to do something that they can't do, then the rest of us need to help them develop the capacity to do it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:59 p.m. at Hot Springs High School. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks Welcoming King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

July 25, 1994

History is made when brave leaders find the power to escape the past and create a new future. Today two such leaders come together, as we welcome King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin to the White House on this extraordinary occasion.

On this morning of promise, these visionary statesmen from ancient lands have chosen to heal the rift that for too long has divided their peoples. They have seen the outlines of a better day where others have seen darkness. They have sought peace in place of violence.

On both sides of the River Jordan there have lived generations of people who thought this day would never come. King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin have reached out to each other across the river, to build a future where hatred gives way to hope.

The Koran instructs us, "Requite evil with good, and he who is your enemy will become your dearest friend." And the Talmud teaches, "That man is a hero that can make a friend out of a foe." Before us today stand friends and heroes.

King Hussein, Prime Minister Rabin, all Americans welcome your presence here today. You give us great hope that this house, our people's house, will be a constant witness to a lasting peace that spreads forth to embrace your region.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:15 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Remarks at the Signing Ceremony for the Israel-Jordan Washington Declaration

July 25, 1994

Your Majesties, Prime Minister and Mrs. Rabin, distinguished guests: Today we gather to bear witness to history. As this century draws to a close, a new era of peace opens before us in ancient lands as brave men choose reconciliation over conflict. Today our faith is renewed.

As we write a new chapter in the march of hope over despair on these grounds and at this historic table, we remember the courage of Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin and the leadership of President Carter at Camp David 15 years ago, the efforts of President Bush to bring Israel and her neighbors together in Madrid 2 years ago, and that shining September day last year when Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat declared that their two peoples would fight no more.

Today, in that same spirit, King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin will sign the Washington

Declaration. After generations of hostility, blood, and tears, the leaders of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the State of Israel will solemnly declare, with the world as their witness, that they have ended the state of belligerency between them. From this day forward, they pledge to settle their differences by peaceful means. Both countries will refrain from actions that may adversely affect the security of the other and will thwart all those who would use terrorism to threaten either side.

The Washington Declaration is the product of much hard work. Less then a year ago, Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan and Foreign Minister Peres of Israel met here publicly for the first time. Together, with the wise counsel and persistent energy of the Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, Israel and Jordan have pursued peace. And we are all in their debt.

It takes but a minute or two to cross the River Jordan, but for as long as most of us can remember, the distance has seemed immense. The awful power of ancient arguments and the raw wounds of recent wars have left generations of Israelis, Jordanians, and Palestinians unable to imagine, much less build, a life of peace and security. Today King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin give their people a new currency of hope and the chance to prosper in a region of peace.

Under the Washington Declaration, Jordan and Israel have agreed to continue vigorous negotiations to produce a treaty of peace based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin will meet as often as necessary to shepherd and personally direct those negotiations. Their objective is a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace between Israel and all its neighbors, a peace in which each acknowledges and respects the territorial integrity and political independence of all others and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

In the meantime, Jordan and Israel have decided to take immediate steps to normalize relations and resolve disputes in areas of common concern. They have agreed to survey the international border based on the work of their boundary subcommission. They have resolved that negotiations on water resources should aim to establish the rightful allocation between the two sides of the waters of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers. They have determined that their police forces will cooperate in combating crime, with a special emphasis on drug smuggling. They have set up as their joint purpose the abolition of all economic boycotts and the establishment of a bilateral economic cooperation.

And as of today, Jordan and Israel have agreed to take the first practical steps to draw their people together and to let the peoples of the world share in the wonders of their lands. They will establish direct telephone links, connect their two nations' electricity grids, open two border crossings between their nations, including one at Aqaba and Eilat and another in the north, accelerate the negotiations aimed at opening an international air corridor between the two countries, and give free access to third-country tourists traveling between their two nations. These are the building blocks of a modern peace and ancient holy lands.

Your Majesty, after our first meeting, you wrote me a heartfelt letter in which you referred to your revered grandfather King Abdullah. You told me that his untimely assassination at the entrance to Jerusalem's Al Aqsa Mosque had come at a time when he was intent on making peace with Israel. Had he completed his mission, you said to me, your region would have been spared four decades of war. Today, 43 years later, Abdullah's grandson has fulfilled his legacy. And in the declaration you will sign, your role as guardian of Jerusalem's Muslim holy sites, Al Aqsa among them, has been preserved. And Israel has agreed to accord a high priority to Jordan's historic role regarding these holy sites in final status negotiations.

Prime Minister, when you first visited me in the White House, you spoke eloquently of your soldier's life, defending and guiding your nation through four bloody decades of struggling to survive. You told me your people had had enough bloodshed, that this was time to make peace. Ten months ago, you stood on this same lawn and shook the hand of Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestinian people. Today you stand together with King Hussein, descendant of the Prophet Mohammed, to declare that Jordan and Israel have ended their conflict. In holding out to your people the hope of a normal, secure life, you, sir, have fulfilled the mission of your life and of all those who have fought by your side for so long.

Now as we go forward, we must guard against illusions. Dark forces of hatred and violence still stalk your lands. We must not let them succeed.

King Hussein, Prime Minister Rabin, as you and your people embark on this journey of peace, we know the road will not be easy. Just as we have supported you in coming this far, the United States will walk the final miles with you. We must all go on until we ensure that the peace you are seeking prevails in the Holy Land and extends to all Israel's Arab neighbors. Our common objective of a comprehensive peace must be achieved.

Now as we witness the signing of this declaration and applaud the bravery of these men, let us remember that peace is much more than a pledge to abide by words on a page. It is a bold attempt to write a new history. Guided by the blessings of God, let us now go forward and give life to this declaration. For if we follow its course, we will truly achieve a peace of the generations.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks at the State Dinner for King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

July 25, 1994

Your Majesties, Prime Minister and Mrs. Rabin, all our distinguished guests: Welcome to the White House. Today we have seen history in the making. And tonight we celebrate this marvelous occasion with King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin and to all of you who for so long have supported their efforts for peace.

It's a special pleasure for Hillary and for me to welcome Queen Noor and Mrs. Rabin who, in their devotion to the health and the well-being of the children of their nations, prove that the quest for peace is not the only cause that knows no borders.

Today's signing of the Washington Declaration is the handiwork of many. But it is safe to say we would not be here tonight were it not for the persistent and far-sighted efforts of Crown Prince Hassan, Foreign Minister Peres, and our Secretary of State, Warren Christopher. I want to express my special gratitude to Secretary Christopher, who has brought such great energy and devotion to this task, and to applaud all three gentlemen for their efforts.

The Washington Declaration is a blueprint, both inspiring and practical, a foundation for lasting peace between two peoples who have been divided for too long. It is also clearly a personal tribute to two brave leaders, both called upon at a young age to shoulder enormous responsibilities, one to be a king, the other a defender of his people, brought together now at long last in the common cause of peace.

King Hussein, tonight we recall again the legacy of your grandfather and mentor, King Abdullah, a man who dreamed that one day, on both sides of the River Jordan, Arab and Jew could live together in peace and who lost his life for that dream of peace. At the age of 17, when most of us were still in school, you were left to shoulder the great weight of leading your people.

In the 42 years that have passed, you have led your kingdom through the stormy waters of the Middle East. You have improved the lives of your people and endowed your nation with a spirit of tolerance, civility, and compromise. You've built bridges between the Arab world and the United States through your actions as an advocate for stability and through your marriage to the Queen, herself a daughter of Americans who came from the Arab world. For that, we, sir, are in your debt.

And today you have moved to erase the divisions between the people of the two sides of the River Jordan. Tonight it can truly be said that you have fulfilled the legacy of King Abdullah.

Mr. Prime Minister, tonight we honor you, a son of the land of Israel. Your parents, Nehemia and Rosa, were among the first pioneers who came to Palestine. And like so many others of their generation, they devoted their lives to building a national home for the Jewish people.

Schooled in the science of agriculture, you once planned to devote your life to making the fields and deserts of Israel come alive. But at the age of 19, you answered the call to join the Palmach, destined to spend your life fighting to establish and defend the nation of Israel.

Now, after a life consumed by a war, you have become the architect of a great peace, building a homeland your parents could only imagine, a peaceful, prosperous land at harmony with its neighbors, a land where a new generation will be free to cast aside its weapons and fulfill your dream to make the valleys and deserts bloom. Tonight we honor you and the fulfillment of your legacy, sir.

These two men have crossed much hostile territory so that their children and their children's children need fight no more. They have earned this peace, and we are all in their debt.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to rise and join me in a toast to these men of courage, to their fine families, to the peoples of Jordan and Israel, and to the promise of peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:36 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

Statement on Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Roger C. Altman
July 25, 1994

Secretary Bentsen and I believe that Roger Altman has been an excellent Deputy Treasury Secretary and we want him to continue in that capacity.

The President's News Conference With King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel
July 26, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. I am happy to once again welcome King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin.

In the last 2 days, history has been made in Washington, and a brighter future has been built, a future that offers more peace and security, not only for the people of Israel and Jordan but also for the people of the United States. With great courage and foresight, the King and the Prime Minister have united in their conviction that it is time to end more than four decades of bloodshed and loss. They have demonstrated that contact can overcome conflict, that direct talks can produce peace. They have declared an end to the state of war between their two countries and have determined to secure a lasting peace. They have personally committed to making sure that a treaty is concluded as rapidly as possible.

When we met yesterday, the King, the Prime Minister, and I agreed to designate representatives to ensure that the provisions of the Washington Declaration are implemented quickly.

In the week of an extraordinary set of events, this morning we witnessed another one, as the King and the Prime Minister appeared jointly before Congress. Their eloquent remarks articulated a common vision of cooperation that will yield specific and concrete benefits for all peoples on both sides of the Jordan River. The outpouring of support by Members of Congress for these two heroes of peace, I believe, clearly reflect the feelings of all the American people.

As I've made clear since my first meetings with the King and the Prime Minister, America will stand by those who take risks for peace. We will support leaders whose boldness and wisdom are creating a new Middle East. Today I have reaffirmed to Prime Minister Rabin that as Israel moves forward in the peace process the constant responsibility of the United States will be to help ensure its security. I have also reaffirmed to King Hussein my determination to assist Jordan in dealing with its burden of debt and its defense requirements. I am working with Congress to achieve rapid action on both

these matters. The United States is committed to a comprehensive peace in the Middle East and an end to hostility between Israel and all her Arab neighbors.

I spoke yesterday with President Asad of Syria and reaffirmed my personal dedication to achieving a comprehensive peace. Secretary Christopher has devoted a great deal of time and effort to the negotiations with Syria, and I have asked him to return to the region soon to continue that work.

In these 2 days we have taken great strides on the road to peace. But even as these two leaders have come together, the enemies of peace have not been silent. In recent days terrorists have struck in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and in London. We will not, we must not, allow them to disrupt this peace process.

This week's events here in Washington and the bravery of King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin prove that a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East is within reach. Inspired by the extraordinary events of the last 2 days, now we go forward with a new sense of determination and a new sense of confidence to take the next steps in the days and weeks ahead.

As I turn over the microphone, if I might, to the King and to the Prime Minister, let me say at the end of the statements we will take press questions in alternating order from the American, the Jordanian, and the Israeli press.

King Hussein. Mr. President, Prime Minister Rabin, ladies and gentlemen: These have been unique days in our lives, yesterday and today. They have witnessed dreams, hopes, and prayers realized in terms of an end to the state of war between Jordan and Israel, more important, in terms of our determination to move ahead in executing our duties towards our people, towards our peoples in the entire region in the present and in the future that they live secure in peace with the ability to come together, for the opportunity to give their talents a chance, to make a difference, to create at the breaking dawn of peace in the region what is worthy of them.

I would like, Mr. President, to thank you very, very much indeed, sir, for your personal support, continued interest. We are proud to have you as our partner. We are proud and happy that these meetings between myself and Prime Minister Rabin have taken place here in Washington. We are overwhelmed by all the warmth and support that we have seen during these last 2 days. We recall and appreciate the efforts of the Secretary of State, the efforts of so many friends here that enabled us to get this far.

I hope, together, we will build from now on and we will continue and we will succeed in giving all our peoples the chance to live under conditions that have been denied us, certainly as far as I'm concerned throughout my life. And I am proud to say that the overwhelming majority of Jordanians rejoice with me, as I am sure is the case in Israel and here in the United States.

Thank you very, very much.

Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. President, Your Majesty King Hussein, ladies and gentlemen: I believe that the last 2 days represent a landmark in the positive developments towards peace in the Middle East. I believe to understand the meaning of what has been done by Jordan and Israel, with the assistance, support of the United States, has to be looked at in proportion to what are the trends today in the Middle East. We see two conflicting trends in the Middle East: one, the rise for extreme, radical Islamic terrorist movements within the Palestinian side, within the Lebanese side, in other Arab countries, derived from a certain source that each purpose is undermining any possibility to achieve peace. I believe that we see their fingers in the international terror acts that have taken place not so far ago in Thailand, in Buenos Aires, in London, in addition to what goes on from Lebanon and in the territories by the extreme radical Islamic terrorist groups. It's an all-out war waged by these elements against the possibility of the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict in all its parts.

I believe that they have got infrastructure of terror all over the world. We saw it lately in Argentina. I don't want to talk about what's going on here, in Europe, in the Far East, in addition to the Middle East.

And therefore, what we have done in the last 2 days is a major step of brave people on both sides to come up and to say, we are making an important, important phase towards peace, because the Washington Declaration is, first and foremost, end of a state of belligerency or as the King declared, end of state of war. Believe me, today in the Middle East, to reach commitment by the countries of the region for non-belligerency, no violence, no terror, can be the

greatest contribution to peace in the region, and not only in the region.

Between Jordan and Israel we have reached the end of the state of belligerency. But there is a need, beyond the end of war, threats of war, violence, and terror, to build a structure of peace, the relations of peace. We laid the foundations to this world, to this work, to this phase. The test will be to what extent we will succeed to build this structure of peace, to reach the kind of relations between Jordan and Israel that the man in the street in Amman and in Tel Aviv will call it a peace.

Therefore, hard work is before us. We are committed, I believe, on both sides to do what is needed, in addition to the elimination of war, to build the relations of peace. We need your assistance, Mr. President, in doing so.

The first responsibility lies with the parties, with Jordan and Israel. But without—[*inaudible*]—the United States, the leader of peace in the region, hopefully other countries, the European Union, assisting those who take risks, calculated risks for peace, we will not achieve it in the way and the pace which it is needed.

We open a new chapter. We created a new landmark. But the road is still, hopefully not too long, but still work has to be done. We will do it. We need participation of those who preach peace to translate their words to realities, to practical support of those who take the risks for peace.

Thank you very much.

Lebanon

Q. I'd like to direct my question to Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. Prime Minister, when do you expect to pull your occupation troops out of southern Lebanon?

Prime Minister Rabin. As you know, there were 3 years of war in Lebanon which the purpose then declared by the Government of Israel was to eliminate Lebanon as a basis for terrorism. In '85 the government—then the Prime Minister was Shimon Peres, and I was the Minister of Defense; it was a national unity government—we decided to pull out. But in the absence of central government in Lebanon, in the absence of military and security forces that can take control of each sovereign soil, and with the continuation of at least Syrian division on the Lebanese soil and from the area that the Syrian army is deployed, Hezbollah takes action against us. There are still members of the revolutionary guards of Iran there.

We have made it clear, and I repeat it, in the context of a peace treaty with Lebanese Government that will be in full control of its own sovereign soil, Israel will agree to peace treaty. We don't seek one square inch of Lebanese territory. The border there is defined. There is an international border, and we will respect it. We are not seeking one cubic meter of their water. All that we want: peace treaty and their capability to maintain control of their own land. I believe they are capable, if somebody from the outside will not interfere and will prevent it.

Nuclear Weapons

Q. Mr. Rabin, I'd like to ask you a question. We've seen the historic handshake and the Washington Declaration. But there is topic that was rarely discussed, and that is, now that Israel is moving very quickly on the Palestinian and Jordanian front, and hopefully will have—with the advent of peace in the Middle East, with other Arab countries, what does Israel intend to do with its huge arsenal of nuclear weapons?

Prime Minister Rabin. Well, as you know, Israel is not a nuclear country in terms of weapons, and therefore, your question is not relevant. We are committed to the United States for many years not to be the first to introduce nuclear weapons, or weapons, in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict. But at the same time, we cannot be blind to efforts that are made in certain Muslim and Arab countries in this direction. Therefore, I can sum it up. We'll keep our commitment not to be the first to introduce, but we still look ahead to the dangers that others will do it, and we have to be prepared for it.

Syria

Q. Mr. President, I would like to ask you when do you hope to see the President of Syria, President Asad, standing next to you like his Majesty King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel? And what are you prepared to do in order to achieve it?

The President. Let me say, as you know, I have already met with President Asad once for an extended period of time in Geneva. We have talked many times on the phone, and the Secretary of State has been to Syria on several occasions, and we are working hard there. But

in the end, the lesson of the successes which have been enjoyed over the past year is that the best thing the United States can do is to help to create the conditions within which the parties themselves feel secure in making peace.

This is an agreement made by Israel and Jordan. In September we had an agreement freely made by Israel and the PLO. What remains is for sovereign states with great interests and long histories to reach an accord. My job will be to create the conditions insofar as I am humanly capable for such a peace to be made, but the decisions will have to be made by them. And the successes of the last year rest on that fundamental understanding.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News].

Terrorism

Q. Mr. President, it is widely believed that Hezbollah was responsible for some of the recent bombings in Buenos Aires and Panama, if not also in London. Did you discuss that with President Asad? Do you believe that more pressure should be brought against Iran by Germany, France, other of our allies who have had very friendly relations with Iran? Do you believe that Hezbollah could operate as it has in Damascus and southern Lebanon without the complicity of President Asad?

I'd also like to ask Your Majesty if you could comment on that, and also the Prime Minister, on Hezbollah as well.

The President. Well, let me say first of all, I condemn—the United States condemns the terrorist attacks in Buenos Aires and in London. They are, in all probability, of too recent vintage for anyone to be absolutely certain what the source of them is, but I think it is reasonable to assume that terrorists who wish to be the enemies of peace are behind it.

I did discuss the terrorism issue with President Asad in Geneva. I have continued to press with our friends and neighbors, our allies, the importance of standing up against nations which support terrorism. Trying to stem the expansion of terrorism is a major objective of the United States. And I think that there is a good chance that this agreement between Jordan and Israel, juxtaposed against the horrible events in Buenos Aires and the attempt at a horrible result in London, may stiffen the resolve of other countries around the world to help us to move against this.

And I think we must all try to do more. I am committed to do more. I think everyone in the United States would want us to do more against terrorism. And we're going to have to have some more help from our allies. We cannot allow the enemies of peace to prevail.

Q. May we have comments——

The President. Sure.

Q. Can you comment on that also?

King Hussein. I believe, Mr. President, that the enemies of peace is the right description, the enemies of life, the enemies of human relations between human beings, the enemies of hope, the enemies of security, the enemies of what should be normal between people. We have always stood against terror and terrorism, and we have paid a heavy price.

I condemn these recent deaths. And in fact, just a while ago we were discussing amongst ourselves, myself and some of my colleagues, the need for us to increase our vigil in the time ahead because more may come.

However, I believe that this is a challenge we face, to speak for what we believe in, to speak for the overwhelming majority of people. We are Muslims in Jordan and Christians. We live as members of one family. Nothing irritates me more or is more painful to me than to witness and see acts and attitudes attributed to Islam that have nothing to do with Islam, my faith and my religion. But I believe this is extremism as we know it in our world, people with blinders, with no vision.

I believe that what we have achieved here in Washington and our commitment to make a difference, to continue in dealing with every aspect of the building of the house of peace in our region in terms of negotiations to come, work to be done, and to have all this culminate in a peace treaty between us, hopefully in the context of a comprehensive peace, is our best answer to those who try to continuously destroy it everywhere in our region.

Prime Minister Rabin. The Hezbollah is very active daily, equipped with modern weapons, Russian-made, Soviet-made antitank—[*inaudible*]—mortars, antitank weapons, artillery. To the best of our knowledge, it comes from Iran via Syria, might be lately in reduced number. Their forces are deployed. One of the bases that we attacked was in area in the Bacca in which the Syrian army is deployed.

If you'll ask me who is the boss of Hezbollah, I would say, Iran. If you'll ask me, Syria can

put limitations on its activities, my answer will be yes. If you'll ask me for proof for that, in July, in response to prolonged—[*inaudible*]—by Hezbollah, we went and used firepower in southern Lebanon. And we worked out certain understanding through the good offices of the United States, in which the Secretary of State was involved. The talks were, to the best of my knowledge, with the Syrians. If the Syrians could reach understanding, limit part of the activity of Hezbollah, it means that they have got at least preventing capability vis-a-vis Hezbollah. If you ask me, do they want to use it, my answer: in a very limited way.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Your Majesty, do you believe that it is time to convene the Arab family of nations in order to support these agreements which were signed between Jordan and Israel, and between the Palestinians and Israel, and make ways in order to clear the political environment, which is very poisoned in the Arab world, and prepare and begin for the reconciliation process between the family of the Arab world?

King Hussein. I believe this is inevitable. And at the same time I know that you know that we have been trying to get that for a long period of time. It will happen I hope and before too long.

Q. Your Majesty, what does it take when more is still needed to be done for your grandson and my son, who have met before but abroad, to meet respectively in Amman and Tel Aviv? And also, since we are on a live broadcast to Israel, would you care to carry a message directly to the Israeli people?

King Hussein. I hope to share with the people of Israel the hopes that the people of Jordan share with me, that we are on the verge of the breaking of a new dawn for all our peoples for a secure, safe future, for a future of peace, cooperation, for human relations to develop and grow between us. And I hope that the answer will come as a result of our joint efforts, which I hope, following this meeting, we will be able to shepherd, both the Prime Minister and myself, in terms of the tasks ahead of negotiating on all aspects of the problems that we still have to resolve, in other words, using his words, the building blocks of peace that will culminate in a peace treaty hopefully before long.

I hope it won't be long before what you suggest will happen, sir.

Russia and Estonia

The President. Let me say one other thing before we leave. I think that King Hussein and the Prime Minister have put peace in the air all over the world.

A few hours ago, I received a message from President Yeltsin saying, first of all, how pleased he was about what had happened here between Jordan and Israel and, secondly, that he had reached agreement with President Meri of Estonia to withdraw all Russian troops from Estonia by August 31st.

As you know, this has been one of the principal objectives of American policy, so that now, for the first time since the end of World War II, on the last day of August there will be no more Russian troops in Germany or anywhere in Eastern Europe. And I think maybe the vibrations of peace that the King and the Prime Minister have sent out—who knows what may be announced tomorrow.

Thank you very much, and good day.

NOTE: The President's 67th news conference began at 4:15 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks at a Reception Honoring King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel

July 26, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Thank you for your kind remarks. Thank you for being a remarkable host tonight for this fitting capstone of the last 2 days. And thank you for your tireless efforts toward this remarkable achievement. The world is in your debt as well, sir, and we're grateful to you.

What a 2 days this has been. It's been so elevating and so exhilarating, I hesitate to diminish it in any way with a little humor. But when we were being called in and we realized, the three of us, that once more we were going to be asked to say something, I said, "Isn't it wonderful we're going to give another speech." [*Laughter*] His Majesty rolled his eyes—[*laughter*]—and the Prime Minister said, "You go in and tell everybody we're very grateful to them, we've had a wonderful time, and we're going to eat and drink some more." [*Laughter*]

I think America will long remember the remarkable signing ceremony yesterday and the gripping appearance of King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin before the joint session of Congress today. They were truly magnificent. They remind us by the events here in the last 2 days and by the lives that they brought here that it still is possible for hope to triumph over hate, for unity to triumph over division, for optimism to vanquish cynicism even in this day and time.

And I want to say a special word of thanks on behalf of the American people for this process in the Middle East. Your Majesty, Prime Minister, if you look out in this room today, there are Jewish-American and Arab-American citizens of my country who never knew each other before this process began, who never related to each other, who always wondered if they really did share the same citizenship, the same experiences, the same feelings and values. Now they're part of the Builders for Peace program. They're talking about all the young people coming over here from Jordan and Israel and Egypt and Morocco in the Seeds for Peace program. They're imagining what might happen in the new world of investment and trade and human contact between people in the United States and people in the Middle East. So that is something that we owe you as Americans.

I am very proud of the role the United States has been able to play in this process, but all we can ever do is to make it possible for brave leaders to feel secure enough, certain enough, trusting enough of us so that they can do what it is in their heart they wish to do. If we have done that, I am very proud and grateful for the opportunity to have done that.

But in the end, we must, all of us, be grateful to these two remarkable men and their remarkable nations. And we must commit, all of us, to make sure that the great journey they have started has a successful conclusion. That is my commitment. And with that, I welcome them to this podium and thank them for these last 2 magnificent days.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:25 p.m. in the Benjamin Franklin Room at the State Department.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Documents on the Palau-United States Compact of Free Association

July 26, 1994

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

On November 9, 1993, the voters in Palau approved the Compact of Free Association between the United States and Palau, opening the way for the Compact to be brought into force 7 years after the passage by the Congress of U.S. legislation approving the Compact.

In giving its approval to the Compact of Free Association, the Congress required the transmittal of certain agreements, Palau's Economic Development Plan, and a report on that Plan, at least 30 days (excluding days on which both Houses of Congress are not in session) prior to the effective date of the Compact.

Therefore, in accordance with section 101 of the Compact of Free Association with Palau Act, Public Law 101–219 (December 12, 1989), section 101(d)(1)(C) and (2) of the Compact of Free Association Approval Act, Public Law 99–658 (November 14, 1986), and section 102(b) of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985, Public Law 99–239 (January 14, 1986), I am hereby submitting the Economic Development Plan of the Republic of Palau, including this report thereon with supporting material, copies of certain subsidiary agreements between the

United States and Palau, and an agreement between Palau and the United States establishing October 1, 1994, as the effective date for the Compact, provided that all lawsuits in Palau challenging the compact have been resolved by that date. A separate letter from the President of Palau commenting on the Economic Development Plan also is attached.

The Congress also required that approval of the Compact be free of legal challenge in Palau and that I certify that there are no legal impediments to the ability of the United States to carry out fully its responsibilities and to exercise its rights under the defense-related provisions of the Compact. There is currently a lawsuit challenging the Compact in Palau. I will make this final certification once that lawsuit is resolved.

Report on the Development Plan

Under my direction, the Department of the Interior, the Agency for International Development, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and other interested agencies, have conducted a review of Palau's Economic Development Plan. These agencies have concluded, and I so find, that the Plan as submitted, together with the July 15, 1994, exchange of letters between Secretary of the Interior Babbitt and President Nakamura of Palau establishing a joint working group to coordinate efforts under the Compact to protect the unique marine resources of Palau, is acceptable. They have recommended that following the statutory period for Congressional review provided in section 102(b) of Public Law 99–239 (January 14, 1986), and subject to consideration of any Congressional comments, the United States will concur with Palau's Development Plan. Palau also has agreed to submit subsequent development plans at intervals no longer than every 5 years as required by law (section 102(b)(1) of Public Law 99–239 (January 14, 1986)).

Effective Date Agreement

The July 15, 1994, Agreement Regarding the Entry Into Force of the Compact of Free Association establishes October 1, 1994, as the effective date of the Compact, provided that all legal challenges in Palau have been resolved by the date ("provided that the requirements of section 101(1) of United States Public Law 101–219 (December 12, 1989) have been met"). See Senate Report No. 101–189, at 9 (1989). If all legal challenges in Palau have not been resolved by that date the agreement provides that the effective date shall be the earliest possible date thereafter as established by exchange of letters between the two governments. There is currently a pending lawsuit in Palau challenging implementation of the Compact.

Subsidiary Agreements

Compact subsidiary agreements were submitted to the Congress in 1986 prior to approval of the Compact (see section 101(a) of Public Law 99–658 (November 14, 1986)). Additional agreements concluded since that time are submitted with this letter. These are: the Agreement Concerning Procedures for the Implementation of United States Economic Assistance, Programs and Services Provided in the Compact of Free Association Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Palau, signed December 2, 1987; the Agreement Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Palau Regarding Mutual Assistance in Law Enforcement Matters, signed December 2, 1987; and the Agreement Concerning Special Programs Related to the Entry Into Force of the Compact of Free Association Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Palau, signed May 26, 1989.

Certification

I will make such additional certification and report to the Congress as required by law prior to the effective date of the Compact in accordance with section 101(d)(1)(A) of Public Law 99–658 (November 14, 1986).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate; Lee H. Hamilton, chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs; George Miller, chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources; Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and J. Bennett Johnston, chairman, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Labor Administration Convention
July 26, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention (No. 150) Concerning Labor Administration: Role, Functions and Organization, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 64th Session in Geneva on June 7, 1978.

The report of the Department of State, with a letter from the Secretary of Labor, concerning the Convention is enclosed.

As explained more fully in the enclosed letter from the Secretary of Labor, the current system of labor administration in the United States fully satisfies the requirements of Convention No. 150. Ratification of this Convention, therefore, would not require the United States to alter its law or practice in this field.

Ratification of additional International Labor Organization (ILO) conventions will enhance the ability of the United States to take other governments to task for failing to comply with the ILO instruments they have ratified. I recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of ILO Convention No. 150.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 26, 1994.

Appointment for the President's Committee on Mental Retardation
July 26, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Valerie J. Bradley to be Vice Chair of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation (PCMR) and Jane Browning, Michael Remus, Elizabeth Pittinger, and T.J. Monroe as members.

"Valerie Bradley's outstanding knowledge and commitment to the field promise a revitalization of the committee and innovative programs for the future," the President said. "The newly announced team will contribute significantly to renew innovative and beneficial programs at PCMR."

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

Remarks by Telephone Relay With Glenn Anderson of Gallaudet University
July 27, 1994

The President. Dr. Anderson? Good morning. I want to begin by congratulating you on your appointment as the Chair of the Gallaudet University Board of Trustees. I also want to thank you for your great career in rehabilitation work, and your earlier help to me when I served as Governor.

I'm glad we can use this telephone network today because I know what an important link it is to millions of Americans.

Go ahead.

Dr. Anderson. Good morning, Mr. President. Thank you very much for your kind words. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak with you this morning. Thank you for agreeing to make this relay call. Also, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your appearance at the Gallaudet University commencement last May. You inspired deaf people all over the country by your appearance and your wonderful commencement address.

Go ahead.

The President. Well, the honor was mine. I was very inspired by the students and their dreams. I also want to say how very proud I am of the strong support we have been receiving from the deaf and disabled communities on health care reform.

Go ahead.

Dr. Anderson. Great. Yes, we very much care about improving health care services, and we are so glad that you have taken the lead in advocating for health care reform.

Hopefully, you will also be able to remind health care providers of how important it is that they be sensitive to the needs of people with disabilities for health care services and for access to reasonable accommodations. I am very inspired by your hard work and will do all I can to support your efforts.

The President. Well, of course, I will be sensitive to those things. And I think you well understand that the only way we can extend those benefits and opportunities to the disabled community is to cover all Americans. If we do that, we will be able to contain costs and empower disabled Americans to work and to live to the fullest of their abilities.

Let me say, also, before we close this conversation, how pleased I am that the ADA is working and giving us things like this telephone relay system. It's a great tribute to the work that millions of disabled Americans have done.

I want to make a special note of the work that your wife, Karen, has done and the help she gave to our campaign in 1992 and our efforts to reach out for all Americans.

Go ahead.

Dr. Anderson. Great. My wife is here with me, and she's grinning from ear to ear. She enjoyed the opportunity to serve you and work in your campaign.

I also want to say, yes, the ADA is working very well. And it will work even better in the years to come. Our conversation this morning is a living example of how well ADA is working.

Go ahead.

The President. I want to thank you again for all you have done to make the ADA work for people in their everyday lives.

It's been a real pleasure to talk with you today. One of my aides told me that your son, Jamal, and I have a picture together that you would like me to autograph. I'd be glad to do that, and I look forward to seeing you again soon.

Signing off.

Dr. Anderson. Great. Many, many thanks for this opportunity. Thank you, again, and you have a great day, too.

Bye-bye.

The President. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:26 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. The telephone conversation used a new relay service technology which allows deaf persons to communicate by telephone.

Remarks on the Fourth Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act
July 27, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. It is wonderful to see this sea of Americans here at the White House today. Senator Harkin and I were back there talking, and he was beaming because he had so much to do with the ADA. And I was listening to the First Lady and to Tipper and to the Vice President give their fine speeches, and they were all so good, I was wishing I could just sit there and not have to say anything—[*laughter*]—enjoy the day and welcome you here.

I thank especially the Members of Congress who are here: Congressman Hoyer, Congressman Fish, Congressman Major Owens, and Congressman Goodling. Thank you for being here, sirs. Two who are not here because they're on the Hill working, I want to mention, Senator Kennedy and Congressman Jack Brooks who worked so hard on this. I thank former Congressman Tony Coelho who's done a magnificent job as Chair of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disability. I thank all the people who are here on this stage. And I want to say something today about the spirit of bipartisanship. I will say more later, but I would remind you that it would be wrong for

the day to go by without pointing out that this bill was signed into law by my Republican predecessor, President Bush, and I thank him for doing that.

I'd also like to introduce three young people from Gallaudet University who are here who are part of one of our administration's most important initiatives and an illustration of why we have to keep working to open the doors of opportunity to all Americans. They are Jennifer Nasukiewicz, Amy Hopkins, and Madelaine Frederickson. I would ask them to stand. [*Applause*] They are completing their training to be participants in the first class of our national service program, AmeriCorps. Beginning this September, they will be part of 20,000 young Americans who will be working to help to reclaim our sense of national community. They'll be working to help reclaim the natural beauty of the Chesapeake Bay. And together, they'll be working to revolutionize our sense of what we can do together. And in return, they'll get a little bit of help to continue their education.

You know, as the Vice President said, when we went across this country and sought the opportunity to serve here, our slogan was, "Putting People First." What that meant to me was pretty simple as we hurtle toward the next century. As we come to the end of the cold war, we owe it to our people to do some basic things: first of all, to try to create a world of greater peace and prosperity; that's what we've been about here the last 2 days with the King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel; second, to restore the American economy; third, to rebuild our American community with stronger community, stronger families; fourth, to empower all Americans to live to the fullest of their God-given abilities and to expect them to assume the responsibility to do so.

We are at a moment in history when our values, what we believe is morally right, and our interests, what is clearly good for us in a tangible material way, are one. We do not have a person to waste, and that is why we are here today to rededicate ourselves to an America where every man, woman, and child can reach the fullest of their God-given potential.

Like every civil rights law in our history, the Americans with Disabilities Act is just that, it's about potential. It is not a handout. It stands for what's best in our heritage, empowering Americans to build better lives for themselves. In that tradition, I pledge as your President to see that this Act is fully implemented and aggressively enforced in our schools, our workplaces, in government, and in public places for the benefit of all persons with disabilities, the blind and visually impaired, the deaf and hard of hearing, persons with mental retardation, persons with mental illness, persons who are mobility-impaired, all people who have problems that can be overcome. That's what this act is about.

We must move from exclusion to inclusion, from dependence to independence, from paternalism to empowerment. Your future and the future of those whom you represent is at the heart of my vision for America. In every aspect, consider this: If our goals here at home are to restore our economy, to rebuild our American communities, and to empower individuals, how can we achieve them unless you are part of all of them? Look at the progress which has been made and look at where we have to go.

In the last 18 months, we have passed a bill cutting the deficit by record amounts, reducing the Federal Government to its smallest point since John Kennedy was President, having 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President. And it's produced 3.8 million jobs and a 1.5 percent drop in the unemployment rate. But we've got a long way to go. We've got a long way to go because millions of Americans with disabilities could be working and contributing if this society opened it to them.

We are working up here to strengthen our American community. Congressman Brooks today is back in the Congress working on the crime bill, which will put more police officers on our streets and ban assault weapons and toughen sentences, but also give our children something to say yes to. There are billions of dollars there to invest in programs to get kids out of trouble before they are too far gone. It will rebuild our American community. But how can we be a community if millions of you are isolated from our common life and our common purposes? We can never be an American community.

The Secretary of Education is working to implement the most important empowerment agenda of all. Along with the Department of Health and Human Services and others, we are trying to implement a lifetime education system starting with Head Start for all children who need it and going through lifetime learning for people when they change jobs in the workplace.

But how can this work unless you are part of the empowerment agenda of America? We will never be fully empowered.

So, I say to you, if our job is to put people first, to rebuild the economy, to strengthen our communities, to empower our people, we cannot do that job unless you walk every step or ride every step or get there however you can. We need you, and without you we cannot do it.

In this global economy, as the Secretary of Labor never tires of telling me, the only thing we have that nobody can take away from us is the mind and the heart and spirit of our people. That's good news. It means the mind of our people and the spirit of our people can be used sometimes without lifting large weights or doing great physical labor. It means we can open the possibility of employment to more people. But it also means if we really want to win for all Americans, we must believe and act on the premise that we do not have a person to waste.

When I was first elected Governor—it seems like 100 years ago now—but back in the late seventies before the Americans with Disabilities Act came along, of the 50 or so people that worked in my office, three were blind. I got to the point where I didn't notice because they were just great employees. It struck me as crazy for them not to be part of a work force they could contribute to. Today I have had the honor of appointing 44 outstanding people with disabilities to important jobs in our Government, including Judy Heumann who's here with me today, the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education. She had to fight for her first job as a teacher. She's fought for disability rights for her entire life. Now she's fighting for the future of every child in America. I say that to make this point: We have not appointed a single, solitary person because of their disability. They have all been appointed because of their ability to serve the American people.

Why is this health care issue so important to this agenda? There are many reasons. We're the only country in the world that's going backwards in health care coverage with an advanced economy. A few years ago, 88 percent of our people were covered; now we're down to 83 percent. In the last 5 years alone, over 5 million Americans have lost their health insurance coverage. That is very troubling. We're spending too much money to get too little, throwing billions of dollars away on paperwork and bureaucracy every year so that we don't have the money we need. Look at this Cabinet behind me—to fight drugs, to take care of veterans' health care needs, to build a transportation network for the 21st century, to spend on education and training programs, to spend on the needs of the poor and to fight crime. That's just the Cabinet members behind me. Why? Because we are holding all spending flat while health care spending explodes—not for new health care, more money for the same health care.

But most of all, it is a human problem. The other day in western Pennsylvania, I was introduced by two women: one, a mother of five children who had become ill and she and her husband lost their health insurance and all their children; the other, a 62-year-old woman who had been a dairy farmer all of her life; 7-day-a-week work—no slacking in that business—and she finally had lost her health insurance at the time in her life when she needed it most. And if you look out at this sea of people and all those whom you represent, the fact that the health insurance system of America discriminates against millions of people because of their disabilities or because they have had serious illnesses or because they are too old when they switch jobs or when their employer gets in trouble, and the fact that it is wildly discriminatory against small business, which is creating most of the new jobs in this country but paying 30 or 40 percent more for health insurance than those of us in Government or working for big businesses do—all these things are keeping us from putting every person's talents to use; and especially, especially, the disabled Americans who could be in the work force if their employers could afford to provide them health insurance.

The people who fought for the Americans with Disabilities Act understood that. They originally had health care reform in the Act, and it had to be dropped, because they knew that this bill would be delayed for years if it had to deal with the difficult and complicated and politically explosive issue of health care reform. But I tell you, my fellow Americans, now is the time to act and to go forward and to finish the work that was done in the beginning 6 years ago.

Audience members. Now! Now! Now!

The President. Now is the time.

Audience members. Now! Now! Now!

The President. There are those who say, "Well, we can just reform the insurance laws and say everybody's entitled to insurance and everybody's entitled to take it from job to job and subsidize the poor more." Let me tell you, if we do that, we will cut Medicare for the elderly. We'll do a little more for the poor in the short run; we'll do nothing to help people be part of the working middle class because what will happen is insurance premiums will go up, coverage will go down, small businesses on the margin will stop covering, and people who wish to be part of the working middle class will have fewer, not more, opportunities to work and live to the fullest of their capacities.

We do not want to create a system where the only way you can have health care is if you are poor and go on welfare, if you go to jail, if you go to work for a big employer or the Government, or you are wealthy. We want a system that covers everybody so you can be what you want to be.

Let me tell you that for over a year—and in my case, as a citizen of this country and when I was a Governor for now more than 4 years—we have pursued every avenue; we have examined all evidence; we have solicited every suggestion for how to provide this kind of opportunity and security for all Americans. I have seen no one yet who has come up with a better idea than shared responsibility between employers and employees for private health insurance in our private health care system. It already works for most families; that's the way most families are covered. And in the State of Hawaii, it works for all families. In Hawaii, for 20 years, there's been a requirement for shared responsibility for private insurance between employers and employees.

And whenever I bring this up, people say, "Well, yes, Mr. President, but in Hawaii, everybody goes there because they want a vacation. It's sunny and people are healthier there. Everything is more expensive there, so what difference does it make if health insurance is more expensive? Everything costs more."

Look at the facts. First of all, 20 percent of the people in the health system in Hawaii are poor native islanders. Secondly, health insurance is the only thing in Hawaii that is not more expensive than anyplace else in America. It's 30 percent cheaper for small businesses than the average cost of health insurance in America because everybody pays and no one avoids their responsibility. And the people are healthier because they have primary and preventive care like the First Lady was talking about.

As has been pointed out, somewhat embarrassingly to them, there are many American companies now in the forefront of the fight against universal coverage who provide coverage to all their employees when they open businesses in other countries, and they do just fine. And they can do just fine here, too.

What is different about this moment in history? Well, I'll tell you what's different: For the first time ever, you have the American Medical Association——

Audience member. You're here.

The President. Thank you. Thank you. Somebody was whispering, "What's different at this moment in history is the President's crazy enough to take on this fight." [*Laughter*]

No, what is different? This time the American Medical Association, the American Association of Family Practice, the pediatricians, the American Nurses Association, the medical schools of the United States, the American Association of Retired People, the AFL–CIO and an association literally, literally, of hundreds of thousands of small businesses and many of the biggest businesses in the country, as well as a majority of the American people, all have agreed that the best way to do this is to have employers and employees share the responsibility for buying private insurance.

Now, how are we going to do it? Let me say that I desperately want a bipartisan bill. I have reached out to members of the other party; this bill passed with a bipartisan majority. At one point, two dozen Republican Senators supported Senator Chafee's bill for universal coverage. But every time I have reached out, they have moved further away. I feel like I keep reaching out. I wish we were in a car, and they would eventually run up against the door and have to come back to my way—[*laughter*]—because I keep reaching out.

Let me say that 22 years ago—22 years ago—a Republican President, Richard Nixon, and one of the incumbent Republican Senators from Oregon, Robert Packwood, offered a bill to require employers and employees to share the responsibility for private health insurance. If it was a good idea 22 years ago, it is a better idea today when things have gotten more difficult in terms of cost and coverage, and we ought to do it.

Now, let me say—you heard the Vice President with that quote from the Republican consultants say, "Let's send them home empty-handed." We've done that a lot, you know. We've done that a lot. It took 5 years to pass the ADA. When I showed up in town here, it had taken 7 years until we could finally pass the Brady bill last year—7 years—7 years; 7 years until we could finally pass the family and medical leave law last year—very important to you; 7 years until we could finally get the worldwide trade agreement that will add a half a million jobs in America between now and the end of the decade. A lot of times, if you want bipartisan consensus on a tough issue, it takes forever. But I tell you, we dare not wait longer. For 60 years, Presidents of both parties have known we should cover all Americans. We now see health care costs going up, and the only Government spending going up is in health care while we are desperately trying to bring this deficit down and invest in our future. And we know that in only 5 years, 5 million Americans have lost their coverage.

We are at an historic moment. For the first time ever, there are bills on the floor of both Houses of the Congress that will give Americans health care. We must say we don't care about politics. There are Democrats and Republicans and independents in this audience. There are people here today who voted for all three people who ran for President last time. I do not give a rip what your politics are, but I do want you to have health care so you can contribute to America's future.

Audience members. Health care now! Health care now! Health care now!

The President. That's right. Let me say this, I love these chants, but this is what often happens in our society: We're all here preaching to the saved. And I ask you, I ask you to go to the Congress with a simple message, and to go back home to your communities with a simple message. Let us discard politics. Let us put people first. And let our focus be simply this: what will work.

I have no pride of authorship. Nothing would please me more than if somebody else's name, 100 names, 400 names, 500 names in both Houses of Congress would be on a health care bill, but we dare not do something which holds out false hopes. Let's do what works. Let's complete the work of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Let's say to the whole world, this is one country that knows we don't have a person to waste, and we're going into the next century with all of our people, arm-in-arm.

God bless you. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:08 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. The proclamation of July 26 on the anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks Honoring the NCAA Women's Basketball Champion University of North Carolina Tar Heels

July 27, 1994

I apologize for being a little late. I've been on the phone with Members of the Congress, which I had to do. Senator Helms, Congressman Valentine, Congressman Lancaster, Congressman Price; I think Congressman McMillan's out there somewhere. Alex. It's good to see all of you, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great honor for me to have this basketball team here, if only to see them all looking normal after I watched that incredible end to the championship game. The University of North Carolina women's basketball team not only won its first national title this year but had the best record in the country and the school record, 33 wins. Coach Sylvia Hatchell broke the 400-career-victories mark and was named National Coach of the Year. But my guess is that—actually, I wanted to ask her this, whether when the team spray-painted her hair Carolina blue, it made it worthwhile, or she began to wonder. [*Laughter*]

I want to say, of course, a special word of congratulations to Charlotte Smith for that three-point shot. I can tell you I've been in a lot of tough fights myself around here, and there have been a lot of times when I've looked

around for somebody who could take that shot. [*Laughter*] And I want to congratulate Tonya Sampson, who I know has overcome some considerable personal challenges to be the leading scorer in Carolina women's basketball history.

I also want to say something that I have felt for a long time—and it's appropriate this year because North Carolina women's basketball and soccer teams won the NCAA titles, and so often in the past your men's basketball team has done so well—the thing I have always admired about the University of North Carolina is it's been a place that emphasized both academics and athletics and other extracurricular activities. And it's demonstrated to the country that it is not necessary to make a choice, and that there's something to be said for learning how to compete, to work on a team, to put aside your own personal ambitions for what is best for a group, and that an institution like the University of North Carolina, which I had the opportunity to join in celebrating its 200th birthday just a few months ago, can really set a standard for the entire country. And it's something that I hope not only other colleges and universities will look at but our school systems as well.

I get very concerned when I travel around the country and I see so many children growing up in difficult circumstances and they're going to schools that are no longer able to finance their team sports programs, their athletic programs, their music programs, the things that give children a chance to get out of themselves and reach beyond themselves and to grow and be part of something important. And I don't believe those things should ever be held to be in conflict with or adverse to developing our intellectual faculties that God gave us.

So the University of North Carolina is truly a symbol, it seems to me, of what our country ought to be striving for in the personal development of all of its students. And I'm especially glad to see the triumph of the women athletes this year. It's something that my wife and my daughter and my beloved mother, if she were still living, would always be very happy to see me here honoring today.

I thank you all, and I congratulate you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to team members Charlotte Smith, forward, and Tonya Sampson, guard.

Statement on Protection of Voting Rights

July 27, 1994

Over the past 30 years, the protection of voting rights, and the resulting increase in the number of minority representatives in Congress, has been a testament to our enduring democracy. Now, it is increasingly clear that a direct attack is being mounted on electoral districts that contain African-American or Hispanic population majorities. In the face of this attack, the position of this administration is clear: We are committed to the gains made by minority voters through enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

When the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965 with support from Democrats and Republicans alike, it was properly viewed as central to our Nation's efforts to eradicate racial discrimination. It seeks not only to increase the number of minority representatives, as important as that is. More fundamentally, it ensures that minority voters have an opportunity to cast meaningful votes and to elect candidates of their choice, particularly in those areas where politics are racially or ethnically polarized.

At my instruction, Attorney General Janet Reno and Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Deval L. Patrick are vigorously defending the congressional districts that are currently being challenged. Under their leadership the United States has either intervened as a party or become involved as a friend of the court in every one of these challenges. Ironically, these districts are the most integrated congressional districts in the Nation. Under the leadership of Deval Patrick, the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division is working hard to ensure that the Constitution has meaning for minority voters by making the case that these districts stay intact. I agree wholeheartedly that he

should have all the resources necessary for that work.

In the short-term, the fate of minority voting rights is in the courts. In the long-term, if necessary, I will work with Attorney General Reno and Members of Congress to enact legislation to clarify and reinforce the protections of the Voting Rights Act. Inclusion of all Americans in the political process is not a luxury; it is central to our future as the world's most vibrant democracy.

Statement on the National Rural Conference
July 27, 1994

Rural America, which makes up a quarter of our population, is vital to the overall development of our Nation's economy and future. This administration is committed to working closely with rural communities in tackling the important issues of jobs, trade, and the preservation of the family farm as our Nation enters the next century.

NOTE: This statement was included in a White House statement announcing the National Rural Conference scheduled for December 1.

Remarks on Anticrime Legislation at the Department of Justice
July 28, 1994

Thank you very much, Chief Moose, for the introduction and for your lifetime of service to your community and for the wisdom of your words and your leadership. Thank you, Attorney General Reno, for the magnificent work that you and the others here at the Justice Department have done on the crime bill. Thank you, Lee Brown, for the work you did to make sure that we had enough funds in the crime bill for drug prevention and drug education programs and drug treatment programs. Thank you, Secretary Bentsen, for the law enforcement work you do and the comments you made today. And I want to thank all of the Members of Congress who are here. I thank Senator Metzenbaum for letting Joe Biden get even with me by calling you in the middle of the night. [*Laughter*] I thank you, Congressman Hughes. I thank you, Congressman Schumer, for on occasion being like a mad dog in dealing with these issues. I think you will be proud into a deep, old age for the work you have done on this crime bill, and I thank you, sir.

And I cannot say enough about Chairman Brooks and Senator Biden. I like them both very much, and it's not hard to figure out why when you hear them up here talking. I ran completely out of my stash of donated cigars trying to get Jack Brooks to keep pushing ahead with every aspect of the crime bill. [*Laughter*] People always want to know, you know, what did the President give away to get this, that, or the other thing. All I gave away were mountains of crocodile tears and donated cigars because Jack Brooks wanted this country to have a crime bill. Joe Biden, I think you could see by the visible way that he is moved by this, how important it is to him. And I am profoundly grateful to him for that, and for what he said today. It is true that I called him at midnight, and that Joe asked him the next day if he remembered what the phone call was about. I wish I had asked him for a lot of other things, because I'm not sure he did. [*Laughter*] I could still make assertions about what we've talked about on that late night.

I thank all of you here who have worked on this bill, all the representatives of law enforcement and others who care about having a safer America.

Because the conference was finished just before we started this event, this is truly an historic day. On the verge we are of a major victory for our country. It's been a remarkable week

for America. I think all of us have joined in the elation we felt when Israel and Jordan's leaders came to this country and declared an end to their state of war and their intention to work together as friends, and took great pride in the role the United States played in bringing about that agreement. And then, less noticed but also important, the President of Russia made an announcement that by the end of August, for the first time since the end of World War II, all Russian troops would be gone from Germany and Central and Eastern Europe, and I'm proud of the role the United States has played in that endeavor. But I can't help thinking today it would be even more important if we could bring peace to the streets and the children of the United States.

The Vice President patted me on the back earlier this week when we were just sort of swelled up with happiness over the progress of things with Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein and said, "You know, this is one of the reasons that you ran for President."

But I can tell you, this is one of the reasons that I ran for President. Almost 20 years ago now I started my career in public life as attorney general of my State, being involved in the prosecution and the appeals of criminal cases, dealing with State police and defending them when we got sued over first one thing then another.

When I became Governor, I found myself in charge of a large and growing prison system, an overtaxed but dedicated State police, with the responsibilities to do everything from trying to prevent crime to carrying out the death penalty. I have lived on a daily basis for most of my life in public service with law enforcement officials. I have been to the funerals and to the homes of people who have been killed in the line of duty, repeatedly.

I have done everything I could over all these years to learn what it is we could do together to make it easier for people in law enforcement to do their job, and most importantly, to make it better for all of us to live in this country. Now, after nearly 6 years, congressional leaders and people in both parties have agreed on what will be the toughest, largest, and smartest Federal attack on crime in the history of the United States of America.

You know, it puts more police on the street and takes more guns off the street and takes more children off the street. It puts violent criminals behind bars and gives others the chance to avoid a life behind bars. Senator Biden and Chairman Brooks assure me this bill will be on my desk within days, and I assure you I will sign it into law without delay.

I want to ask you just for a moment, because most of what needs to be said about this bill has been said. But just for a moment, think about the meaning of this act today in terms of what all of you want for America, even those of you in uniform, what you want as citizens, as fathers and mothers and husbands and wives and children, and what you want for your children.

I got into this job I'm in because I was very worried that our country was going in the wrong direction, that our deficit was going up and our economy was going down, that we were increasing burdens on middle class Americans and reducing investment in them and their children. And I was very worried that as we move toward the 21st century, after our Nation won the cold war, that we would not be able to keep the American dream alive. And it was obvious to me that to do that, we would have to rebuild our economy and rebuild our sense of community and our families and empower individuals to do a better job of taking responsibility for themselves.

We tried to do that with a new economic policy to reduce the deficit and to give us the smallest Federal Government in 30 years and 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President and to increase investment in people and in trade, and it's working. We've got 3.5 million new jobs and a big drop in the unemployment rate. But if you think about it, even though the economy is going in the right direction, can we really hope—can we really hope to rebuild the economy, rebuild our sense of community, and empower individuals if we are frightened, if we are scared, if we are burdened by crime, if the highest rate of crime is now among people at their tenderest and most formative years, between the ages of 12 and 17 when we're trying to say, "Do this; do the right thing. You will be rewarded. You can have a good life. You can be a responsible parent. You can be a successful citizen"?

Look at the cost of crime to the economy. Look at the cost of crime to our sense of community and to the idea that we are an American family. Look at the cost of crime to our efforts to empower every individual, including all these

young people that are growing up in terribly difficult circumstances.

Remember just a few things that I have tried to tell the American people—the 9-year-old boy in New Orleans who said, "I'm asking you nicely to do something about crime because I'm afraid I might be shot;" and 9 days after he sent me the letter, he was shot dead because he just happened to be in the wrong place; the immigrant waiter in New York City who said he loved being in America, but he didn't like the fact that his son wasn't free, because he couldn't go to school without his daddy walking him to school and couldn't walk across the street and play in the park without somebody being there. And he asked me to make his son free.

All the other goals we seek for ourselves, in our families, for our children, in our workplaces, and for our great Nation, depend at bottom on our being able to live together with certain clear assumptions that, even though we are very different, we are different by race, we are different by religion, we are different by politics, there are a few basic things that will always hold us together, beginning with the fundamental respect for law, order, and our fellow human beings. And it is vanishing in too many places today.

Now, you have already heard this, but I have to say it again: For nearly 6 years this bill has been debated over and over again. Oh, the details have changed from time to time and when I was elected, I had some very specific ideas that I hoped would be in here, and you heard Senator Biden talk about his conviction about violence against women. And then in the 11th hour a few more good things were added. But for 6 years, the Congress has been trying to fashion a response to crime.

Most of the time the deliberation of Congress is a good thing, I suppose, but there are times in the history of a country when you just have to stop deliberating and act. And at a time like this when the world is changing so very fast, I think we really have to ask ourselves whether we can afford to take 6 years on a matter of this moment. Well, now it is done.

The most important thing about this crime bill, besides its specifics, which are very important, is what the chief said. He used the word "holistic." If you're a chief of police you can use that; if you're a politician they tell you it looks kind of funny to say a word like that because people aren't sure what it means. [*Laughter*] And if you're President, they tell you not to say it because you should never use a word that anybody's confused about. But what it means is to go beyond old ways of thinking and false choices. Are we going to be tough, or are we going to be compassionate? Are we going to go after criminals, or are we going to go after guns? These debates have divided us for too long while children died.

And the real achievement of the Congress at this moment is that they are going beyond those old ways of thinking. They are reaching for a new consensus that reflects the world we are living in and that recognizes the absolutely horrendous conditions in which a lot of our younger people are living and the need to be very, very firm but very, very smart about the road ahead, its difficulties, and its challenges.

We had to argue with a lot of people to get this bill. We had to fight with the NRA over the assault weapons ban, but we guaranteed over 600 hunting and sporting weapons free from Government interference. I would argue that both things were the right thing to do. We had almost unanimous consent, finally, for the idea that children should not be in the possession of handguns unless they are under the supervision of an appropriate adult.

We have a measure in here that we haven't talked much about to make our schools safer. If a child is not safe in school, how can the Republic go forward when we need education as the basis for our future? We had to fight with some of the folks in our party who thought that our approach on punishment was a little too tough. Then we had to fight with some folks in the other party who thought our approach on rehabilitation and prevention was a little too soft or too generous.

I want to say this: The prevention money in this bill is there for one reason—and I want this on the public record now—not because the President wanted it, although I did; not because the Attorney General wanted it, although she did; not because the drug director or the chairman of the Senate committee or the chairman of the House committee wanted it, although they did. The prevention money is in this bill because the law enforcement officials of the United States said, "We cannot jail our way out of this crisis. We've got to give our kids something to say yes to and a future." You told us to put it in there, and that is why it is in there.

So we have had a lot of arguments—but that is the essence of democracy—and we have gone beyond these categories that kept this bill bottled up, fights over ideas, fights over interest. We put the people of this country first again, and we focused on what they needed. Now I say to you: Let's not forget that the bill is not law. It has been voted out of a conference committee. The House must vote a rule to permit it to come to the vote. Then the House and the Senate must pass it.

It is urgent that we send the message out of this meeting that not only the law enforcement community but the American people want a 20 percent increase in the police forces in this country, 100,000 police, that you want the tougher punishment, that you want the capacity for imprisonment, that you want the prevention funds, that you want the assault weapons ban, that you want the ban on teenagers owning guns, that you want the protection for women against violence, that you want the schools to be safer, that you believe it makes sense because it deals with the problem in a human, intelligent, and firm way. And it gives us a chance to come together again as a people. Let's go pass the bill.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11:30 a.m. in the Great Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Charles Moose, chief of police, Seattle, WA.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting the Report on International Exchange Programs

July 28, 1994

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

As required by section 229(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), I am submitting the enclosed report on Federally-funded international exchange programs together with an analysis of the objectives of these programs and the extent to which the objectives of some of these programs are similar. Copies of the Fiscal Year 1993 report, *International Exchange and Training Activities of the U.S. Government*, prepared by the United States Information Agency (USIA) are enclosed.

United States Government educational, cultural, scientific, and professional exchange programs enhance communication and understanding between the United States and other societies. They are among the most effective tools to achieve long and intermediate range objectives of U.S. foreign policy. In Fiscal Year 1993, the Federal Government supported more than 105,000 international exchange participants at a cost of $1.4 billion.

Among the numerous categories of exchange activities, we have identified two in which similar programs are administered by different agencies: overseas foreign language and area studies undertaken by American citizens and the exchanges related to the encouragement of democratic processes. The programs in foreign language and area studies abroad by Americans, as currently legislated, are managed by the Department of Defense, the Department of Education, the Department of State, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and USIA. The programs are identified in the attachment to this letter. In the second category in which we have identified similar programs, democracy exchanges, subtleties of defining and measuring objectives require additional time for analysis. This will be done by October 31.

In an environment of funding constraints, it is important that international exchange programs be administered in a manner that ensures clarity of objectives and cost effectiveness. To help plan and better coordinate exchange activities, I have instructed the Director of USIA to convene periodic meetings of the major exchange-sponsoring departments and agencies. I have also asked relevant agencies to submit appropriate data to the USIA Director prior to these meetings.

My Administration will continue to work closely with the Congress to realize our shared goals of improving efficiency and reducing costs.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Nomination for Court of Appeals and District Court Judges
July 28, 1994

The President today announced the nomination of Diana E. Murphy to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. The President also named the following two individuals to serve on the Federal district bench: Dominic J. Squatrito for the District of Connecticut and Shira A. Scheindlin for the Southern District of New York.

"These nominees have demonstrated outstanding legal ability and a commitment to justice for all," the President said. "I am sure they will be of great service to our Nation's courts."

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

Remarks Announcing Further Assistance to Rwandan Refugees and an Exchange With Reporters
July 29, 1994

The President. Good morning. In the past week the United States has taken significant steps to alleviate the problems in Rwanda and the suffering, the terrible suffering, of the refugees. We have delivered more than 1,300 tons of equipment, food, water, and medicine. We have increased safe water production and distribution from nothing to 100,000 gallons a day.

This relief effort is the most difficult and complex the world has faced in decades. I want to commend all those in the field who are facing the frustrations and the heroic challenges.

The United States must do more. Today I have requested that Congress immediately provide $320 million in emergency relief assistance. I commend Chairman Obey, Chairman Byrd, Senator Leahy, and their colleagues for their swift action yesterday in support of the initial $50 million of these funds. If Congress approves the balance of our request, this would bring total United States assistance since April to almost half a billion dollars.

To monitor our on-the-ground activities in the refugee camps, I have asked Secretary Perry to visit the region this weekend and to make an immediate report to me upon his findings. We are urgently reviewing whether to open a new airfield in Kigali in Rwanda to help deliver supplies that are being held up because of the limited airport capacity in Zaire.

Let me be clear about this. Any deployment of United States troops inside Rwanda would be for the immediate and the sole purpose of humanitarian relief, not for peacekeeping.

The men and women of our Armed Forces have responded to this tragedy with vigor and speed. They have already met the goals we set out last week. The Entebbe air hub is operating around the clock. The Goma airport is capable of operating 24 hours a day. Transportation between airfields and the refugee camps is vastly improved, and as I noted, we are expanding water supplies as quickly as we possibly can.

The United States is also working hard with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to create conditions that are necessary for the refugees to return home to Rwanda. Assistant Secretary of State George Moose will be traveling again to Kigali this weekend to continue his talks with the new leadership, and we are hopeful that more refugees will be returning

soon. That is the only solution ultimately to this humanitarian tragedy.

Yesterday I met with representatives of the world's private relief organizations, whose employees and volunteers have converged on the refugee camps. The American people should know about the remarkable skill and compassion they bring to their work. But they, too, need more assistance to continue. And I appeal to all Americans to reach out in the form of private contributions to these relief efforts so that more people can be kept alive.

Working together with the international community, both public and private, I believe we are making progress in the battle against suffering and death on the borders of Rwanda. The United States will not cease its efforts until the dying stops and the refugees have returned. This is our mission; we must continue it until it's accomplished.

Before I close, I'd also like to say a word about the terrible wildfires that are burning in the West. As of this morning, we had reports of 320 fires burning in seven States. The Interagency Fire Command Center in Boise reports that the Federal Government has mobilized more than 330 fire crews and more than 200 fire engines, helicopters, and air tankers. Two battalions of marines have begun training today and will be deployed to fight the fires as soon as possible. Our hearts go out to all those who have been displaced or who have lost property in these fires.

The Federal Government will continue to monitor the situation closely, to marshal the necessary resources, and to coordinate the firefighting efforts. This is a deeply troubling development, but we will do all we can to help them deal with it.

Now I'd like to turn the briefing over to the National Security Adviser, Mr. Lake, and to General Shalikashvili to discuss the operations in Rwanda in greater detail, and to answer whatever questions you have.

Q. How do you feel about the French going out of Rwanda, Mr. President?

Q. What about mission creep?

Q. How many troops would have to go if there are troops who have to go to Kigali, Mr. President?

The President. You've asked me three questions. I want to let General Shalikashvili respond to Andrea's [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News] question.

I don't think that—mission creep is not a problem here. And General Shalikashvili will explain why that is. We've had a long talk—we just completed about an hour and 45 minutes national security principals meeting this morning. And I do not believe that that is a problem.

With regard to—the French will have to make whatever decision they make. But I do believe you will have large numbers of people contributing to this humanitarian effort. I was most deeply moved when we met yesterday at some length and the general and Mr. Lake and others briefed the representatives of the nongovernmental organizations. I am deeply moved by the number of volunteer organizations, many of them American citizens, who are there working. I think everyone knows this is a humanitarian effort, and it will be kept at that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:15 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Teleconference Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the Unity '94 Convention in Atlanta, Georgia

July 29, 1994

The President. Thank you, Connie. I want to add my congratulations to Nancy Maynard and to say hello to my friend Wilma Mankiller and to all of you in Atlanta at the Unity '94 Convention.

I want to say a special word of congratulations, too, to the four minority journalist associations meeting together for the first time at this groundbreaking occasion. I must say that all of us have heard a lot about your meeting and have been following it with great interest.

We're living in an extraordinary time when people in America and all across the world are searching for common ground and new solutions in a time of change. This has been a great week for America. The King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel shared the stage on the White House lawn, opened a new era of dialog and cooperation between their people. At the same time, halfway around the world, the President of Russia made an announcement that by the end of August, for the first time since the end of World War II, all Russian troops would be gone from Germany and Central and Eastern Europe, a significant goal of our policy with Russia over the last year and a half.

Over and over, we have learned from experiences like these that people can transcend great historical, political, and cultural obstacles in the name of progress of humanity. And we've also learned that here at home, the American people are our greatest asset as we try to meet the challenges of the coming century. All of us can take pride that we've helped Arabs and Israelis and other former enemies to bridge their own differences. But their examples must also inspire us to strengthen our own sense of community and to celebrate the rich diversity of the American culture.

The job of your associations is to see that more Americans of diverse backgrounds, races and ethnic heritage have an equal chance in journalism. It's also to make sure that the Nation sees the faces and hears the voices of nonwhite Americans whose ideas and achievements too often are ignored.

And my job here in Washington is to ensure that every citizen has an equal chance at the American dream. I've said it many times, and I firmly believe that we don't have a single person to waste, that every person, no matter what his or her background, has an idea, a vision, an opinion to share that can enrich our Nation. That's why I've been fighting to create new opportunities for people who work hard, take responsibility, try to make something of their lives. I believe everybody has something to give, and we have to make it possible for everyone to give his or her best.

One of my proudest accomplishments as President is the people I have appointed to serve in this administration. If you look at the top positions in the White House and the Cabinet today, you will see the most able, talented group ever assembled. These appointees also happen to make up the most diverse administration in the history of our Republic.

If you look at our nominations to the Federal bench, you will see that a higher percentage of them have been rated "well qualified" by the American Bar Association than in any previous administration since these rankings have been made. A majority of those appointees are people of color and women, not a minority but a majority for the first time ever.

None of these people were chosen because they were African-American or Hispanic or Asian-American or American Indian or because they were women. They were selected because they were the best qualified for the job. And they are proof that the American dream is still alive and within reach of those who choose to pursue it.

Still, we can't ignore the burdens and barriers that prevent too many of our people from moving forward in their lives still today. It is our job to renew the American dream. I sought the Presidency because I was worried that our country was going in the wrong direction. The deficit was going up; the economy was on the decline. Washington was placing heavier and heavier burdens on the backs of middle class Americans, and we were coming apart when we ought to be coming together.

I believed then and I believe now that our job in this time is to restore the economy, rebuild our sense of community, empower individuals to take responsibility for their own lives, and put Government on the side of ordinary Americans. In just 18 months we've begun to renew that American dream. Our economic strategy will produce the smallest Federal bureaucracy in 30 years and 3 years in a row of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, while providing tax cuts for 15 million working American families and millions of small businesses.

What's been the result of this economic strategy? Well, the economy has created 3.8 million new jobs; inflation is the lowest in two decades. Just today we've seen more evidence that this strategy is working. Today's report shows that the gross domestic product of the United States grew at a very impressive rate of 3.7 percent in the last quarter while inflation remained low.

And more important, we're reaching out with greater energy and compassion to responsible working families who too often have to struggle

to make ends meet. Already in just a year and a half, through the increase of the earned-income tax credit, 15 million working parents have been able to get lower income taxes to encourage them to stay in the work force and to be good parents without having to go on welfare. We've made it easier for millions and millions of young people to get college loans by making those loans available with lower interest rates and more flexible repayment schedules. We've established more job training and school-to-work apprenticeships to help young people who aren't going to college find and keep good jobs. We've sought tax incentives and grant money to stimulate economies in needy areas, through things like our empowerment zones and enterprise communities and new community development banks, the reform of the Community Reinvestment Act and making low income housing credits permanent.

Some of these achievements, to be sure, have come easier than others. But I knew when I asked for this job that progress would not always be easy and that we'd have to fight for the kind of change that we need. Very often it takes years to get things done—the Brady bill, 7 years; the family leave law, 7 years; years for motor voter. But these things all work because these things together and the efforts we are making have brought us to a pivotal, exciting moment in our history.

If you just think about what's happened this week alone it's been remarkable for our Nation: on the verge of an historic victory in the toughest, largest, smartest Federal attack on crime in the history of the United States; not only making peace in the Middle East but trying to bring more peace to the families and children of America. Just think for a minute about what this crime bill means for all of us as citizens, for us as mothers and fathers, husbands and wives and children. Look at the cost of crime to our economy. Look at the cost of crime to our sense of community and to the idea that we are an American family, to our sense of personal freedom; the cost of crime to our efforts to empower every individual, including too many young people who are growing up in terribly difficult circumstances.

Crime is holding too many of us back from reaching the American dream, splintering families, making people afraid of their neighbors, interfering with our children's education, robbing us of our literal sense of personal freedom. No matter what other goals we seek for ourselves and our families and our children and for our country, we simply have to be able to live together with a shared respect for law and order and civility.

The most important thing about this crime bill is that it creates a whole new way of thinking about how to deal with crime, one that doesn't pit one group of Americans against another. It doesn't ask us to make a false choice between tough punishment and strong prevention. It calls for a sensible balance between the two. It doesn't ask us to make a false choice between going after criminals and going after guns. It recognizes that those sorts of debates divided us for too long while more and more children were dying on our streets.

The crime bill strengthens the police, our system of punishment, and our means of prevention. It will put 100,000 more police on our streets, a 20-percent increase in the number of police officers patrolling our neighborhoods. More police trained and properly deployed means lower crime and prevention. The bill includes a ban on assault-style weapons, something few people ever dreamed would be accomplished. It includes a ban on ownership of handguns by minors. It will send a strong message to criminals that behavior that is criminal and repeated will not be tolerated and that punishment will be tough and swift. And it will invest $9 billion in crime prevention over the next 6 years, something that law enforcement officers in every State and city asked us to do so that we could give young people more safe places to go, more positive role models, more opportunities to fulfill themselves in healthy constructive ways. And we have a program to make our schools safe so that our children can learn again in the absence of fear.

For 6 years, this crime bill was debated over and over again. Why is it about to succeed? Because after intense argument and disagreement, a majority of people were able to find common ground. They were able to put people over politics. Now, I want Congress to put this bill on my desk within 2 weeks so that I can sign it before our children go back to school.

Now, if you think 6 years was long enough to wait for a crime bill, then surely we can all agree that 60 years is far too long to wait before all American are guaranteed health security that can never be taken away. And health

security, after all, is another crucial piece of the American dream.

Many people across our country know what it's like to dig and scrape all their lives to have the opportunities that you've been given and that you've earned. If you're like me, you actually know somebody without health insurance or somebody at risk of losing their health insurance. You know somebody whose coverage is so meager, they avoid the doctor because it costs too much. You know people who are eager to work but are trapped in the welfare system because it's the only way they can be assured of health care coverage for their children. We know these people because there are millions and millions of them out there, people who struggle all their lives and play by the rules so that they can move forward, make progress, build security for their families only to be knocked off the ladder because of the pink slip, the catastrophic illness, or a simple change in jobs.

Indeed, we're moving in the wrong direction in our health care system. We're moving in the wrong direction when 5 million hardworking people, people with jobs, have lost their insurance in the last 5 years. Indeed, there's a smaller percentage of Americans insured today than there were 10 years ago.

Ever since I began pushing for reform, I've made it clear that I was open to suggestions about how to achieve it. I've listened to concerns about the approach we originally proposed. And in response to what all kinds of Americans told us, I've agreed that we should modify that approach to make it simpler, less bureaucratic, more flexible, to do more for small business. But I remain committed, and I hope all of you will be committed to giving every American health security, health that is guaranteed in law.

We must have a system, I believe, where everyone shares responsibility, a private system that works. That is certainly what the vast majority of Americans want, because today the hardworking middle class Americans have that kind of coverage.

Today we've moved a step closer to health care security. The House Speaker, Tom Foley, and the majority leader, Dick Gephardt, said they would put forward a bill that achieves universal coverage and controls costs. They've met their goal and the goal of the American people in doing that. The House bill tells the American people that they have been heard. It is simpler, more flexible, more sensitive to small business. Gone is the bureaucracy they didn't like. Protections for small businesses have been strengthened. The bill is being phased in over a longer period of time. All Americans can keep their health plan and their doctor, and everybody will have coverage.

We know from experiences across the country that this will work. We also know what doesn't work. We have seen in State after State that if you have insurance reforms that sound very good without expanding to universal coverage, what is usually going to happen is that the cost of insurance goes up and then people's options for health care or even the number of people with health insurance, go down. But we also know from looking at the example of Hawaii that a private system of universal coverage in which employers and employees share responsibility for paying for private insurance premiums will not only control costs but will also lead to greater coverage and a healthier population.

We know it can be done. After all, in Hawaii, nearly everything is more expensive than any place else in the United States, but health care premiums for small business are 30 percent cheaper. Now, after 60 years of waiting, after 14 years in which costs have been going up dramatically, after a decade in which more and more Americans are losing coverage instead of getting coverage—and most of those who lose their insurance are working people—it's time to say to every American, if you change jobs, if you get sick, if you're laid off, if your child has a serious illness, you will always be able to afford health care as a citizen of the richest nation on Earth.

Tomorrow I'm going to Independence, Missouri, to Harry Truman's hometown, to talk about health care. Harry Truman was a man of great decency, common sense, and courage who believed that America would be much stronger if every American had health security. He was right. And he fought hard for it, though he didn't succeed. And because he was right, President after President, Presidents of both parties have fought for that goal. Well, now it's up to us to fulfill their vision and once again to renew the American dream. It's time to build on our economic progress, build on the success of the crime bill, build on the progress we're making toward world peace, and take this next

critical step by passing real, substantive health care reform. That is the challenge our generation faces today. And it is our great opportunity.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the moderator thanked the President and invited participants to ask questions. A participant then asked about proposed Native American gaming legislation.*]

The President. Well, I'm not familiar with all the details of the gaming law. Let me say this. I have worked hard with Secretary Babbitt to work with the Native American tribes throughout the country——

[*At this point there was a problem with the satellite transmission.*]

Have you lost my sound?

Q. Yes, we did. Can you continue? We can hear you now, Mr. President.

The President. Okay, let's try again.

I said I'm not familiar with the details of the legislation. I can tell you that for the last 18 months, Secretary Babbitt, on my behalf, has worked hard to try to work through the Indian gaming issue, to be supportive of the tribes, to protect and promote their legitimate rights, and also to urge that the income from gaming be used to diversify the economic activities of the tribes and to strengthen economic possibilities for Native Americans over the long run.

So I'm going to do my best to do that. As you know, there are a lot of thorny controversies between the States. A lot of States feel pressure to expand gaming beyond the reach of the Native American groups, and this has been a very difficult issue. But I think that our administration has worked very closely with the tribes. And I think we have shown our good faith in trying to protect these activities. We will continue to do so.

I am not familiar with the specifics of the law, so I can't comment on that. I'm sorry.

Multiethnic Media Coverage

[*A participant asked how the lack of diversity in the Washington press corps affected coverage of a multiethnic America.*]

The President. I'm not sure that I can answer that question. And I am fairly sure that if I do, my answer will be blown all out of proportion to anything else I say today. But let me say that I believe that all of us in positions of responsibility with influence should strive to make our decisions through a process that involves all the American people, their insights, their understanding, their experience and it takes advantage of their talents. That's why I've worked so hard to have the most diverse administration in American history. And I believe we have proved beyond question that you can have diversity and excellence. That's another one of those false choices people are always trying to put on the American people.

So if it is true for the United States Government, it ought to be true for the American press as well. I don't think I should say more than that, but I think that ought to be enough to say.

Health Care Reform

[*A participant asked how vaccination of all children in the country could be achieved without health care coverage for undocumented aliens.*]

The President. Undocumented workers would not receive under our plan a health security card unless they had jobs anyway, so they got it because they were in the workplace. But under our plan we have a significant expansion in funds for public health units which are open to all people today and where a lot of the vaccinations, for example, are done today.

In my State, over 80 percent of our children, including even upper middle class children, are vaccinated through the public health units. So what we attempted to do to deal with this clear and present problem in the United States is to have a substantial increase in funding for public health and to do outreach so that we can vaccinate all the children and give basic health services to the children who are within the United States.

Racism

[*A participant asked if the administration would confront the issue of racism.*]

The President. Well first, let me say that I don't agree with the characterization there. If you look at the work that the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has done, it's been more active than any civil rights division in a generation under the leadership of Deval Patrick. Look at the Denny's settlement. Look at a lot of the other issues in which they have been involved.

If you look at the work that Henry Cisneros did in highlighting and directly confronting the

problems in Vidor, Texas, in public housing, if you look at the work that we have done in trying to involve at the grassroots level community groups of minorities in things like developing the empowerment zone concepts, the community development banks, I think it is plain that this is an administration that is committed to stamping out racism, both in a negative sense by standing up to it and in a positive sense by working to bring people together to overcome it.

If you can think of anything else I can and should do, I would be glad to have your recommendations and your suggestions. But the idea of stamping out racism, in my view, permeates everything I do. When I try to give kids a better life, a safer street, a better future, and I keep telling the American people we don't have anyone to waste, we've got to have everybody in here together—one of the earlier questions referred to how the administration—or what my opinion was about the way things were covered given the makeup of the press—I have been repeatedly criticized by various sources in this town for trying to be more diverse and try to reach out and to achieve greater diversity, although no one has ever said that we couldn't have excellence and diversity at the same time.

So I am trying to build the fight against racism into everything we do, both in a positive and negative sense. But I will say again, if anybody there—not just you, Dorothy, but anybody has any other suggestions about what I can do, I would be happy to hear them, and I will do my best to respond.

Health Care Reform

Q. If Congress passes a bill that fails to include some mechanism for universal coverage, will you sign it or veto it, yes or no?

The President. Well, what I have said is that we have to achieve universal coverage. The fight now is over how best to do it. And what I have to tell you is there is a big argument about whether it can be achieved in any way other than the way I have proposed. I will not sign a bill that I think makes a false promise to the people of the United States. We have got to sign a bill that achieves full coverage for the American people. If you don't do it, you can't contain costs, you can't give the breaks that small business needs over the long run. You can't achieve these things.

So, yes, if Congress passes a bill that is different from the one I originally proposed, would I veto it? It depends on whether it achieves full coverage. If it is a credible attempt to do that, then I'm open to it. But it must be a credible, credible bill to do that.

And that's the only thing I ask all of you to focus on now. Instead of letting the political rhetoric control this debate on health care, let us ask simply what will work.

The other day—let me just give you this in closing because this is very important, and if I don't achieve anything else today in this conversation that I've had with you, which I've enjoyed immensely, if I can achieve agreement with you on this, it would be something profound to me. This is a very complicated issue, health care. I have studied it for years and years. But the more complex it gets, the more you understand that in the end it comes down to some simple choices. In every nation that has covered everybody, quality health care can be provided at lower costs than in the United States, the only nation that doesn't cover everybody.

So what I ask us all to do, as others come forward with their ideas and bend over backwards to avoid what I think we should do, which is to require all employers and employees to take responsibility through private insurance, let us ask: Will it work? We are going in the wrong direction. We are losing coverage and exploding cost. I am not going to sign a bill that I think perpetrates these problems on the American people.

If someone else can figure out how to get universal coverage in a different way than I have achieved it, I would be open to that. I have not seen it yet. That's why the American Medical Association, the National Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, other physicians' groups, and huge numbers of businesses and consumer groups have endorsed our approach.

So that's what we ought to be doing. We shouldn't be trying to get ourselves into word games now about what mechanism is appropriate. The only test is what works. And I know my plan will work if we share responsibility and cover everybody.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:20 p.m. from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building.

In his remarks, he referred to Connie Chung, luncheon emcee; Nancy Maynard, cofounder, Maynard Institute; and Wilma Mankiller, chief, Sioux nation.

Remarks to the American Legion Boys Nation
July 29, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Welcome to the White House. I want to say a special word of welcome to your president, Thomas Whitehead, and your vice president, Robert Mattivi, and to Jack Mercier, George Blume, and Ron Engel. And to all of you, welcome and congratulations.

I have a special treat for you today. This has been a remarkable week for America, a great week for you to be here. We had the signing of the agreement between the King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel ending the state of war between them, the announcement that Russia would withdraw all of its troops from Central and Eastern Europe, for the first time since the end of World War II, by the end of August. We had the announcement today that our economy grew 3.7 percent in the last quarter, that jobless claims are down, that the robust growth is continuing. It's produced now 3.8 million new jobs in the last year and a half.

And yesterday we had the historic agreement by the Senate and the House on what will be the toughest and smartest crime bill in the history of the country, that will put 100,000 more police officers on the street, ban assault weapons, provide a "three strikes and you're out" law, and provide billions of dollars to young people for activities to give our kids something to say yes to as well as to punish people who do the wrong thing.

And then today we had an historic event just about an hour ago, where a new Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Stephen Breyer, was confirmed. And I thought it would be a nice thing if Mr. Justice Breyer, accompanied by Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch, would come here and make his first public appearance to you. So I'd like to ask Justice Breyer and Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch—[*applause*].

I wanted to say just a word about this, and then I'd like to ask Justice Breyer to come up here and speak to you for a moment or two, and then they'll all have to go back to work.

Let me thank Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch and Chairman Biden and the other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who recommended Judge Breyer by a unanimous vote to the Senate as a whole.

This gentleman has set a standard of excellence and fidelity to the law and the Constitution of which every American can be proud. When he came before the Senate, there was a very broad spectrum of praise for his appointment among Democrats and Republicans alike, among people who consider themselves liberals and people who consider themselves conservatives.

I have now had the honor to appoint two people to the United States Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer have now shown that we can have excellence on the Supreme Court that unites the American people, rather than divides them.

Let me say that—we were joking a little out here—the Founding Fathers in their wisdom said that there had to be somebody hanging around to resolve these fundamental constitutional disputes, and so they created the Supreme Court. And they didn't want the Supreme Court to be subject to undue pressure, so they gave the Justices of the Supreme Court a lifetime term, so they could say no to everybody, including the President. And we were laughing on the way out that Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatch are running for reelection, and of course, the President gets a 4-year term. Now Justice Breyer has a lifetime term. You are looking at the only man in America that you've met lately with total job security. [*Laughter*]

There is a reason for it. Someone needs to be free to decide what the Constitution requires

of the rest of us without the pressures of day-to-day politics. But that imposes on the President and on the United States Senate a very heavy responsibility to pick someone with the character and wisdom to use that awesome power and that lifetime guarantee in the interests of our Constitution, our values, and all the American people, without regard to their race, their income, and their background. I believe Justice Breyer will be that kind of person, and it's an honor for me to introduce him to you at this time.

[*At this point, Justice Stephen Breyer made brief remarks.*]

The President. Well, I am glad we were able to do that, and I hope you enjoyed it.

As all of you know, we share a common bond. I sat where you are 31 years ago, and Senator Kennedy's brother was here as President. Ironically, Senator Kennedy pulled out the record of what President Kennedy said to us when I was here where you are, and on that day he happened to be meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So he brought them out to meet the Boys Nation delegates. And so you'll now always be able to remember this, and I think as Justice Breyer goes on to a long and distinguished career on the Supreme Court, when you read about him or you hear some decision that he's written, I hope you will always remember this day with pride and with some amount of joy.

I was thinking a little today about how different the world is now from what it was like 31 years ago when I was here. We were in the middle of the cold war; Russia was still the Soviet Union; our troops faced each other, divided, in Berlin. We still had huge amounts of legal segregation in large parts of the United States. There were all kinds of problems. But at the same time, we had enormous faith in the capacity of our economy and our people to solve those problems.

Now the cold war is over. We had all those good events I told you about this week. We have been working very, very hard to try to deal with the horrible tragedy in Rwanda. And again, I have been so impressed with and grateful for our military in their capacity to move quickly over there to take a terrible situation—we have delivered 20 million packets of oral rehydration therapy to try to help the people with cholera. We've gone from zero to 100,000 gallons of water a day to serve the people there almost overnight.

We have all these things going on. And yet we know that there's still a sense of foreboding, of worry in our country because we do have a lot of problems. There's still a lot of people that want jobs that don't have them. There are people who have jobs who are insecure in those jobs. We have people who are growing up in mean streets and tough neighborhoods where there's too much crime and violence. There was a study last week which showed young people between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely than people younger than or older than them to be victims of violent crime, that even in cities where the crime rate is going down, often it's going up among young people.

So there is a disturbing as well as a hopeful atmosphere in the country. The thing I always love about Boys Nation is that I can look out and be guaranteed I'll see 96 optimists. And that's a very important thing for our country because a great deal of how we live and whether we go forward depends upon our willingness to view the future with possibility and hope. And a big part of the battle I fight around here as President every day is to try to keep people's spirits up and their eyes on the future and thinking about big things, not little things, and believing that we can make a difference. And I believe that.

I ran for President because I was very concerned about the direction of the country. We had the economy going down and the deficit going up, middle class people being burdened more, while we weren't investing enough in our young people, in our future. The country was coming apart when I thought we ought to be coming together. And my simple mission is to make sure that the American dream is there for you in the 21st century and to do it by restoring the economy, rebuilding our sense of community, empowering individuals to take responsibility for themselves and to do it by putting the power of Government on the side of ordinary Americans.

The first thing I tried to do was to get our economic house in order. We had quadrupled the debt of the United States in 12 years. You were facing a prospect, by the time you were my age, we'd be spending a third or more of all your tax money just paying off our deficit.

Now, we've had the biggest deficit reduction program in history. We have reduced the size

of the Federal Government dramatically. By the end of this decade, your National Government will be under 2 million people in size for the first time since I came here when President Kennedy was President—smallest Federal Government in 30 years. We will have 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. And it's produced 3.8 million jobs and a 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate. Last year, we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States since the end of World War II, in any year. So we're moving the economy in the right direction.

What else do we have to do? We've got to make sure young people are ready to compete in it. We need a system of lifetime learning in which a young person, who will change jobs on average seven or eight times in a lifetime, will know that he or she can always, always get the training, the skills, the knowledge that you need if you have to make a change.

You know, when you make changes in life, they can either be very frightening or very exciting. And usually, changes are a little bit of both, aren't they? Usually changes are a little bit of both. And what keeps our country going is knowing that changes always have more hope than fear in them, that there's more excitement than there is reservation. And every time in our country we come to the end of one era and start another, there's almost a mental war that goes on inside the American people: Are we going to be scared, or are we going to be hopeful? Because we've always had problems, and we're always going to have problems. The Scripture says we'll have problems until the end of the Earth. It's part of our human nature, right?

So when we come to the end of one era and we start another, the issue is, will our dominant feeling be fear or hope? In the 20th century, when World War I was over, the American people said, we do not have any more energy for the problems of the world. We withdrew from the world. We elected a President who said he would take us back to normalcy, whatever that meant, and give everybody a good lettin' alone. And there was this huge uprising of the Ku Klux Klan right after World War I and a huge uprising of a Red scare—you know, there was a Communist under every bush.

At the end of World War II, the same thing happened, but we had a President named Harry Truman who said, "We're not going to walk away from our problems at home; we're not going to walk away from our obligations abroad." He passed the GI bill to give the soldiers coming home housing and education and a way to support their families. He put in motion the system that allowed us to stop communism and win the cold war. He passed the Marshall plan to restore Europe and Japan after World War II so that even our former enemies could become our allies and our trading partners. Today, America has a very close relationship with both Germany and Japan, our bitter enemies in World War II, fighting for democracy, fighting for economic growth.

But all the time, there were people who said, "Oh, I'm more scared than full of hope." There were people who said Harry Truman was radical, incompetent, unfit to be President, too liberal—accused him of being soft on communism. At that time—some of you will read about this when you go to college—not long after that, Senator Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin started saying every third person he met was a Communist. It's interesting, because Wisconsin has historically been one of the most progressive States in America. But what it shows you is, at the end of one time and the beginning of another, when people are used to looking at the world through this set of glasses and then they haven't put on another set of glasses yet, anybody can be confused.

And that's what we're seeing today. We've come to the end of the cold war, and I can no longer be President and just tell you that we'll view everything in terms of our competition with the Russians, because it's not true anymore. We're cooperating with the Russians. I just was elated the week before last when the United States Congress passed by overwhelming majorities our continuation in the international space station project which now is not an American project to put a space station in the sky, it's an American, a European, a Japanese, a Canadian, and now a Russian project. We're going into the future together. And that's good.

But what it means is, when you're trying to get people to build the future and when there's not an obvious enemy and when you have a lot of responsibilities, there's a big question out there in the country. Are we going to be dominated by our hopes or our fears? Are we going to be builders or dividers? When we look at

America's problems and promise, is the glass half empty, or is the glass half full? You wouldn't be here if you didn't think the glass was half full, if you didn't believe in yourselves, your communities, and the future of your country.

What I want to say to you goes way beyond any kind of partisan politics or issue. It is that this country has now been around for a very long time, 218 years since the Declaration of Independence, 11 years less than that since the Constitution. We have been around for a very long time. And the way we have survived is by believing in the future and by coming together, not being driven apart. And we've had to redefine over and over and over again what coming together means. Upstairs in the next floor up here, in 1863, Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, in this house, liberating the slaves. Before that, coming together meant what all the white folks decided to do. He redefined that forever. It took us another 100 years and more to figure out how to live together. We haven't quite got it all worked out yet, but we've made a lot of progress.

Now what we have to do is to figure out, how are we going to restore our economy? How are we going to make it work for all Americans? How is all this racial and other diversity we have in our country going to make us stronger and more united? How do we stand up for what we believe in our religion and our politics and still respect people who are totally different from what we are? How can we live together? Los Angeles County alone has 150 different racial and ethnic groups, one county. Can we be an American family?

I can tell you this. If we figure it out, nobody can stop this country because in a world where the global economy gets smaller and smaller and smaller, having somebody in your country who's an American first but who understands every other culture in the world is a huge plus. It is a big deal we should be happy about.

So, can we be a community again? How can we rescue all these kids that are in trouble? How can we drive the crime rate down and the graduation rate up? How can we empower people so that they don't think the Government's doing something for them but the Government is doing something with them to give them the skills to take responsibility for their own lives? These are the great questions. How can we live in a world where we promote peace and prosperity by taking care of the remaining nuclear threats, stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, promoting democracy, and at least trying to limit chaos and human suffering as we are doing in Rwanda?

And it is clear, as we move toward the next century, to me, that a major, a major, major, major factor in what it looks like, whether the American dream is alive for you and your children, is whether we believe we can do these things.

And so, that's what I want to leave you with. Whatever your politics, whatever your philosophy, whatever your party, do not participate in this movement that happens at the end of every great era to be cynical, to be negative, to be divisive, to look down on your friends and neighbors, to see the glass as half empty, not half full. This is America. The glass is half full, and you can fill it up the rest of the way if you are determined to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:08 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Jack Mercier, director of activities, and Dr. George Blume, legislative program director, Boys Nation; and Ronald A. Engel, deputy director for Americanism, American Legion.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Health Care Reform Legislation

July 29, 1994

Hard working middle class Americans have moved a step closer to real health security today. House Speaker Foley and Majority Leader Gephardt said they would put forward a bill that achieves universal coverage and controls costs.

They have met their goal and the goal of the American people.

The House bill tells the American people that they have been heard. The bill is simpler, more flexible, and more sensitive to the needs of small business. Gone is the bureaucracy they didn't like. Protections for small businesses have been strengthened. And the bill is being phased in over a longer period. All Americans can keep their health plan and doctor, and everyone will have coverage.

The bill also recognizes that shared responsibility is the best way to achieve universal coverage. It works. Building on the current system where 9 out of 10 Americans receive private insurance through the workplace just makes sense. It works abroad, and it's supported here at home by the AMA, AARP, AFL–CIO, hundreds of thousands of big and small businesses and a majority of the American people.

Speaker Foley, Majority Leader Gephardt, the committee and subcommittee chairs and many Members of the House should be commended for their tireless work to fashion a bill to go to the House floor. They chose a pragmatic and more moderate path; they've achieved the shared goal of universal coverage, and it works for ordinary Americans.

The time has come to pull together and work in a bipartisan manner to deliver guaranteed health care coverage to all Americans.

Statement on the Death of John Britton and James Barrett

July 29, 1994

I strongly condemn the senseless shootings today which abruptly ended the lives of two men and seriously wounded a third in Pensacola, Florida.

The safety, freedom, and protection of all our citizens is paramount in guaranteeing the health and vitality of our Nation. I am strongly committed to ending this form of domestic terrorism that threatens the fabric of our country. I encourage a quick and thorough investigation into this tragic incident as the local officials work closely with the resources of the Federal law enforcement community.

Hillary and I extend our deepest sympathy to the friends and family of Dr. John Britton and Mr. James Barrett on their tragic loss today, and I speak for all Americans in expressing my hope for a full and complete recovery for Mrs. June Barrett.

NOTE: Dr. Britton and his escorts, Mr. and Mrs. Barrett, were attacked as they arrived at an abortion clinic where the doctor worked.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the Continuation of Export Control Regulations

July 29,1994

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On September 30, 1990, in Executive Order No. 12730, President Bush declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States resulting from the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, the President continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, and Executive Order

No. 12131 of May 4, 1979, as amended by Executive Order No. 12551 of February 21, 1986.

2. President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12730 pursuant to the authority vested in him as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. At that time, the President also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). On March 27, 1993, the Export Administration Act was extended through June 30, 1994. Subsequently, on September 30, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12867, terminating Executive Order No. 12730.

3. Section 401(c) of the NEA additionally requires the submission of a final report on all expenditures incurred during the period of emergency. This report, covering the period from September 30, 1990, to September 30, 1993, is submitted in compliance with this requirement.

4. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 3-year period from September 30, 1990, to September 30, 1993, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are estimated to have been $117,720,000, most of which represented program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel, and overhead expenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 29, 1994.

The President's Radio Address
July 30, 1994

Good morning. This was a good week for America, as we Americans were reminded again not just of our problems but of the immense possibilities of our times and our country.

First, here at the White House, two brave leaders, King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel, put an end to their state of war and declared their intention to work together to promote lasting peace between their peoples.

Meanwhile, President Boris Yeltsin announced this week that Russian troops would leave Estonia by August 31st. With this withdrawal, all Russian troops will be out of Central and Eastern Europe for the first time since the end of World War II, a major goal of our policy with Russia for the last 18 months.

I'm proud of everything our country has done to further the march of hope over despair around the world. In times of historic change, America has always risen to great challenges at home as well as abroad.

Yesterday it was announced that our economy grew 3.7 percent in the second quarter of this year. Jobless claims were down dramatically again. We've got strong growth with low inflation.

In the last 18 months, we've begun the work of renewing the American dream. Our national economic strategy, with $255 billion of budget cuts, tax breaks for small business and 15 million working American families, new investments in education and training and expansion of trade, and a reduction in the Federal bureaucracy to its smallest level in 30 years, has produced 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, 3.8 million new jobs in our economy, the largest number of new businesses formed in any year since World War II, and a 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate. We're moving in the right direction.

And this week, after 6 years of delay, congressional leaders finally reached agreement on the toughest, largest, smartest Federal attack on crime in the history of our country.

I sought the Presidency because I was concerned about the direction of our Nation. I was concerned that we were losing the American dream for our children and that we had to restore the economy, rebuild our communities, and empower individuals to assume responsibil-

ities for their future. To do that, we had to have a Government that worked for ordinary Americans. And none of that is possible as long as crime and violence threaten the safety of our streets, the sanctity of our homes and schools, and the innocence of our children. That's why the American people have demanded that we take action against crime.

This crime bill will put 100,000 more police on our street, a 20 percent increase. It will ban assault weapons. It will prohibit possession of handguns by minors. It will put violent career criminals behind bars by making "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. And it answers the calls of hundreds of thousands of police officers who want big increases in crime prevention programs to give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.

This month, we have learned that our children are more at risk from crime and violence than any other portion of the population. Children between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely than the rest of us to suffer from violent crimes like rape and aggravated assault. This is madness, and we must stop it.

The crime bill is about to reach a final vote in both Houses of the Congress. Unbelievably, there are still those who are trying to kill it with old debates about whether we ought to be going after criminals or guns, whether we ought to be tough or compassionate. Well, the law enforcement community has told us we have to do all these things and we have to do it now.

Tell your Senators and Representatives to pass the crime bill. I want it on my desk within 2 weeks. I want to sign it before our children go back to school. We owe them a future of hope, not fear.

If 6 years is long enough to wait for a crime bill, then 60 years is certainly long enough to wait for health care coverage for every American. Now it's time for us to move forward to yet another historic front, one that seven Presidents of both parties have sought: guaranteeing every American health coverage that can never be taken away.

Soon Congress will deliberate on bills to provide health security, the first time ever that such bills have even been voted out of congressional committees. We know from our experience only one way that really works, the way that works for the great majority of our families already, getting health insurance on the job.

It's a way that's worked in Hawaii for 20 years, where health insurance is cheaper than it is in the rest of the country. It's the way that relies on the private sector, not government; that rewards work, not welfare; that builds on shared responsibilities between employers and employees.

Many other partial reforms sound good and aren't as controversial to implement and have been tried elsewhere. But the experience is that often these more limited reforms actually reduce the number of people with health insurance and increase rates. In Hawaii, where everyone contributed so that everyone could be covered, insurance rates went down and coverage went up.

Some in Congress are trying to kill health care reform altogether. If we don't act this year, 3 million more working Americans will lose their health coverage next year. Five million more Americans are uninsured now than were insured 5 years ago. The American people don't need more hemming and hawing. They need health care they can count on so they can get on with building their lives.

Later today I'll be in Independence, Missouri, the home of President Harry Truman, to talk about health care. President Truman believed in the common sense and the common decency of the American people, and he tried very hard to get health care security for all Americans. It's time for us to fulfill Harry Truman's mission, to act with his vision and courage, to do what he always believed we should do: guarantee health security for all Americans.

Let's continue to build a land of limitless hope and to remain an inspiration to the world.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:47 a.m. on July 29 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 30.

Remarks to Health Security Express Participants in Independence, Missouri
July 30, 1994

Thank you, Governor Carnahan. Thank you, Mr. Vice President and Tipper and Hillary. And ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for coming. And let me especially thank those two fine women, mother and daughter, that stood up here and spoke for the nearly 40 million Americans who deserve health care.

I have to tell you, a lot of things have been said here today; maybe everything that needs to be said has been said. But I would like to offer one mildly dissenting view. I believe that most of the people here who disagree with me today about national health reform do admire Harry Truman. They probably think he ought to be on Mount Rushmore. And it must be surprising to them to know that they had the same arguments that are being made against us made against him 50 years ago. That is always the case when you try to change things and why it's so important to use the Presidency to fight to help the ordinary American to live a better life.

You've already heard it. You've heard it in what the other people have said. Harry Truman had to say, "No, this is not socialized medicine, this is private insurance. No, this is not a Government takeover, we're preserving the choice and the private medical system. No, we're not going to waste more money covering everybody, we'll actually save money." And what did they say? "Harry Truman's a radical liberal. He's for socialized medicine. He's for big Government. He's going to take this country down."

Well, the truth is Harry Truman had Independence, Missouri, values. He had this old-fashioned notion that we value work and family and faith. And people who work hard and play by the rules ought to help one another when they need it, ought to join together to help themselves and to help their children have a better life.

And that is really what is at stake here. All this screaming and yelling, what's really hurting America today is that we're shouting too much and listening too little and speaking in a respectful tone too little.

Two years ago, on Labor Day when we all came here to kick off our general election campaign, what a wet day it was. Do you remember how wet it was? And we stood here in the rain because we believed we were on a mission to restore the American dream. We were tired of the screaming, yelling, anti-Government crowd that told us one thing and did another, that exploded the deficit, reduced investment in the American people, drove our economy into the ground. We were tired of seeing our country come apart and be divided by this rhetoric of hatred and division when we need to be coming together, to pull together for the 21st century. And we knew that at the end of the cold war we had a great test before us: Would we move into the next century with confidence, hope, united, so that we can compete and win and every one of our children can live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities, or would we give in to the same old dark fears and divisions that have been dredged up over and over and over again in this country's history?

My fellow Americans, that is the real truth of what your President, Harry Truman, had to face. At the end of World War II, when he was the victor in the war, 80 percent of the people thought he was just great. But then a new world had to be created. And the question was would the President just tell people what they wanted to hear, or would he set about creating that new world?

And what did we get: the GI bill, a way to educate our families, a way to build houses, a way to build the middle class, bringing down the deficit, stabilizing the economy; rebuilding Europe with the Marshall plan; rebuilding Japan; standing up against Soviet expansionism so we could eventually win the cold war. That's what he did. And every step along the way the American people were subject to the most vicious and brutal attacks. Why? Because when people leave one era, when everybody can look at the future through the same set of glasses and they have to pick up another set of glasses to figure out how to understand things, we are always vulnerable.

You think about your own life. Every time you've been asked to change you may have a mixture of hope and fear. And the real test

every time is are your fears going to overtake you, and are you going to give in? Or are you going to live by your hopes and your courage and charge forward and grow and become better? That is the test for the United States today.

This health care fight is far from the first one in which we have been engaged. When I became President, I told the American people I was tired of hearing people say they were conservative and they hated Government and they didn't like the deficit, and presiding over the biggest deficits in history, and I would do something about it. And we passed, against the solid opposition of every member of the other party in the United States Congress, an economic program. And what did it do? Two hundred fifty-five billion dollars worth of spending cuts; tax cuts for 15 million working Americans, including 295,000 Missouri families; a tax increase for the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people; a reduction in the Federal work force, something the conservatives say they want, a reduction in the Federal work force of 250,000. And what did we produce? Three years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States and 3.8 million new jobs, more than in the previous 4 years put together by far and a 1.5-percent drop in the unemployment rate and the largest number of new business starts since World War II. They said we would wreck the economy. Instead we brought it back, because we wouldn't give in to this hatred and rhetoric of division and destruction, and we moved forward.

And then we moved on to try to make sure all of you could compete and win in this global economy, expanding trade against opposition, providing for lifetime training, more for Head Start, world-class standards for our public schools for the first time, apprenticeship programs for our young people who do not go to 4-year colleges but need more training and a reduction in interest rates and better repayment terms for student loans, so that 20 million Americans are immediately eligible for lower interest on their student loans.

My fellow Americans, this is not about hot air and hot signs. This is about what we talked about here in the rain, what Al Gore and I wrote about in "Putting People First," and most of all, it's about what counts in your life as you move forward with your families and your hopes. And we are going to continue doing that.

Just look at the last week in America. What a great week America had. Harry Truman recognized the State of Israel. Now, with our strong help, Israel and Jordan have agreed to end the state of war between them and to work for peace and to make us more secure.

Harry Truman set up a system that enabled us to win the cold war. Now, after the cold war, after much hard work by the United States, Russia has announced that by the end of August, for the first time since Harry Truman was President, there will be no Russian soldiers in Central and Eastern Europe, making the world more secure.

After 6 years of tough talk and anticrime rhetoric by previous administrations, at long last, at long last, this week the House and the Senate agreed to send the toughest, smartest crime bill in the history of the United States to a vote on the floor of the United States Congress this coming week.

And as has been said, your majority leader, Dick Gephardt, and the Speaker of the House have, for the first time in American history, voted out a bill to the floor of the Congress that would provide for affordable health care for all of the American people. It has been a good week for the United States.

But the only way we can go forward is if we go beyond the slogans to the facts, go beyond all the posturing to the people. Look at this crime bill, folks. Children are 5 times more likely to be the victims of violent crime. Violent crime has gone up by 300 percent in the last 30 years, the police forces by only 10 percent. This crime bill will add 100,000 police to our streets. It will make "three strikes and you're out" the law of the land. It will take the assault weapons out of the hands of the gangs that make them better armed than the police forces. It will make handgun possession and ownership by juveniles illegal unless they're under the supervision of an adult. It will make our schools safer. And it ought to pass next week, not because of all the rhetoric against it but because our families deserve a better and a safer and a more secure future.

But if we had to wait 6 long years for a crime bill, isn't 60 years way too long to wait for all the American people to have health care security? That's how long we've been waiting. President Roosevelt wanted it. President Truman proposed it three times. Seven Presidents of both parties have tried to achieve it.

Let me ask you something, and I want you to listen to this, it's so ironic. What is the real big fight here? The big fight is whether employers and employees should be asked to purchase private health insurance and whether the Government saying to the American people, "You must purchase private health insurance" is either socialized medicine, somehow unethical, or bad for the economy. That's what all this boils down to, whether it would be better to keep on doing what we're doing.

Well, let me ask you to consider this. Number one, in 1971, President Richard Nixon and the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee today, the Republican Senator from Oregon, Bob Packwood, proposed that all employers pay for half of the health insurance costs of all their employees and that we do it. If it was such a hot idea in 1971, why are the members of the other party running against it today as if it had the plague? It was a good idea then, and it's a good idea today.

As you know, I just returned from Germany where I saw the flags of the Berlin Brigade cased because they're coming home, having won the cold war. And I met with hundreds and hundreds of our armed services families. All of them have health care in the military. And do you know, the only thing they wanted to talk to me about was health care. "Mr. President," they said, "when we come home to serve our country out of uniform, we want to know that our children are going to be covered by medical insurance. I hope you can pass health care this year."

It would be different, my fellow Americans, if we didn't have personal experience. Look at the State of Hawaii. In Hawaii, everything is more expensive than it is here on the American mainland, except one thing, health care. Because for 20 years in Hawaii, employers and employees have been required to purchase health insurance so that everybody is covered. And guess what? Small business insurance premiums are 30 percent lower, $400 a year lower for small business people in Hawaii than they are in the United States on the average. We know this works; why are we running away from it? Why don't we run toward it and embrace it and take care of people like that fine young woman that spoke to you here today?

And what happens when we try these half measures? Insurance rates go up, and coverages goes down. Do you know that one of the things I just wish—it's not much I wish for from those who shout and scream, instead of talk and listen and exchange, but I do wish they had some burden to prove that what they're for works.

This is the only country in the world with an advanced economy where we're going backward in health care. Ten years ago, 88 percent of our people were covered. Today, 83 percent of our people are covered. Five years ago there were 5 million Americans who had health insurance then who don't have it today. Five million Americans have lost their health insurance for good, just in the last 5 years, and over 80 percent of them are middle class working people. This is a broken system, and we ought to fix it without delay.

Folks, 60 years ago this fight started. Fifty years ago Truman tried it three times and failed. Twenty-nine years ago, halfway between the beginning and now, President Johnson came to this city to sign Medicare into law and to give Harry and Bess Truman Medicare cards one and two. I'll bet there are a lot of people in this audience whose parents have been helped by Medicare. I bet there are a lot of people in this audience whose family budgets would have been severely strained if it hadn't been for Medicare.

If you have ever dealt with Medicare, you know that it's the furthest thing in the world from socialized medicine. Senior citizens pick their doctors, and the doctors make the decision. And yet, the arguments we're hearing today against this plan are the same arguments the same crowd made against Medicare 29 years ago, just like they did against Harry Truman 50 years ago and F.D.R. 60 years ago.

Let's do better. Let's finish Harry Truman's fight. We're halfway home, and we can go all the way. And let me say this. I want to be as good as my word to say we should talk about people, not slogans. In this beloved State of yours there are 700,000 Missourians without health care. There are 175,000 children without health care. But there are millions who could lose their health care. They're an injury, a sickness, a job loss, a job change away from losing it. I believe we can do better.

I was raised in a home with a mother who was widowed when I was born, who left me with my grandparents to learn to be a nurse. I grew up around hospitals. And I buried my mother earlier this year, after a long and brave battle with cancer for which, thank God, she

received magnificent care because she had health insurance. How can we in good conscience say, when we know every other country's done it, when we know Hawaii has done it and saved money doing it and made people more healthy, how can we say America is not up to it? How can we give in to those who would play to our fear and our fears of the future instead of going forward? Harry Truman would say the buck stops here, the buck stops in Congress and the buck stops with you. Let's push it over the finish line this year.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. outside the Truman Courthouse in Independence Square. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri and Health Security Express riders Susan and Rachel Crowthers.

Remarks on Arrival in Cleveland, Ohio
July 30, 1994

Well, first, let me thank all of you for coming out to see Hillary and me. We are delighted to be back in Ohio and glad to be back in Cleveland. And I know I started the baseball season here, so I know you're all really thrilled at how well the Indians are doing. And I—[*inaudible*]—hope there won't be a strike.

[*At this point, the President's microphone failed.*]

Is it working now?

Let me just say a—[*inaudible*]. It keeps dying. Can you hear it now? All right, we'll try again.

As you know, I'm here on behalf of Joel Hyatt's campaign. I'm proud to be here helping him. I also want to say how delighted I am to be here with Congressmen Louis Stokes, Sherrod Brown, and Eric Fingerhut. And I want to make just a couple of points.

When I came here seeking the Presidency, and Ohio gave me the votes first to be nominated and then to be elected, I knew that this was a State which was really the heartland of America, where people were more or less evenly divided by party but where everybody wanted this country to work again for ordinary Americans. And I made some commitments to you, that I'd work on restoring the economy, bringing the American people together instead of dividing us, making the Government work for ordinary people again, and strengthening our communities and our families at the grassroots.

And let me just say that if you look at what has happened, we have worked very hard, often against bitter, bitter opposition, to make this country work. We adopted a plan to reduce the deficit, after the other party had the White House for 12 years and quadrupled the debt, without a single solitary vote from the other side. We passed the biggest deficit reduction plan in history, reduced spending by $255 billion, gave tax cuts to 500,000 working families in the State of Ohio alone, asked 47,000 who can afford it to pay higher taxes to pay the debt down.

Now, what has happened? We, the Democrats alone, without any help unfortunately from Congress from the other party, have reduced the Federal Government to its lowest size since Kennedy was President. We have taken $700 billion off the national debt that would have been there before we came in and passed our economic plan. And what has been the result: 3.8 million new jobs, a 1.5-percent drop in the unemployment rate, the largest number of new businesses in any year since the end of World War II. This plan is working, and we need to keep Sherrod and Eric and Lou in the Congress and elect Joel Hyatt to keep America's economy going.

The other party, they always talked about how tough they were on crime. But for 6 years, under two administrations, there was no crime bill. Last week, the Members of the Senate and the House voted to put on the floor of this Congress this week the toughest anticrime bill in the history of the United States. So those are two reasons that I ran for President on—restoring the economy, helping to deal with crime.

I just want to say one last thing. This last week was a great week for America. The King of Jordan and the Prime Minister of Israel came to Washington to end their war and to pledge

to work for peace. And we've been working hard on that. Peace for our children—[*inaudible*].

After working hard on it for a year and a half, the President of Russia called me and told me that Russian troops would get out of Central and Eastern Europe for the first time since World War II, making the world more peaceful for these children here.

But I'm telling you, what we owe these kids is not just peace in the world but peace on our streets and peace of mind. That means we need to pass the crime bill. We need to provide health care for all Americans, and we need to do it now.

Let me say to you, I went to Washington hoping against hope and against all the evidence that I could work with people of both parties to make this country a better place. And I have done everything I could to overcome the kind of inertia and opposition we have faced. And I just want you to know, if you like the fact that the American economy's recovering, if you like the fact that we're going to finally do something serious about crime, if you like the fact that after years we voted family leave, we voted for the Brady bill, we voted to make the American people safer, then you ought to keep these people in Congress and send Joel Hyatt to the Senate so we can do things, not stop things. This is a country that's can-do. And we're going to do if you put people in the Congress who believe in making America a better place.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:11 p.m. at Cleveland-Hopkins International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Reception for Joel Hyatt in Mayfield Heights, Ohio
July 30, 1994

I'm delighted to be here with Joel and Susan and their two fine sons, who spoke so well and really said it all, and with Joel's mother, who must be so proud of him.

You know, if it hadn't been for my mother, I would never have been elected President, because there were plenty of elections I ran in where she and I were the only two people who thought I had a chance to win. [*Laughter*] Unfortunately, a time or two they were right, and we were wrong. [*Laughter*] But we just kept on going.

I'm delighted to be here with Senator and Mrs. Metzenbaum, and with all of you. I want to say a special word of thanks to attorney general Lee Fisher for his leadership on the fight against crime and for his leadership on behalf of the Clinton-Gore ticket. I also want to say a special word of thanks to the three Members of Congress that Joel mentioned, Tom Sawyer, Sherrod Brown, and Eric Fingerhut, without whom our economic program would not have passed and this country's economic direction would not have turned around. And I thank them so much.

You know, it's funny, I came to the Cleveland Airport—we're a little late because there were 500 people there when I landed, so I went around and shook hands with them—and I thought, what great passionate public issue will they be concerned about. I thought I knew America well enough, and sure enough, the first 15 people I shook hands with said, "Can't you do anything about the baseball strike?" [*Laughter*]

You know, as a lifelong fanatic baseball fan, I threw out the first pitch here. And I saw the Indians come out of nowhere, and they're doing so well. And in the other part of the State, by the way, the Cincinnati Reds are not doing bad, either. So for Ohio, perhaps more than any other place in America this year, we're really all happy that we're having the best baseball season in 4 years, and we hope we get a chance to see if those records can be broken and all that progress can be made.

But you know, I want to make a point about that. A couple of years ago, David Letterman had a funny top 10 list called "Suggested Slogans of the 1992 Democratic Convention." And one of his allegedly funny slogans was, "We're

the Cleveland Indians of politics." [*Laughter*] Well, we got the last laugh, and now Cleveland might get the last laugh, as well.

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to Senator Metzenbaum. Al Hunt, in the Wall Street Journal, who is sometimes acerbic, said the other day, and I quote, "Senator Metzenbaum is a persistent pain in the neck." [*Laughter*] Now, wait, wait, he said, "As a result, thousands of little kids are likely to have a better life." That was an article about Senator Metzenbaum's adoption bill, a bill that I feel very strongly about, one of the few things that anybody in Congress has done besides given a speech to try to give more little kids a chance at a good life. And I really respect it. And I have told people who disagree with us on the issue of choice that if they're really concerned about that issue, they ought to go see Howard Metzenbaum and saddle up and pass his bill in the Congress, so that we can offer real and meaningful adoption to more of our poor children in this country. I thank him for that, and I know you do, too.

Senator Biden pointed out last week at a big ceremony at the Justice Department, with hundreds and hundreds of police officers from all over the country, as we were celebrating the fact the Senate and the House had agreed to put this crime bill Joel talked about on the floor of the Congress next week, that the final negotiations were snagged in the early hours of the morning and that one man saved the entire bill by being willing to work out a last-minute compromise. And he said, that man was Howard Metzenbaum.

The thing I like about him is that he is always fighting. He doesn't always win, but he always fights. And what we need in this country is not people who are always trying to win, or at least look like they're winning, but people who are willing to fight.

I first knew about old Joel Hyatt back in Yale law school when he had already begun a program for undergraduates to teach inner-city kids. It's still going on. It's kind of like Hyatt Legal Services; it's going to live behind him. Even after he goes to the Senate, I'm sure it will go on. And then when he and Susan started Hyatt Legal Services I thought it was a good idea, which made me sort of an iconoclast among lawyers. But it seemed to me that ordinary people ought to be able to go see a lawyer and get something fairly straightforward done without having to take the shirt off their back or be scared to death.

And he did that. And I think that's important, because it's not just a mechanical service. It makes people think that the system can work for them. And believe me, if we could just make more than half the American people believe that this whole country could work for them again, we would do a very great deal indeed. And that's what Joel did with Legal Services. That's what he can help to do with the United States when you send him to the Senate.

Hillary and I have had a wonderful day today. We went to Independence, Missouri, to Harry Truman's hometown. And we celebrated there the final leg of the effort to get national health reform and guaranteed health insurance for all Americans. We went there for a couple of reasons. First of all, Harry Truman tried three times, in 1945, 1947, and 1949, to get guaranteed health coverage for all Americans.

And it's very interesting, all the people that were out there holding their signs and demonstrating against us today, they all think Harry Truman ought to be on Mount Rushmore. [*Laughter*] But I come from a family who was for him when he was alive. And I know that they're the same folks that tried to kill all of his reform programs back then.

At the end of the Second World War, Harry Truman was at 80 percent in the public opinion polls. By the time he sent the health care reform to Congress for the second time, he had been driven down to 36 percent and was going lower because of all the hatred and venom and misinformation put out about him and his program. They said, "This is socialized Government, socialized medicine, big Government run amok." Do you know what it was? He was asking for private health insurance for all Americans.

And we're going through the same fight today, 50 years later. In the middle, President Johnson came 29 years ago this day—this exact day, President Johnson went to Independence, Missouri, to sign Medicare and to give Harry and Bess Truman Medicare cards numbers one and two. It took that long to guarantee health care to the elderly of this country. And I couldn't help thinking, I wonder how many people out there today, with their right-wing extreme signs and all their harsh slogans, have parents who, thank God, are healthier because of Medicare and who have, therefore, avoided bankrupting their children because of Medicare?

I say that to make this point. There is something about this time that matters, that is far more important even than the specific things we are about, because we have come to the end of one era and we are starting another. And we have to decide again what kind of people we are and what we're going to do.

Every time in this country's history—and I won't go through the whole thing, but I do want to talk about this century, and some of you have seen even a little more of it than I have—every time we have come to the end of one era and started another, we have as a country been just like people are. When you have to make a big change you are filled with both hope and fear. You want to make the plunge and grow into a bigger, better person, but you have all kinds of reservations. And you wish somehow that you wouldn't have to make these changes.

At the end of World War I, the American people voted for normalcy in a President, whatever that is. It really meant, let's just do nothing. Let's come home, we draw up in the world and do nothing here. We are tired. We paid a lot in this war. We can't think about this stuff anymore. And so we had no direction, and we just sort of flailed around. And what happened? The Ku Klux Klan got a big foothold in America, went on the rise and promoted a lot of hate. And there was the first big Red scare alleging that there were Communists everywhere trying to run down America. And the world came apart at the seams. And we found ourselves thrown into a great depression and, ultimately, another world war.

And then at the end of World War II, we had a different sort of leader, Harry Truman, only 4 months as Vice President when he found himself President. He brought the war to a successful conclusion; passed the GI bill so that soldiers could come home and get an education, buy homes for their families; brought the deficit down; got the civilian economy going; established the Marshall plan and rebuilt Japan as well as Europe; and set in motion that whole system that enabled us to stand up to communism and win the cold war. And he was still in terrible trouble when he started running for reelection, because people said he was a radical, he was unfit, he was not good. Why? Because people were afraid. They had to put down one set of glasses through which they had viewed the world, and they hadn't been able to pick up another set. Harry Truman was making that set of glasses, that framework in which we would all understand the world. But the American people did the right thing. They reelected him. And we enshrined those institutions that kept us going for four and a half decades and made us the great country that we are today.

Now we have won the cold war, and we are going into a new era without the great enemy of the Soviet Union to define our every move and with more competition than we ever thought we'd have for jobs and opportunity and the future. And we know the future can be bright and wonderful and various and exciting. But it's also frightening. And we are, as a people, vulnerable today to the most vicious kind of attacks on our own self-confidence and our best impulses. And you hear it every day. And so we are still unable to escape the almost biological nature of a great democracy at a time of change.

I ran for President because I believed that the American dream was in danger for my daughter; because I believed that the economy was going downhill, the deficit was going up, jobs were going down, investment was going down; because I believed that the country was coming apart, being divided by race, by religion, and in other ways, when we ought to be coming together and taking great joy in all the diversity of America; because I believed that Government no longer worked for ordinary people. And Presidents and other politicians found that they could stay most popular by saying things people wanted to hear and doing absolutely nothing, avoiding the tough problems that inevitably causes the kind of conflict we see today. And I saw nothing ahead for my country but trouble.

And so I asked for the chance to serve, and I want to thank you for it. I have loved every day of it. And the rougher it gets the better I like it because that's what we're here to do.

Now, but what I want to say to you tonight—this is a huge country; there are 250 million plus people here. There are billions of decisions every day. The President cannot do what America needs done alone. We need a Congress working for change, and we need people committed to change at the grassroots level. And we need people who keep their heads on straight and their hearts in line, working for a better and brighter America.

You know, when I offered up that economic program, people in the other party told me for

years that they just hated the deficit. I couldn't figure out why their Presidents kept proposing these big deficits, but they talked it down anyway. And I figured, surely we'll get some help. We got zero votes from the congressional Republicans for the economic plan. They said it would bring the country down. They said it was the ruination of America. They said it was the extension of tax-and-spend.

Here's what it was: It was $255 billion in spending cuts. It was an income tax cut for half a million Ohio families, and a tax increase for only 47,000 who were asked to pay more to pay down the debt. And you know what it brought us? It brought us a reduction in Federal employment over the next 5 years of a quarter of a million, so that the Democrats, not the Republicans, will give you the smallest Federal Government that has existed in the United States since John Kennedy was President. And it has brought us 3 years in a row of reducing the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States. That's what it did.

And what were the results of this: 3.8 million new jobs, 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate, the largest number of new business starts last year of any year since World War II, with no inflation.

That's why Eric Fingerhut, Sherrod Brown, and Tom Sawyer, and everybody else in this congressional district and State who represent you in Congress, who put their necks on the line, deserve to be reelected: because they gave you this economy, they did something about the debt, and they did it in the midst of a vicious attack on their credibility and unbelievable misinformation. Where would we be today if we hadn't done it?

When I travel to other parts of the world, when I go to these meetings of the leaders of the big industrial nations and they say, "Your exports are growing faster than ours, your investments are growing faster than ours, your unemployment rate is lower than ours, your growth rate is higher than ours; how did you do it? How did you do it?"—I think of people like you that put me in and people like Congressman Brown, Congressman Sawyer, Congressman Fingerhut, and the others. We won by the narrowest of margins.

If Joel Hyatt's opponent had defeated Senator Glenn last time, the entire economic plan would have come crashing down and it would not have passed, because we carried it by a single vote. This election matters.

In times of change where people are uncertain, the airways are full of misinformation and people do not know it matters whether you vote for people who have the courage to change and take on the tough problems and do the tough thing. What is in fashion today is talking tough and acting soft. I believe in what Teddy Roosevelt said—maybe the last great Republican President—talk soft, act tough. That's what we ought to do.

But there is reason for hope. We passed Family and Medical Leave to empower families to be successful workers and successful parents, after 7 years of gridlock and a couple of vetoes. We finally passed the Brady bill after 7 years, 7 years in which it could not be passed. We passed more legislation and had more agreements to expand our trade to generate jobs for Americans and for people in Ohio in the last year than in any year in the past 30 years. We passed more legislation to help States and localities and private businesses, retrain and educate people, for more Head Start international standards of excellence for our schools, to apprenticeships for the kids that don't go to college, to lower college loans, for interest rates on college loans—listen to this—for 20 million Americans, so that more people can afford to go to college from working class, middle class families.

Now, that's what we have been doing there. And if you don't know about that it's because others are more interested in other issues. But that is what we have been doing there. And we need doers in the United States Congress. There have been some issues on which we have received some bipartisan help, and for that I am very grateful. I would love it if it happened on ever issue. But when it comes to pivotal issues like health care, I can do no better than the distinguished Republican Congressman from Iowa, Fred Grandy, who complained the other day that the Republicans have been ordered not to cooperate with the administration to try to achieve our common goal of universal health care for all Americans. I don't care whether people are Republicans or Democrats. I don't even care how they're going to vote in the next election. I think they all ought to have health care, even if they ought to change their politics. This is not a political issue, it's an American issue. We cannot solve it without American doers in the United States Congress.

Now, let me say that I am, in spite of everything, full of hope. Look at the week the United States had this week: the King of Jordan, the Prime Minister of Israel, with strong support from the United States, coming to Washington to put an end to the state of war and to commit to create a full, decent, lasting peace between them after all these years of separation. After a year and a half of hard work on our part, the President of Russia notifies me that, yes, Russian troops will withdraw entirely from Central and Eastern Europe by August 31st. For the first time since the end of World War II there will be no Russian troops there. We will be a safer place. We confirmed a brilliant new Justice of the Supreme Court. We learned that our growth rate was 3.7 percent in the second quarter of this year. Our military swung into action in a courageous and bold way in Rwanda to help save the lives of the people there.

The United States had a good week last week. And the Congress voted out the crime bill. It will be on the floor this week: 100,000 police officers; "three strikes and you're out"; $8 billion in prevention programs to give something to say yes to, not just something to say no to; an assault weapons ban; a ban on handgun possession by minors unless they're under the supervision of adults; and funds to make our schools safe so kids don't have to duck under their desks when the shooting starts. That's a big deal. And all that happened last week.

And for the first time in history, we now have on the floor of the Congress—the first time in history on the floor of both the Senate and House there are bills that would guarantee health care to all Americans.

And I want to say this, just this, in closing: We have been waiting 60 years through Presidents of both parties to try to figure out a way to cover every American. We are the only major country in the world that not only does not provide coverage for all American working families, we are going in reverse. Ten years ago 88 percent of our people were insured; today only 83 percent are. Five years ago, there were 5 million more Americans with health insurance than have it today. Five million Americans living and working in the United States of America today had health insurance 5 years ago and do not have it today.

And what's worse is we know what works. We know that the simplest, easiest thing to do is to ask employers and employees to share the responsibility of buying private insurance. We know it works from looking at other countries. I just came back from Germany. I met with hundreds of military families who are coming home. The only issue they said was, "Mr. President, don't let us come home to an America without health care for our children. We've been covered in the military; we see how it works in Germany." In Germany, everybody pays; everybody's covered. It's a world-class health care system. They've got world-class pharmaceuticals. They spend 8½ percent of their income to cover everybody. We spend over 14 percent of our income to cover 83 percent and leave one in six Americans uncovered. I think we can do better.

But the best example is close to home. For 20 years, Hawaii, Hawaii has covered everybody. Now, if you've ever been to Hawaii, you know everything in Hawaii is more expensive than it is on the mainland, except health care, where small businesses pay rates that are 30 percent lower than any other place. Why? Because if everybody has to pay their fair share, if everybody has to pay their fair share, then you have everybody doing what's happened in this Cleveland business partnership here, where small businesses have been able to buy cheaper insurance. Insurance goes down for everybody, and coverage goes up.

If you just try to reform the insurance system, insurance rates go up if you put more sick people in; people stop covering, the pool gets smaller, and the rates go up again. Why should we not simply do what works?

And I want to close with this: This should not be a political thing. In 1971, the President of the United States, Richard Nixon and the man who is now the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Robert Packwood from Oregon, introduced a bill that required employers and employees to split the cost of health care to cover everybody. So I say to the Republicans in the Congress, let's have a bipartisan American solution. You go back to where Richard Nixon was 23 years ago. I'll meet you halfway, and we'll take care of the American people with people like Joel Hyatt in the Senate.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. at the Landerhaven Country Club. In his remarks, he referred to television talk show host David Letterman.

Subject Index

AARP. *See* Retired Persons, American Association of
ABC News—488, 1035, 1358
Abortion. *See* Health and medical care
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS). *See* Health and medical care
Administration. *See* other part of subject
Administrative Conference of the U.S.—1359
Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the—931
Advisory. *See* other part of subject
Advisory committees, Federal. *See* Government agencies and employees
Aeronautics and Space Administration, National—201, 1294
Africa
  See also specific country
  Economic assistance—830, 1151
Africa, White House Conference on—1119, 1150
African-American History Month, National—183
African Development Foundation—168, 476, 1356, 1367
African Unity, Organization for—1299
Agency. *See* other part of subject
Aging, Federal Council on the—900, 1366
Aging, National Council on—783
Aging, White House Conference on—280, 1369
Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, Federal—1361, 1362
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. *See* Agriculture, Department of
Agriculture
  Disaster assistance—1251
  Farm loans—901
  Grazing fees on Federal lands—497
  Honey imports—747
  Rural Conference, National—1324
  Tobacco—498
Agriculture, Department of
  Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—1353
  Assistant Secretary—1363
  Commodity Credit Corporation—1063
  Deputy Assistant Secretary—1355
  Farmers Home Administration—901, 902, 1251
  Food and Nutrition Service—1353
  General Counsel, Office of—901, 902
  Inspector General—1367
  Private attorneys, use in farm loan actions—901
  Secretary—697, 901, 1251
  Soil Conservation Service—1353
AID. *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
AIDS. *See* Health and medical care
AIDS Policy Coordinator, Office of the National—1222
Air and Space Museum, National. *See* Smithsonian Institution
Air Force, Department of the
  See also Armed Forces, U.S.
  Assistant Secretaries—126, 312
  Fairchild Air Force Base, WA—1137, 1143
  Under Secretary—312
Alabama
  Flooding—1216, 1250, 1269, 1368
  Governor—1250
  Tornadoes and flooding—1360
  Winter storms—368
Alaska, mineral resources, report—300
Alaska Natives. *See* Native Americans
Albania
  Trade with U.S.—1019
  U.S. Ambassador—1360
Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Bureau of. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Alfalfa Club—1355
Algeria
  Civil conflict—1056, 1221, 1229
  Terrorist activity—1229, 1230
  U.S. Ambassador—562
Ambassadors. *See* specific country
American. *See* other part of subject
AmeriCorps—294, 419, 730, 762, 907, 962, 1175, 1319
Ameritech Corp.—704, 1361
Amtrak. *See* Railroad Passenger Corporation, National
Andrew W. Mellon Dinner—845
Angola
  National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)—676
  U.S. national emergency—675
Antigua and Barbuda
  Haitian refugees, role—1219
  Prime Minister—1367
Appeals, U.S. Court of—137, 221, 526, 853, 984, 1063, 1101, 1120, 1253, 1328
Architect of the Capitol—1301
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board—1369
Arctic Research Policy Committee, Interagency—363
Argentina
  President—1366
  Terrorist attack at Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires—1269, 1313
Arkansas
  Governor—1305
  President's visits—1304, 1305, 1353, 1356, 1369
  Winter storms—1357
Arkansas, University of—1081

Armed Forces, U.S.
See also specific military department; Defense and national security
Air collision at Pope Air Force Base, NC—541, 542, 552, 553
Base closings—958, 1074
Commander in chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe—453
Commander in chief, European Command—1369
Draft registration—948
International role. *See* specific country or region
POW's/MIA's—178, 1367
Armed Forces Day—972, 974
Armenia, trade with U.S.—1019
Arms and munitions
See also Defense and national security; Nuclear weapons
Arms control negotiations and agreements—72, 353, 558, 905, 980, 1127
Chemical and biological weapons—72, 145, 353, 558, 636, 905, 979, 1046, 1127
Export controls—71, 980, 1169, 1193
Missile systems and technology—72, 381, 558
Nonproliferation—73, 209, 558, 979, 1169
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U.S.—558, 805, 807, 809, 1364, 1369
Army, Department of the
See also Armed Forces, U.S.
Assistant Secretaries—126
Corps of Engineers—167
1st Infantry Division—1008
Force sufficiency certification—964
General Counsel—1358
Military Academy, U.S.—1363
Art, National Gallery of. *See* Smithsonian Institution
Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Arts, National Endowment for the—1249, 1250
Humanities, National Endowment for the—947, 1096, 1327
Arts, National Council on the—1359
Arts, National Endowment for the. *See* Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
ASEAN. *See* South East Asian Nations, Association of
Asia-Pacific region
See also specific country
South Asia, regional nonproliferation—73, 209
Association. *See* other part of subject
Association Executives, American Society of—395
Atomic Energy Agency, International. *See* United Nations
Australia, U.S. Ambassador—805
Austria, Chancellor—731, 1360
Awards. *See* other part of subject
Azerbaijan
Trade with U.S.—1019
U.S. Ambassador—147

Bahrain
Ambassador to U.S.—1356
U.S. Ambassador—363
Baltic American Enterprise Fund—1201
Bangladesh, Ambassador to U.S.—1356
Banking—163, 455
Battle Monuments Commission, American—944, 1361, 1364
Belarus
Arms control negotiations and agreements—21, 80
Chairman, Supreme Soviet—22, 77, 1354
Economic assistance—44, 79
Investment treaty with U.S.—1354
President Clinton's visit—77, 1354
Prime Minister—1354
Trade with U.S.—1019
Belgium
Foreign Minister—484
King—1354
President Clinton's visit—8, 14, 15, 18, 21, 24, 28, 32, 1354
Prime Minister—8
Belize, U.S. Ambassador—1363
Biological weapons. *See* Arms and munitions
Black Mayors, National Conference of—793
Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, Committee for Purchase from the—1360
Board. *See* other part of subject
Boeing Corp.—263, 264
Bolivia
President—1095, 1181
U.S. Ambassador—1368
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Arms embargo—186, 704, 721, 734, 825, 988, 997, 1000
Bosnian Croat representative—354, 484, 485
Confederation agreement with Croatia—354, 484
Conflict resolution—20, 23, 30, 42, 57, 64, 115, 122, 186, 217, 219, 220, 248, 281, 287, 350, 354, 484, 494, 570, 589, 595, 645, 660, 661, 670, 702, 703, 726, 731-735, 758-760, 770, 806, 823, 825, 826, 832, 987, 996, 1000, 1015, 1026, 1050, 1054, 1056, 1173, 1182, 1218, 1236
Constitution establishing Muslim-Croat Federation—354, 484
Economic assistance—503
Gorazde, Serbian attacks and NATO response—660, 661, 670, 679, 694, 699, 703, 732, 755, 759
Humanitarian assistance—30, 224, 825, 996, 1053
NATO air power, authorization and potential use—20, 23, 24, 28-30, 33, 35, 42, 57, 121, 186, 193, 219, 224, 228, 232, 248, 250, 272, 278, 280, 281, 283, 286, 287, 699, 727, 732, 733, 755, 774, 806, 825, 987, 1000
No-fly zone—282, 326, 354, 679, 733
President—122, 354, 484, 485, 503
Prime Minister—354, 484
Sarajevo marketplace attack—186, 193, 217, 218, 224, 282
U.S. Ambassador—503
U.S. military, role—29, 232, 280, 281, 283, 354, 589, 679, 721, 758-760, 996, 1000, 1056
U.S. Special Envoy—354, 485, 699, 702, 1049
Boy Scouts of America—1358

Boys Nation—1335
Bridges. *See* Infrastructure
British Broadcasting Corp.—996
Brown v. *Board of Education*, 40th anniversary—931, 935, 940
Budget, Federal
  See also specific agency; Economy, national
  Balanced budget, proposed constitutional amendment—292, 349, 352
  Defense spending—836, 1240
  Deficit—117, 118, 127, 128, 306, 439, 463, 591, 595, 1140
  Entitlement spending—223
  Fiscal year 1995—196, 236, 835
  Foreign aid spending—343, 462, 1057
  Peacekeeping operations, funding—700, 808
  Rescissions and deferrals—201, 815, 1062
  Spending cuts—176, 196
  Supplemental appropriations, fiscal year 1994—242, 244, 519, 1355, 1356, 1370
Bulgaria, trade with U.S.—135, 1298
Bureau. *See* other part of subject
Burma, National League for Democracy leader—257, 1287
Burundi, President—635, 678
Business and industry
  See also specific company or industry
  Credit availability—163
  Enterprise zones. *See* Enterprise zones
  Industry conversion and job retraining—238, 527, 886, 958, 1074
  Productivity and competitiveness—441
  Research and development—163, 442
  Small and minority business—162, 195, 469, 519, 579, 593, 605, 608, 625, 835, 836, 1165, 1256
Business Council—305
Business Roundtable—164, 1102

Cabinet
  See also specific position
  Meeting—1361
Cairo conference. *See* United Nations, International Conference on Population and Development
California
  Democratic Party events—965, 1363
  Earthquake—91, 99, 101, 102, 107, 117, 119, 235, 242, 244, 253, 302, 483, 486, 700, 1060, 1128, 1355, 1356
  Economic conditions—236
  Federal aid for immigration costs—238, 536
  Governor—91, 100, 104, 243
  Gubernatorial election—1127
  Health and medical care—529
  Newspaper publishers—235
  President's visits—102, 559, 563, 564, 567, 957, 959, 965, 971, 1355, 1361, 1363
California-Los Angeles, University of—959
California Medical Association—528
Cambodia, U.S. Ambassador—371
Cameroon, Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Canada
  Ambassador to U.S.—1356
Canada—Continued
  Defense, U.S. and Canada, Permanent Joint Board on—1367
  Joint Commission, U.S. and Canada, International—38, 1356
  Prime Minister—731, 733, 759, 1182, 1368
  Trade with U.S.—1182
Cancer Society, American—187
Caribbean region
  See also specific country; Latin America
  Maritime boundaries—418
CBS News—1033
CBS Sports—556
CBS "This Morning"—1358
Central America. *See* specific country; Latin America
Central Intelligence Agency—4, 297, 304, 320, 323, 834
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board—1369
Chemical weapons. *See* Arms and munitions
Chicago Housing Authority—635, 1091, 1092
Children and Families, Administration for. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Children and youth
  See also specific subject
  Child care—884
  Child support—499, 887, 1077, 1083
  Immunization programs—630, 729
  Teenage pregnancy and parenting—174, 594
  Teenage suicide—715
Children's Defense Fund—1366
Chile
  President—1157
  Trade with U.S.—1158
  U.S. Ambassador—1368
China
  Human rights—377, 474, 829, 991, 994
  Rhinoceros and tiger trade—668
  Trade with U.S.—747, 828, 948, 954, 991, 994, 1018
  Vice Premier—829, 1362
CIA. *See* Central Intelligence Agency
Cinco de Mayo—851
Cities
  See also State and local governments
  Enterprise zones. *See* Enterprise zones
  Mayors, meetings with President—138, 214, 695, 793, 1071
Cities, National League of—1358
Citizens Medal, Presidential—368
Civil Aviation Organization, International—1356
Civil Liberties Public Education Board—1365
Civil rights
  See also specific subject
  Discrimination—97, 908, 936, 1333
  Federal policy—886
  Religious freedom—801
  Voting rights—301, 1323
Civilian Community Corps, National—1360
CNN—820, 1030
Coast Guard, U.S. *See* Transportation, Department of
COCOM. *See* Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Security Export Controls

Colleges and universities. *See* specific institution; Education
Colombia, U.S. Ambassador—1360
Colorado
  Fires—1216, 1368
  Governor—1217, 1284, 1368, 1369
Commerce, Department of
  Assistant Secretary—48
  Base conversion and redevelopment—1074
  Deputy Secretary—105
  Export Administration, Bureau of—1340, 1353
  Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National—1353
  Policy and Planning, Office of—1353
  Secretary—52, 66, 183, 226, 243, 263, 264, 748, 831, 951, 1169, 1225, 1270
  Under Secretary—1353
Commerce, international
  See also specific country or subject; Economy, international
  Boycott of companies doing business with Israel—217, 472
  Export controls—307, 1169, 1339
  Foreign boycotts, participation by U.S. persons—1169
  Free and fair trade—368, 885
  General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—11, 27, 32, 380, 381, 833, 895, 1050, 1054, 1105, 1197, 1216, 1223, 1225, 1228
  Generalized System of Preferences (GSP)—272, 371, 381, 747
  Group of Seven nations (G-7)—87, 321, 436, 454, 1050, 1163, 1196, 1216, 1220, 1223, 1225, 1227, 1230, 1358, 1368
  Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the U.S. (HTS)—747
  Investment treaties—395, 1354
  Military exports. *See* Arms and munitions, export controls
  North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)—26, 111, 176, 194, 1176
  Trade barriers with former Communist countries—12, 27, 1232
  Trade expansion, U.S.—368, 383, 1189
  Trade negotiations and agreements—112, 276, 380, 410, 433, 822, 1228
Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Regulatory Review Panel—1198
Commission. *See* other part of subject
Committee. *See* other part of subject
Commodity Credit Corporation. *See* Agriculture, Department of
Commodity Futures Trading Commission—834
Common Cause—1115
Communications
  See also specific State, country, or news organization
  Antiviolence public service announcements—477
  Broadcast programs, international—807
  Information superhighway, national—175, 237, 238, 908
Communications—Continued
  Media ownership, incentives for minority and ethnic groups—1191
  Minority journalists, convention—1329
  Television, violence in programs—719
Communications Commission, Federal—363, 469
Community Enterprise Board, President's—94, 802
Community service. *See* AmeriCorps; Civilian Community Corps, National; Community Service, Corporation for National and; Education, national service program
Community Service, Corporation for National and—527, 1367, 1370
Competitiveness Policy Council—1365
Conference. *See* other part of subject
Congress
  See also specific subject
  Budget Office—215, 237, 459, 1301
  Budget vote—433
  Campaign finance reform. *See* Elections
  Funding—1301
  House Democratic Caucus—1355, 1363
  Iraq-related documents, access—210
  Lobby reform—794
  Members, meetings with President—164, 670, 780, 1290, 1363, 1365
  Representative Rostenkowski ethics charges—1007
  Senate Democratic Policy Committee—1361
  U.S. assistance to United Nations peacekeeping operations, notification—809
Congressional Medal of Honor—976, 1002, 1363
Connecticut, President's visit—312-314
Conservation
  See also Environment
  Federal lands—497
  Forest preservation—588, 697
  Landscaping practices—781
  Water—409, 781
  Wilderness and wildlife preservation—181, 182, 668, 935, 1001
Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Security Export Controls—381, 1232
Coral Sea Week—805
Corporation. *See* other part of subject
Corps of Engineers. *See* Army, Department of the
Cote d'Ivoire
  Ambassador to U.S.—1366
  President—1356
Council. *See* other part of subject
Court. *See* other part of subject
Crime. *See* Law enforcement and crime
Crime Victims' Rights Week, National—772
Croatia
  Confederation agreement with Bosnia-Herzegovina—354, 484
  Economic assistance—503
  Foreign Minister—354
  President—354, 484, 485, 503
CSCE. *See* Security and Cooperation in Europe, Conference on
Cuba
  Democracy and freedom—517, 831, 964

Cuba—Continued
President, Council of State—831
Customs Service, U.S. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Cyprus
Conflict resolution—124, 712, 756, 1212, 1362
Foreign Minister—125
President—125, 712, 756
Turkish Cypriot leader—125, 712, 755
U.S. Ambassador—712, 713
U.S. Special Coordinator—125, 712, 713, 756
Czech Republic
President—37, 39, 40, 42, 77, 90, 92, 1200, 1354, 1367
President Clinton's visit—37, 39, 1354
Prime Minister—37, 39

D-Day, 50th anniversary—1003, 1038, 1041-1044, 1364, 1365
Dallas Cowboys—352, 1355
Defense and national security
See also Arms and munitions; Nuclear weapons
Ames espionage case—297, 304, 320, 322, 323
Counterintelligence policy—834
Military strength and deterrence—821, 948, 964, 972, 986
National security strategy, report—1297, 1298
Peacekeeping operations, multilateral—853
Pollard espionage case—541
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission—1171
Defense conversion. *See* Business and industry; Science and technology
Defense, Department of
See also specific military department; Armed Forces, U.S.
Assistant Deputy Under Secretary—1355
Assistant Secretaries—25, 1363, 1369
Base conversion and redevelopment—958, 1074
Defense Diversification Director—1355
Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Office—1363, 1367
Deputy Assistant Secretary—1363, 1367
Deputy Secretaries—122, 318, 382, 1298
Economic Adjustment, Office of—528
General Counsel—1363
Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs, Office of—1355
Joint Chiefs of Staff—6, 220, 284, 693, 698, 1027, 1087, 1227, 1252, 1298, 1329, 1353
Operational Test and Evaluation Director—1361
Overseas foreign studies programs—1327
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—1355
Principal Deputy Under Secretary—1369
Secretary—17, 122, 123, 186, 282, 284, 286, 377, 528, 643, 660, 662, 693, 698, 699, 978, 979, 1027, 1087, 1128, 1227, 1252, 1328, 1369
Secretary nominee—101, 107, 121
Technology Transition, Office of—1355
Under Secretaries—1369, 1370
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—1359
Deficit, Federal. *See* Budget, Federal
Delaware, ice storms and flooding—1358
Delaware River Basin Commission—1362
Democracy, National Endowment for—853
Democratic Governors Association—148, 915, 1356
Democratic National Committee—1120, 1124, 1153, 1366, 1367
Democratic Party
Campaign and fundraising events in Washington, DC—1158, 1288, 1362, 1363, 1365, 1369
Congressional dinner—737
Presidential dinners and galas—190, 450, 513
Saxophone Club—1124
State party organizations, fundraisers, etc. *See* specific State
Department. *See* other part of subject
Design Excellence, Presidential Awards for—791, 792, 1249
Detroit Diesel—444, 1358
Development, Agency for International. *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Development, Agency for International (AID)—17, 347, 429, 1163, 1296, 1298, 1299, 1359, 1364
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)—381, 1201
Disabled persons—804, 810, 812, 908, 1317, 1318
Disaster assistance
Alabama flooding—1251, 1269, 1368
Alabama tornadoes and flooding—1360
Alabama winter storms—368
Arkansas winter storms—1357
California earthquake—91, 99-102, 107, 118, 119, 235, 242, 244, 253, 255, 302, 486, 700, 1060, 1128, 1355, 1356
Delaware ice storms and flooding—1358
District of Columbia ice storms—1365
Florida flooding—1251, 1269, 1368
Georgia flooding—1212, 1251, 1269, 1368
Georgia tornadoes and flooding—1360
Illinois storms and flooding—1361
Insurance fund—255
Kentucky winter storms—1358
Louisiana winter storms—1357
Maine flooding and ice jams—1363
Maryland ice storms and flooding—1358
Michigan winter freeze—857, 1362
Midwest flooding—243, 603, 1356
Mississippi winter storm—1357
Missouri storms and flooding—1361
Nebraska snow and ice storm—1362
North Dakota flooding—1367
Oklahoma storms and flooding—1361
Pennsylvania winter storms—1358
South Dakota storms and flooding—1366
Southern tornadoes—557
Tennessee flooding—1360
Tennessee winter storms—1357
Texas tornadoes—1362
Tropical Storm Alberto—1257
Virginia ice storm and flooding—1358
Virginia winter storms—1360
Western wildfires—1329

Discovery. *See* Space program, shuttle
Discrimination. *See* Civil rights
District Court, U.S.—137, 221, 419, 526, 554, 783, 853, 1063, 1113, 1253, 1258, 1302, 1328
District of Columbia
  Budget—845
  Court of Appeals—1250
  Ice storms—1365
  Superior Court—140, 677
District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission—1363
Dominica
  Haitian refugees, role—1219
  Prime Minister—1367
Dominican Republic
  Border with Haiti—1064
  U.S. Ambassador—1360
Drug abuse and trafficking
  See also Law enforcement and crime
  Drug control policy—213, 259
  International cooperation—832
  Prevention efforts—177, 212, 259, 723
  Treatment programs—212, 259, 654, 696, 723, 872, 887
Drug Control Policy, Office of National—143, 211, 215, 259, 696, 772, 1324

Earth Day—740
Easter—561, 570
Economic Advisers, Council of—246
Economic Council, National—223, 469
Economic summit, international—1195, 1220, 1223, 1225, 1227, 1368
Economy, international
  See also specific country; Commerce, international
  Currency values—1132, 1214, 1217, 1220
  Environmental policies, impact—34, 885
  Growth—12, 26, 32, 34, 343, 433, 440, 822, 1027, 1054, 1057, 1058, 1104, 1163, 1196, 1214, 1216, 1220, 1223, 1225, 1243
  Naples economic summit. *See* Economic summit, international
Economy, national
  See also Banking; Budget, Federal; Commerce, international
  Devaluation of the dollar—1114, 1133, 1182, 1214, 1217, 1220
  Growth—141, 194, 246, 307, 351, 382, 433, 439, 455, 518, 567, 571, 590, 883, 895, 970, 1021, 1028, 1036, 1103, 1114, 1121, 1122, 1132, 1183, 1196, 1214, 1223, 1240
  Inflation and interest rates—144, 297, 436, 567, 571, 590, 711, 790, 934, 1036, 1219
  Stock market—567, 570, 591
Education
  See also specific institution
  College grants and loans—97, 294, 340, 429, 593, 594, 888, 1174
  Cultural diversity—881
  Foreign exchange programs—1327
  Funding—293, 342, 881
  Goals, national—170, 209, 292, 563, 565, 584, 745, 929
Education—Continued
  Hispanic-Americans—298
  National service program—97, 294, 420, 457, 594, 888, 962, 1073, 1134, 1138, 1175, 1319, 1360
  Postsecondary and job training—97, 185, 197, 209, 295, 307, 334, 435, 438, 440, 584, 746, 840, 843
  Prayer in schools—499, 585
  Privatization of schools—175
  Safe schools programs—261, 293, 584, 666, 720
  School desegregation—932, 935, 940
  Sex education programs—594
  Teachers—745
Education, American Council on—289
Education, Department of
  Assistant Secretaries—565, 912, 1320
  Deputy Regional Representatives—48
  Hispanic Americans, President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for—299, 1366
  Overseas foreign studies programs—1327
  Regional Representatives—48, 912
  Rehabilitation Services Administration—737
  Secretary—97, 165, 170, 292, 298, 565, 844, 937, 1175, 1319
  Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of—1353
Egypt
  President—85, 362, 844, 1359
  U.S. Ambassador—324
El Salvador, Ambassador to U.S.—1356
Election Commission, Federal—263
Elections
  Congressional campaign financing—1115, 1130
  State and local. *See* specific State
Emergency Management Agency, Federal—91, 99, 101-105, 110, 118-120, 243, 302, 368, 557, 857, 898, 1104, 1122, 1251, 1279, 1367, 1368
Employment and unemployment
  See also Economy, national
  Apprenticeship and school-to-work programs—840, 843
  Disabled persons—1320
  Job creation—184, 291, 383, 433, 435, 437, 444, 452, 459, 489, 594, 835, 1028
  Job training and reemployment—165, 185, 197, 295, 308, 335, 383, 415, 435, 438, 440, 470, 602, 684, 705, 1072, 1105, 1140
  Unemployment benefits—705
  Unemployment rates—414, 443
  Workers' compensation—613
Employment of People With Disabilities, President's Committee on—363, 1318
Empowerment zones. *See* Enterprise zones
Endowment. *See* other part of subject
Energy
  Alternative fuels—1170
  Conservation—409
  Nuclear energy—70, 978, 979
Energy, Department of
  Assistant Secretary—1361
  Chief Financial Officer—562
  Deputy Assistant Secretary—1353
  Energy Regulatory Commission, Federal—1367

Energy, Department of—Continued
Secretary—746, 951, 978, 979, 1356
Energy Regulatory Commission, Federal. *See* Energy, Department of
Enterprise zones—91, 163
Entitlement Reform, Bipartisan Commission on—223
Environment
See also Conservation
Air quality—1170
Chemical weapons convention, impact—353
Economic growth, impact—34, 744
Electromagnetic fields—501
Federal programs, adverse effects on minority and low-income populations—241
Global climate change—742
Pollution prevention—781
Population growth—1162
Water quality—173, 742
Environmental Cooperation, North American Commission for—1369
Environmental Protection Agency—138, 242, 501, 851, 1170, 1353, 1357, 1362, 1364
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—729, 1080
Espionage. *See* Defense and national security
Estonia
Economic assistance—1201
Human rights—1201, 1203
President—1145, 1200, 1204, 1246, 1247, 1314, 1365, 1367
Russian troop withdrawals—1185, 1201, 1203, 1204, 1246, 1314
Ethiopia, U.S. Ambassador—1360
Europe
See also specific country
Defense and security—9, 18, 1053, 1185, 1240
Democracy and freedom—13, 1054
Economic growth—12, 26, 32, 86
Trade with U.S.—26, 32
U.S. military, role—10, 20
Worker rights—34
European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM)—417
European Union—12, 20, 26, 32-37, 417, 484, 485, 1053, 1057, 1110, 1185, 1242, 1354
Export Administration, Bureau of. *See* Commerce, Department of
Export-Import Bank of the U.S.—66, 692, 1104
Exports, U.S. *See* specific commodity or subject; Commerce, Department of; Commerce, international

Farm Credit Administration—1365
Farmers Home Administration. *See* Agriculture, Department of
FBI. *See* Justice, Department of
Federal. *See* other part of subject
Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994—561
Federation. *See* other part of subject
FEMA. *See* Emergency Management Agency, Federal
Finland, U.S. Ambassador—312
Fire and Emergency Services Dinner, National—897
Fishery agreements. *See* Maritime affairs
Fishing industry—519
Flooding. *See* specific State; Disaster assistance
Florida
Democratic Party event—513
Federal aid for immigration costs—505
Flooding—1216, 1250, 1269, 1368
Governor—432, 508, 1123, 1250
Health and medical care—515
President's visits—503, 505, 506, 513, 1261, 1263, 1369
Florida State University—225
Focus: HOPE—434, 1358
Food and Drug Administration. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Food and Nutrition Service. *See* Agriculture, Department of
Football Association, Federation Internationale de—1364
Foreign Assets Control, Office of. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the U.S. *See* Justice, Department of
Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, President's—1364
Foreign policy, U.S. *See* specific country, region, or subject
Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995—807
Foundation. *See* other part of subject
France
Foreign Minister—1362
National Assembly—1051
News media—1055
President—19, 30, 698, 731, 733, 1056-1059, 1365
President Clinton's visit—1041-1044, 1049-1051, 1055, 1059, 1364, 1365
Prime Minister—1050, 1365
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission—1365
Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994—989

G-7. *See* Commerce, international
Gallaudet University—906, 1317
Gambling, gaming on Indian lands—802
General Accounting Office—1301
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). *See* Commerce, international
General Motors Co.—202
General Services Administration—365, 852, 1353
Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). *See* Commerce, international
Geological Survey, U.S. *See* Interior, Department of the
Georgia
Flooding—1212, 1216, 1250, 1269, 1368
Governor—1217, 1250, 1368
President's visits—816, 818, 819, 1250, 1362, 1368
Tornadoes and flooding—1360
Georgia, Republic of
Abkhaz region—390

Georgia, Republic of—Continued
Chairman, Parliament—64, 386, 387, 394, 1190, 1357
Civil conflict—1190
Economic assistance—395
Investment treaty with U.S.—395
Russian troop withdrawals—1190
Trade with U.S.—1019
Germany
Chancellor—144, 145, 731, 733, 1095, 1172, 1181, 1233, 1238, 1242, 1248, 1355, 1356, 1368
Foreign Minister—484
News media—1172, 1181
Peacekeeping and multilateral missions, role—1245
President—1368
President Clinton's visit—1233, 1238, 1239, 1241, 1242, 1247, 1248, 1368
Social Democratic Party—1368
Vice Chancellor—1368
GI bill of rights, 50th anniversary—1103, 1115
Girls Nation—1295
Goals 2000: Educate America Act—563, 564, 929
Government agencies and employees
See also specific agency
Design services for Federal projects—791, 792, 1249
Disaster areas, excused absences—1257
Eagle feathers distribution for Native American religious purposes—801
Earned-income tax credit, eligibility awareness—410, 413
Energy efficiency—409
Environmental programs, adverse effects on minority and low-income populations—241
Federal advisory committees—852, 1359
Federal buildings and grounds, landscaping practices—781
Human radiation experiments—746
Information and documents, access—686
Iraq-related documents, declassification—210
Labor disputes, intervention—686
Native American tribal governments, relations—801
Nonprofit organizations liaison network—672, 673
Personnel reductions—561
Printing of Government publications—1301
Privacy Act, implementation—181
Reform—364, 367, 561, 852, 917, 1301
Senior Executive Service—1353, 1355
Small business initiatives—469
Water conservation—409
Government National Mortgage Association. *See* Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Government Printing Office—1301
Governors' Association, National—142, 154, 1276, 1355
Great Lakes Fishery Commission—1370
Greater Houston Partnership—192
Greece
Cyprus conflict. *See* Cyprus
Deputy Foreign Minister—713
Greece—Continued
Dispute with Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—755, 756, 758, 1362
Foreign Minister—484, 485
Foreign Ministry Director General—713
Prime Minister—33, 34, 36, 37, 713, 754, 755, 1356, 1361, 1362
Relations with Turkey—759
Social Security agreement with U.S.—136
Grenada, Haitian refugees, role—1219
Gridiron Club—1359
Group of Seven nations (G-7). *See* Commerce, international
GSP. *See* Commerce, international
Gun control. *See* Law enforcement and crime

Habitat for Humanity—385
Haiti
Civil conflict—517, 776, 816, 819, 823, 832, 859, 954, 1064, 1100, 1114, 1218, 1292
Economic sanctions—736, 776, 777, 816, 819, 823, 860, 861, 863, 975, 1064, 1113, 1244
Government assets held by U.S.—776
Human rights—1217, 1222, 1244
Humanitarian assistance—860, 1218
President—776, 816, 819, 823, 832, 859, 976, 1064, 1065, 1100, 1114
Refugees—595, 754, 860-862, 1064, 1157, 1203, 1217, 1219, 1221
United Nations Security Council resolutions—777, 778, 863, 975
U.S. air service ban—1064, 1065
U.S. military, role—823, 954, 1244
U.S. national emergency—776
U.S. Special Adviser—859, 1064, 1219, 1245
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund—167
Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the U.S. (HTS). *See* Commerce, international
Hawaii
Governor—158
Health and medical care—525, 1256, 1268, 1282, 1302
Head Start. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Health and Human Services, Department of
Children and Families, Administration for—245, 1361
Food and Drug Administration—633
Head Start—292, 945, 946
Health, National Institutes of—855
Indian Health Service—631, 802, 803
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—245
Medicare and Medicaid—131, 154, 159, 198, 223, 266, 269, 279, 315, 317, 399, 488, 500, 508, 556, 579, 583, 624, 653, 785, 871, 879, 891, 1106, 1256, 1344
Public Health Service—497, 1353
Radiation control, report—300
Secretary—855, 858, 944, 946, 1369
Social Security Administration—785, 790

Health and Human Services, Department of—Continued
Social Security agreement, report—137
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—319
Health and medical care
Abortion—499, 688, 990, 1164, 1339
Academic medical centers—872, 1146
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS)—174, 423, 628, 1222
Cancer—501
Dental benefits—657
Disabled persons—804, 811, 908, 1318, 1320
Drug abuse, treatment programs. *See* Drug abuse and trafficking
Drugs, prescription—315-317, 631, 651, 655, 787, 891
Experimental procedures and treatments—649
Family planning—1164
Health care reform—1, 3, 130, 141, 151, 155, 157, 191, 198, 204, 237, 255, 266, 273, 279, 309, 313, 314, 330, 335, 396, 456, 458, 460, 487, 495, 504, 507, 515, 519, 528, 538, 555, 571, 576, 583, 585, 592, 604, 605, 616, 617, 638, 640, 645, 683, 706, 785, 797, 811, 836, 854, 858, 864, 868, 875, 877, 879, 882, 883, 890, 908, 918, 927, 970, 973, 1063, 1066-1068, 1072, 1078, 1081, 1090, 1099, 1100, 1106, 1122, 1125, 1128, 1133, 1141, 1144, 1146, 1155, 1160, 1165, 1171, 1176, 1177, 1255, 1267, 1274, 1279, 1286, 1290, 1300, 1302, 1306, 1318, 1320, 1332-1334, 1338, 1341, 1342, 1350
Health security plan, proposed legislation—1, 3, 114, 130, 198, 205, 215, 239, 268, 273, 360, 487, 507, 520, 529, 538, 540, 551, 555, 575, 578, 583, 592, 604, 607, 618, 646, 708, 761, 787, 797, 802, 811, 836, 858, 869, 878, 879, 890, 918, 927, 1063, 1066-1068, 1072, 1081, 1099, 1107, 1122, 1128, 1133, 1142, 1144, 1147, 1155, 1167, 1171, 1176, 1177, 1180, 1255, 1274, 1281, 1285, 1300, 1302, 1321, 1332, 1338, 1341
Illegal immigrants, health care costs—871
Immunization programs—630, 729, 1333
Insurance—130, 141, 151, 206, 266, 314, 398, 457, 458, 460, 487, 504, 507, 508, 511, 521, 529, 539, 556, 576, 579, 585, 608, 618, 630, 640, 651, 655, 706, 708, 786, 836, 854, 869, 873, 879, 890, 918, 1100, 1141, 1256, 1283, 1302, 1320, 1321, 1332, 1341
Long-term care—270, 355, 457, 509, 621, 787, 812
Medical malpractice—533, 614, 650
Medical research, protection of human subjects—281
Medical technology—626
Mental health—459, 621, 654
Nurses—510, 573
Organ transplants—632, 653
Physicians—512, 531, 572, 580, 653
Public health services—633, 1333
Teenage pregnancy—594
Tobacco use—497, 633
Health and medical care—Continued
Universal coverage and guaranteed benefits—131, 157, 313, 398, 461, 487, 507, 555, 574, 583, 615, 647, 1099, 1128, 1133, 1166, 1176, 1178, 1180, 1281, 1286, 1290, 1300, 1332, 1334
Veterans hospitals. *See* Veterans Affairs, Department of, Veterans Health Administration
Women's health—854, 858
Workers' compensation—613
Health, National Institutes of. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Health Security Express—1342
Health Service Corps, National—874
Heart Association, American—1356
Highway Administration, Federal. *See* Transportation, Department of
Highway Traffic Safety Administration, National. *See* Transportation, Department of
Hillcrest High School—337
Hispanic-Americans. *See* specific subject
Hispanic Americans, President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for. *See* Education, Department of
Hispanic Association of Higher Education—429
Holocaust Memorial Council, U.S.—1366
Holy See
Head, Roman Catholic Church—1009, 1011, 1013, 1014, 1364
President Clinton's visit—1009, 1364
U.S. Ambassador—1021
Homeless, Federal Interagency Council on the—943
Homeless persons—344, 943
Hong Kong, Governor—348
Hospital Association, American—150
Housing
Federal programs—1199
Public housing—635, 659, 662, 701, 1091, 1092
Housing Administration, Federal (FHA). *See* Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Annual report—897
Budget—197, 1199
Government National Mortgage Association—1199
Housing Administration, Federal (FHA)—385, 1199
Housing programs and grants—341, 385, 1199
Loan guarantee program—302
Regional Administrators—1353
Secretary—97, 99, 104, 105, 110, 118-120, 197, 243, 262, 302, 341, 344, 365, 385, 635, 659, 662, 666, 685, 701, 719, 794, 801, 839, 851, 886, 944, 1091, 1092, 1094, 1263, 1288, 1333, 1369
Howard University—95
HTS. *See* Commerce, international
Human Radiation Experiments, Advisory Committee on—746, 1357
Human rights. *See* specific country
Human Services Amendments of 1994—944, 946
Humanities, National Council on the—1096
Humanities, National Endowment for the. *See* Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Hungary
President—39, 1101

Hungary—Continued
Prime Minister—39
U.S. Ambassador—147

IAEA. *See* United Nations, International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD. *See* Reconstruction and Development, International Bank for
Id al-Fitr—416
Illinois
Democratic Party event—1088
Gubernatorial election—1088
President's visits—326, 332, 337, 1088, 1091, 1092, 1095, 1365
Storms and flooding—1361
IMF. *See* Monetary Fund, International
Immigration and naturalization
See also specific country
Border control—593, 764
Federal aid to States for immigration costs—238, 505, 536, 764, 871, 1222
Federal policy—180, 505, 1193
Illegal immigrants, incarceration and deportation of convicted criminals—764
Immunization Week, National Infant—729
Independence Day—1153, 1186
Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994—1168
India
Kashmir—954
Prime Minister—949, 950, 1361
Trade with U.S.—951
U.S. Ambassador—900, 1359
Indian Affairs, Bureau of. *See* Interior, Department of the
Indian Gaming Commission, National—1363
Indian Health Service. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Indiana
Governor—915
President's visit—912, 913, 915, 1363
Indians, American. *See* Native Americans
Information Agency, U.S.—38, 221, 476, 807, 808, 956, 965, 991, 1200, 1327, 1367
Information superhighway, national. *See* Communications
Infrastructure
See also Transportation
Funding—888
Highway bridge seismic retrofitting legislation—483
Institute. *See* other part of subject
Intelligence. *See* Central Intelligence Agency; Defense and national security; Security Council, National
Inter-American Development Bank—432, 1357
Inter-American Foundation—1362
Interagency. *See* other part of subject
Interest rates. *See* Economy, national
Intergovernmental and Policy Advisory Committee—895
Interior, Department of the
Associate Solicitor—1353
Geological Survey, U.S.—7
Interior, Department of the—Continued
Indian Affairs, Bureau of—801
Park Service, National—181, 182, 981
Reclamation, Bureau of—365
Secretary—365, 497, 668, 697, 801, 802, 910, 981, 1316, 1333
Internal Revenue Service. *See* Treasury, Department of the
International. *See* other part of subject
Interstate Commerce Commission—1362
Investigation, Federal Bureau of. *See* Justice, Department of
Iowa
Governor—1283
Gubernatorial election—1083
Welfare reform—1084
Iran, U.S. national emergency—923
Iraq
Attacks on relief workers and United Nations guards—1048
Economic sanctions—146, 369, 370, 637, 1048
Human rights—370, 637, 1047
Humanitarian assistance—693, 699, 771, 1252
Iraq National Congress—147, 638, 1049
Military potential—73
No-fly zones—146, 636, 1047
Nuclear weapons development—145, 636, 1046
President—145, 636, 1046
United Nations Security Council resolutions—145, 636, 1046
U.S. classified documents, congressional access—210
U.S. helicopters' downing by U.S. forces—693, 698, 770, 1252
U.S. national emergency—368
Ireland, Northern. *See* Northern Ireland
Ireland, Prime Minister—346, 479-482, 1358, 1363
Israel
See also Middle East
Agreement with Jordan—1307, 1309, 1310, 1325
Agreement with Palestine Liberation Organization—217, 319, 692, 844
Economic assistance—4, 472
Economic boycott. *See* Commerce, international
Foreign Minister—218, 1308, 1309
Prime Minister—85, 217, 319, 321, 362, 471, 692, 827, 844, 1173, 1253, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1314, 1315, 1319, 1325, 1330, 1358, 1369
Terrorist attacks on civilians—635, 692
Italy
Foreign Minister—998
News media—998
President—1023, 1364, 1368
President Clinton's visits—1010, 1017-1021, 1023, 1212, 1215, 1223, 1224, 1230, 1364, 1368
Prime Minister Berlusconi—999, 1010, 1018, 1181, 1364, 1368
Prime Minister Ciampi—998

Japan
Emperor—1070, 1074, 1359
Prime Minister Hata—828, 983, 1086, 1362

Japan—Continued
Prime Minister Hosokawa—228, 229, 243, 247, 264, 364, 367, 643, 645, 1355, 1356, 1358, 1360
Prime Minister Murayama—1184, 1212, 1215, 1220, 1368
Trade with U.S.—230-234, 243, 247, 251, 252, 264, 276, 361, 433, 644, 828, 983, 1133, 1184, 1215, 1217, 1228
Japan Art Association—1084
Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission—1327
Jefferson, Thomas, anniversary of birth—667
Joint Chiefs of Staff. *See* Defense, Department of
Jordan
Agreement with Israel—1307, 1309, 1310, 1325
Crown Prince—1308, 1309
King—116, 362, 1114, 1173, 1253, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1314, 1315, 1319, 1325, 1330, 1359, 1366, 1369
Judiciary. *See* specific court
Justice, Department of
Assistant Attorneys General—160, 184, 725, 1323, 1333, 1360
Associate Attorney General—446, 447
Attorney General—108, 109, 215, 301, 541, 599, 635, 659, 662, 665, 666, 695, 701, 719, 772, 801, 851, 901-904, 1094, 1323, 1324, 1354
Attorneys, U.S.—677, 678, 902
Civil Division—902
Civil Rights Division—108, 160, 725, 886, 887, 1323, 1333
Community policing grants—214, 260, 903
Deputy Assistant Attorney General—1353
Deputy Associate Attorney General—1353
Deputy Attorneys General—142, 311
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the U.S.—924, 1363
Inspector General—184
Investigation, Federal Bureau of (FBI)—304, 320, 323, 834, 1243
Justice, National Institute of—1360
Justice Assistance, Bureau of—1362
Justice Programs, Office of—1360
Justice Statistics, Bureau of—1360
Marshals Service, U.S.—944
Parole Commission, U.S.—1365
Senior Counsel—1353
Victims of Crime, Office for—772, 1361
Justice, National Institute of. *See* Justice, Department of
Justice Assistance, Bureau of. *See* Justice, Department of
Justice Programs, Office of. *See* Justice, Department of
Justice Statistics, Bureau of. *See* Justice, Department of
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Coordinating Council on—1367

KABC Radio—253
Kansas
Governor—604
Kansas—Continued
President's visit—601, 605
Kazakhstan
Arms control negotiations and agreements—21, 249
Economic assistance—253
President—21, 248, 1355
Trade with U.S.—272, 1019
Kennedy center. *See* Smithsonian Institution
Kentucky
Governor—1285
President's visit—599
Winter storms—1358
Kenya
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
U.S. Ambassador—246
KMOX Radio—1129
Korea, North
Arms control negotiations and agreements—73, 115, 1014, 1016, 1026, 1031, 1034, 1035, 1039, 1080, 1086, 1099, 1117, 1186, 1224, 1226, 1229, 1236
Nuclear weapons development—73, 115, 234, 503, 505, 550, 559, 589, 824, 1014, 1016, 1022, 1026, 1031, 1034, 1035, 1039, 1051, 1080, 1086, 1099, 1117, 1186, 1212, 1215, 1229, 1235, 1236, 1246
President—1087, 1099, 1118, 1224, 1235
Summit with South Korea—1226
Korea, South
Arms control negotiations and agreements—73
President—505, 559, 1014, 1022, 1086, 1364, 1366
U.S. military, role—1035, 1036, 1086, 1087, 1227
Kramer Junior High School—169
Kuwait, U.S. Ambassador—318
Kyrgyzstan
Trade with U.S.—1019
U.S. Ambassador—1368

La Raza, National Council of—1263, 1369
Labor, Department of
Assistant Secretary—1358
Contract Compliance Programs, Office of Federal—47, 97
Occupational Safety and Health Administration—365
Secretary—97, 165, 365, 416, 527, 841, 844, 886, 1095, 1199, 1317, 1320
Labor issues
See also specific industry
Labor administration, international convention—1317
Labor disputes, Government intervention—686
Labor Organization, International. *See* United Nations
Labor Relations Authority, Federal—800
Labor Relations Board, National—183, 1355
Lake Superior State University—857
Lands, Federal. *See* Conservation
Laos, POW/MIA cooperation with U.S.—179
"Larry King Live"—106, 798
Latin America
See also specific country
Summit of the Americas. *See* Summit of the Americas
Trade with U.S.—432, 831

Latvia
Economic assistance—1201
Human rights—1200, 1201, 1203
President—810, 982, 1145, 1200, 1204, 1230, 1355, 1365, 1367
President Clinton's visit—1200, 1204, 1367
Russian troop withdrawals—810, 982, 983, 1185, 1191, 1200, 1201, 1203, 1230, 1246
Law enforcement and crime
See also Drug abuse and trafficking
Abortion clinic violence—990, 1339
Antiviolence public service announcements—477
Anticrime legislation—113, 133, 139, 143, 171, 193, 203, 212, 260, 303, 308, 325, 328, 334, 338, 420, 490, 492, 504, 516, 582, 584, 591, 595, 603, 659, 664, 684, 695, 701, 706, 714, 717, 766, 772, 774, 795, 804, 813, 839, 846, 881, 882, 885, 903, 920, 922, 1071, 1091, 1094, 1097, 1134, 1136, 1141, 1160, 1258, 1266, 1278, 1300, 1324, 1326, 1331, 1341, 1343
Arson, prevention legislation—898
Capital punishment—161, 595
Child support enforcement—499, 887, 1077, 1083
Crime prevention efforts—173, 420, 696, 718, 719, 724, 796, 922, 1073, 1098, 1134, 1326
Federal funding—584, 696
Gun control—113, 134, 261, 325, 327, 329, 334, 338, 420, 716, 722, 772, 773, 796, 804, 813, 839, 846, 847, 849, 881, 882, 920, 922, 966, 1091, 1097, 1259, 1326
Illegal immigrants, incarceration and deportation of convicted felons—764
Juvenile offenders—882
Mandatory sentencing—723
Memorial ceremony for law enforcement officers—921
Prisons and correctional system—718
Public housing searches—635, 659, 662, 701, 1091, 1094
Safe schools initiative—261, 293, 584, 666, 720
Victims' rights—772
Violent repeat offenders, ineligibility for parole—172, 665, 717
League. *See* other part of subject
Lebanon
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Church bombing—326
Withdrawal of foreign troops—113
Legion, American—1295, 1335
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995—1301
Libraries, public—237
Libraries and Information Science, National Commission on—1356, 1367
Library of Congress—1301
Libya
Economic sanctions—226, 1270
U.S. national emergency—226, 1269
Lithuania
Economic assistance—1201
Fishery agreement with U.S.—1272
Human rights—1201
Lithuania—Continued
President—1145, 1200, 1204, 1365, 1367
Russian troop withdrawals—1185
U.S. Ambassador—1369
Long Island Rail Road—1095, 1357
Louisiana
President's visit—202
Winter storms—1357
Luxembourg, U.S. Ambassador—1365

Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of
Dispute with Greece—755, 756, 758, 1362
U.S. military, role—17, 37, 728
U.S. Special Envoy—756, 758, 1359
Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. *See* Whitewater Development Corp. investigation
Maine
Democratic Party events—1272, 1369
Flooding and ice jams—1363
President's visit—1272, 1369
Malawi, U.S. Ambassador—1360
Malaysia, Prime Minister—856
Malta, U.S. Ambassador—1361
Management and Budget, Office of—105, 120, 196, 852, 900, 1017, 1148, 1149
Management Council, President's—1148
Maritime Administration. *See* Transportation, Department of
Maritime affairs
Boundary treaties—418
Fishery agreements—1272
Fishing conservation and management measures, adherence by vessels on high seas, international agreement—775
Fishing industry. *See* Fishing industry
Merchant fleet, proposed legislation—431
Maritime Commission, Federal—126, 1165
Mark Twain Memorial Lighthouse—1179
Markem Corp.—464, 1358
Marshals Service, U.S. *See* Justice, Department of
Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday—91, 95
Martin Luther King, Jr., Middle School—935, 940
Maryland
Ice storms and flooding—1358
President's visits—210, 935, 940, 984, 1355
Massachusetts
Democratic Party event—450
President's visits—446, 448, 450, 1276, 1286, 1369
Mayors, U.S. Conference of—138, 1071
McDonnell Aircraft Co.—263, 264
Mediation Board, National—1095
Medical care. *See* Health and medical care
Medicare and Medicaid. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Memorial Day—1002-1004
Mental Retardation, President's Committee on—1317
Mexico
Assassination of Presidential candidate—542, 549, 552, 851
Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. and Mexico, International—1365
President—542, 549, 552, 851

Mexico—Continued
Trade with U.S.—177, 1277
MIA's. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
Michigan
President's visit—434, 436, 444, 1358
Winter freeze—857, 1362
Micronesia, U.S. Ambassador—147
Middle East
See also specific country
Arms control—73
Economic assistance—827
Hebron massacre—319, 321, 486
Peace efforts—82-86, 89, 113, 114, 217, 319, 322, 361, 462, 471, 474, 475, 486, 542, 559, 692, 827, 844, 953, 1114, 1173, 1253, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1312, 1315, 1325, 1330, 1359
Military, U.S. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, Federal—1367
Minnesota, President's visit—638, 643, 645
Mississippi, winter storm—1357
Missouri
Democratic Party event—1138
President's visits—615, 617, 1075, 1134, 1138, 1342, 1365, 1366, 1370
Storms and flooding—1361
Welfare reform—1075, 1365
Moldova
Economic assistance—44
Trade with U.S.—1019
Monetary Fund, International—222, 382, 698
Mongolia, trade with U.S.—1019
Montenegro
Economic sanctions—1109
U.S. national emergency—989
Moon landing, 25th anniversary. *See* Space program
Morocco, King—1056
Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation—1368
MTV—714
Mustang 30th anniversary celebration—1361

NAACP. *See* Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the
NAFTA. *See* Commerce, international
Naples economic summit. *See* Economic summit, international
NASA. *See* Aeronautics and Space Administration, National
National. *See* other part of subject
Native Americans
Eagle feathers used for religious purposes, Federal policy—801
Economic development—802
Gambling rights—802, 1333
Health and medical care—631, 802
Religious freedom—801
Tribal governments
Relations with Federal Government departments and agencies—801
Self-governance—801
Tribal leaders, meeting with President—541, 800
Native Americans, Administration for. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of, Children and Families, Administration for
NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, Office of—1367
Navy, Department of the
See also Armed Forces, U.S.
Chief of Naval Operations—453, 726, 735, 988, 1030
Commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe—453
Deputy Assistant Secretary—1355
Naval Academy, U.S.—984
Secretary—528
U.S.S. *George Washington*—1029, 1131, 1364
NBC News—1038, 1098
Nebraska
Governor—1284
Snow and ice storm—1362
Netherlands, Prime Minister—5, 6
New Hampshire
Health and medical care—456
President's visit—454, 463, 464, 1358
New Jersey
President's visit—265
Wilderness and wildlife preservation—181, 182
New York
Attack on Jewish students in Brooklyn—364
Democratic Party events—1153, 1367
Federal aid for immigration costs—871
Governor—1095, 1154, 1369
President's visits—419, 428, 467, 864, 866, 875, 1153, 1358, 1367
New York, Association for a Better—866
New Zealand
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
U.S. Ambassador—7
News media. *See* specific State, country, or news organization; Communications
Newspaper Editors, American Society of—680, 1361
Nigeria
Restoration of democracy—1369
U.S. emissary—1369
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). *See* Commerce, international
North Atlantic Cooperation Council—11, 18, 193, 272, 755, 759
North Atlantic Treaty Organization—5, 6, 11, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28-30, 33, 36, 37, 40-43, 46, 57, 65, 75, 77, 80, 90, 121, 122, 186, 193, 217, 219, 228, 250, 278, 281, 283, 286, 287, 354, 453, 660, 679, 694, 699, 702, 703, 727, 732-734, 755, 760, 774, 821, 825, 826, 978, 979, 987, 996, 1000, 1016, 1017, 1026, 1050, 1053, 1056, 1115, 1172, 1173, 1187, 1189, 1192, 1206, 1210, 1246, 1354
North Carolina
Governor—582
President's visits—553, 571, 575, 581, 597, 1360, 1361
North Carolina, University of—1322
North Dakota, storms, flooding, and ground saturation—1367

Northern Ireland
Conflict resolution—144, 161, 346, 480, 482, 997
Sinn Fein leader, granting of U.S. visa—144, 997
Norway
Foreign Minister—76
Prime Minister—934
U.S. Ambassador—1356
Whaling activities—935
Nuclear weapons
See also Arms and munitions; Defense and national security
Arms control negotiations and agreements—21, 23, 31, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 69, 71, 74, 80, 86, 115, 132, 222, 249, 372-374, 379, 392, 417, 558, 822, 978, 979, 1014, 1016, 1026, 1031, 1034, 1035, 1039, 1080, 1086, 1099, 1117, 1186, 1229, 1236
Dismantling and disposal—70, 71
Nonproliferation—11, 71, 417, 558, 809, 931, 955, 1086, 1169
Testing—71
Nurses Association, American—889

OAS. *See* States, Organization of American
Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *See* Labor, Department of
Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National. *See* Commerce, Department of
Office. *See* other part of subject
Ohio
Democratic Party events—1346, 1370
President's visits—257, 570, 1345, 1346, 1356, 1360, 1370
Senatorial election—1346
Oklahoma, storms and flooding—1361
Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, Permanent Committee for the—364
Olympic winter games. *See* Sports
Oregon, Governor—140
Organization. *See* other part of subject
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Oxford University—1060, 1365

Pacific Halibut Commission, International—1362
Pakistan
Alleged support for terrorist acts—954
Ambassador to U.S.—1356
Palau
Compact with U.S.—1315
President—1316
Palestine Liberation Organization—217, 218, 319, 361, 471, 475, 692, 844, 1173, 1253
Palestinians
See also Middle East
Self-government—218
Panama
Haitian refugees, role—1219
President Endara—1367
President-elect Perez Balladares—1292, 1367
U.S. Ambassador—1363
Panama Canal Commission—676
Papua New Guinea, Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Park Service, National. *See* Interior, Department of the
Park Week, National—980
Parole Commission, U.S. *See* Justice, Department of
Partnership For Peace—11, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, 26, 28, 29, 37, 39, 40, 43, 46, 57, 65, 75, 80, 86, 90, 250, 377, 394, 821, 826, 1026, 1050, 1053, 1102, 1115, 1172, 1173, 1187, 1190, 1192, 1203, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1220, 1246
Passover—554
Pathmark Stores—864
Peace Corps—807
Pennsylvania
Democratic Party event—1369
Governor—158, 1280
President's visits—345, 346, 1254, 1258, 1369
Winter storms—1358
Performance Review, National. *See* Government agencies and employees, reform
Personnel Management, Office of—365
Physical Fitness and Sports, President's Council on—691, 1006, 1356, 1363, 1364
PictureTel—927
Poland
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Economic assistance—1206, 1209
News media—1187, 1189
Parliament—1208
President—6, 39, 42, 77, 1188, 1205, 1207, 1367
President Clinton's visit—1205, 1207, 1208, 1211, 1367, 1368
Prime Minister—39, 1368
Trade with U.S.—1188
U.S. military equipment purchase—1193
U.S. private sector investment—1194
Polish Enterprise Fund—1194
Polish Partners Fund—1209
Pollution. *See* Environment
Population and Development, International Conference on. *See* United Nations
Portugal, U.S. Ambassador—1365
POW's. *See* Armed Forces, U.S.
Praemium Imperiale Arts Award—1084
Prayer Breakfast, National—168
Presidential. *See* other part of subject
President's. *See* other part of subject
Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, Federal—1080
Prince Georges County Correctional Center—210
Public Broadcasting, Corporation for—410, 947
Public Diplomacy, U.S. Advisory Commission on—38, 1356
Public Health Service. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of

Radio and Television Correspondents Association—673
Radio and TV Marti. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Radio Free Asia. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Radio Free Europe. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Radio Liberty. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Railroad industry, labor disputes—1095, 1357
Railroad Passenger Corporation, National—1096, 1366

Railroad Retirement Board—1370
Reclamation, Bureau of. *See* Interior, Department of the
Reconciliation, National Day of—569
Reconstruction and Development, International Bank for—222, 382, 729
Red Cross, International—1047
"Reemployment Act of 1994"—470
Refugees. *See* specific country or region
Rehabilitation Services Administration. *See* Education, Department of
Reinventing Government initiative. *See* Government agencies and employees, reform
Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993—218
Research and development. *See* Business and industry; Science and technology
Research and Special Programs Administration. *See* Transportation, Department of
Reserve System, Federal—590, 711, 763, 1036
Resolution Trust Corporation—545, 548
Retired Persons, American Association of—265
Rhode Island
  Health and medical care—876
  President's visit—876, 879
Risk Assessment and Management Commission—1365
Robert Taylor Homes—1092
Romania, trade with U.S.—272, 1019
Rural Conference, National—1324
Russia
  Arms control negotiations and agreements—49, 52, 53, 69, 71, 74
  Defense Minister—662
  Deputy Foreign Minister—484, 670, 694, 699, 702, 703
  Economic assistance—24, 55, 61, 303, 320, 321, 1219
  Economics Minister—87
  Education—63
  Energy and Space, U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on—60, 74, 896, 1188, 1219
  Foreign Minister—662
  Human rights—73
  Military personnel, resettlement—1193, 1201
  Nationalism and territorial expansion—41
  Political and economic reform—13, 53, 56, 59, 87, 116, 321
  President—22, 41, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, 73, 74, 76, 87, 88, 109, 219, 223, 224, 228, 232, 284, 287, 288, 391, 412, 413, 559, 661, 670, 702, 726, 727, 731, 733, 734, 810, 983, 1014, 1022, 1086, 1102, 1185, 1190, 1191, 1197, 1200-1202, 1204, 1230, 1243, 1246, 1247, 1314, 1325, 1330, 1354, 1365, 1367
  President Clinton's visit—47-50, 58, 69, 71, 73, 74, 76, 1354
  Prime Minister—896, 1188, 1191, 1219, 1366
  Trade with U.S.—52, 55, 66, 1019
  Troop withdrawals—810, 982, 983, 1185, 1190, 1191, 1193, 1200-1204, 1220, 1230, 1246, 1314, 1325, 1330
Russia—Continued
  U.S. Ambassador—223
  U.S. private sector investment—52, 66, 1219
Russia, Fund for Large Enterprises in—1354
Rwanda
  Civil conflict—635, 678, 807, 830, 1056, 1151, 1299
  Closing of Embassy in U.S.—1257
  Humanitarian assistance—830, 1298, 1305, 1307, 1328, 1370
  President—635, 659, 678
  Prime Minister—635, 659
  Refugees—1296, 1298, 1328, 1370
  U.S. Ambassador—661
  U.S. citizens, safety and evacuation—643, 659, 660, 678

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. *See* Transportation, Department of
St. Patrick's Day—479, 481, 483, 1358
Saudi Arabia
  Ambassador to U.S.—263
  King—85, 263, 1355
  Trade with U.S.—263, 275
  U.S. Ambassador—900
Scholars, Presidential—1174
School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994—840, 843
Schools. *See* specific institution; Education
Science and technology
  Communications. *See* Communications
  Foreign policy implementation role—208
  International cooperation—381, 1327
  Military and defense technology, civilian uses—238, 301, 886, 972
  Research and development—176, 195
  Space-based remote sensing systems and data products, policy on sales—1358
  Space program. *See* Space program
  Super collider—1289
  Technology reinvestment programs and grants—301, 304
Science Foundation, National—677
Sciences, National Academy of—1161
Scottish Rite Hospital for Children—555
Secret Service, U.S. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Securities and Exchange Commission—228
Security, national. *See* Defense and national security
Security and Cooperation in Europe, Commission on—1363
Security and Cooperation in Europe, Conference on—66, 70, 73, 75, 1110
Security Council, National
  African Affairs Senior Director—1359
  Asia-Pacific Economic Affairs Senior Director—1359
  Asian Affairs Director—1359
  Asian Affairs Senior Director—1359
  Assistant to President for National Security Affairs—90, 643, 660, 703, 1296, 1298, 1329
  Counterintelligence policy restructuring, role—834
  Draft registration recommendation—948
  Public Affairs Senior Director—1359
Security Education Board, National—1359, 1361, 1362

Selective Service System—948, 1370
Senegal, President—977, 1363
Serbia
  Economic sanctions—503, 732, 761, 825, 997, 1109
  U.S. national emergency—989
Service program, national. *See* AmeriCorps; Civilian Community Corps, National; Community Service, Corporation for National and; Education
Seychelles, U.S. Ambassador—1365
Shipbuilding industry—1364
Singapore
  Human rights—393, 694, 715, 847
  U.S. Ambassador—1360
Slovakia
  Ambassador to U.S.—1366
  President—39, 1101
  Prime Minister—39
Small business. *See* Business and industry
Small Business, White House Conference on—469
Small Business Administration—103, 105, 243, 353, 365, 469, 519, 579, 609, 611, 614, 835, 836, 898, 917, 1104, 1122, 1251, 1279
Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform—1165
Small Business Commission, White House Conference on—469
Small Business Person of the Year—834
Smithsonian Institution
  Air and Space Museum, National—1359
  Art, National Gallery of—845
  John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—1361
Social Security—136, 224, 463, 591, 785, 790
Social Security Administration. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Society. *See* other part of subject
Soil Conservation Service. *See* Agriculture, Department of
Somalia
  Civil disorder—112, 412, 829
  Humanitarian assistance—112, 467, 829, 977, 1150
  U.S. military, role—412, 467, 829, 976, 1150
South Africa
  African National Congress—348, 727, 749, 753, 1357
  Civil conflict—557
  Democratic elections—727, 748, 754, 780, 781, 793, 806, 848, 1062
  Economic assistance—748, 750, 820, 830, 848
  Human rights—752
  Inkatha Freedom Party—348, 550, 727, 749
  President de Klerk—727, 749, 753, 848
  President Mandela—848, 1152
  Trade with U.S.—747, 830
  Transition to democracy—550
  U.S. private sector investment—748, 750
South America. *See* specific country; Latin America
South Carolina, Governor—156, 159, 1283
South Dakota, storms and flooding—1366
South East Asian Nations, Association of—1287
Soviet Union, New Independent States (NIS) of the Former
  See also specific country
  Economic assistance—17
  U.S. Ambassador at Large—223
Space program
  Funding—342
  Moon landing by *Apollo 11*, 25th anniversary—1293
  Satellites—896
  Shuttle—199, 896
  Space station—896, 1289, 1294
Sports
  Baseball—1360
  Basketball—556, 1081, 1322, 1360
  Boston Marathon—1361
  Football—225, 352, 1355
  Ice hockey—857
  Olympic winter games—689, 690, 1356, 1357
  Soccer—323, 1095, 1127, 1181, 1186, 1189, 1365
State and local governments
  See also specific State or subject; Cities
  Federal mandates—1072, 1073
  Health and medical care—158, 576
  School-to-work programs—842, 843
  Welfare reform—1078, 1084
State, Department of
  Ambassadors. *See* specific country
  Assistant Secretaries—712, 1328, 1363, 1366, 1367
  Budget—808
  Deputy Assistant Secretary—1355
  East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Bureau of—1355
  International agreements, reports—469
  Overseas foreign studies programs—1327
  Population, Refugees and Migration, Bureau of—1353, 1363
  Secretary—17, 84, 87, 109, 183, 186, 264, 319, 436, 558, 643, 660, 662, 668, 676, 808, 827, 851, 859, 863, 953, 975, 978, 1065, 1114, 1253, 1308, 1309, 1311, 1312, 1314, 1361
  Southern Europe, Office for—712
  Special Adviser to Secretary—1149
  Special Adviser to Secretary on Haiti—859, 1064, 1219
  Treaties and conventions, reports—136, 486, 905, 1317
  Under Secretary—125
State Justice Institute—1370
States, Organization of American—136, 432, 776-778
Student Loan Marketing Association—1359
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Sudan
  Ambassador to U.S.—246
  Civil conflict—245
  Humanitarian assistance—246
  President's special representative—1359, 1363
  U.S. Ambassador—246
Summit of the Americas—431, 1261, 1265, 1360
Super 301. *See* Commerce, international, U.S. trade expansion

Support Implementation Group—1354
Supreme Court of the U.S.—597, 599, 671, 725, 847, 904, 909, 925, 935, 937, 941, 1288, 1335
Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Susquehanna River Basin Commission—1362
Sustainable Development, President's Council on—744
Sweden, Prime Minister—273
Switzerland
  President—1354
  President Clinton's visit—81, 1354
Syria
  Foreign Minister—84, 87
  Pan Am Flight 103 bombing, alleged role—87
  President—81, 85-87, 89, 114, 217, 472, 827, 1173, 1311-1313, 1358, 1359

Taiwan
  Rhinoceros and tiger trade—668
  Trade with U.S.—669
Tajikistan, trade with U.S.—1019
Take Our Daughters to Work Day—791
Taxation
  Capital gains—162, 455
  Earned-income credit—129, 156, 410, 413
  Enterprise zones. *See* Enterprise zones
  Personal assistance services credit—812
  Self-insured business tax—648
  Small business investment deduction—162, 455
  Tax cut proposals—595
  Tobacco tax—586, 633, 648, 652
Technology. *See* Science and technology
Technology Assessment, Office of—1301
Television. *See* Communications
Tennessee
  Flooding—1360
  Winter storms—1357
Terrorism. *See* specific country or region
Texas
  Democratic Party event—190
  Governor—1362
  President's visits—187, 190, 192, 199, 554-556, 1356, 1359
  Senatorial election—1288
  Tornadoes—1362
Thailand, Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board—1356
Timber industry—588, 697
"Today" show—1098
Togo, U.S. Ambassador—1360
Trade. *See* specific country or region; Commerce, international
Trade and Development Agency—899
Trade Commission, U.S. International—747, 1365
Trade Policy and Negotiations, Advisory Committee for—895, 1359, 1362
Trade Representative, Office of the U.S.—34, 264, 275, 747
Transportation
  See also specific industry; Infrastructure
  Highways—483
Transportation—Continued
  Intermodal transportation program (ISTEA)—888
  Railroads, safety, report—167
  Transportation laws revision, codification, and enactment—1198
Transportation, Department of
  Annual report—362
  Assistant Secretary—1358
  Coast Guard, U.S.—135
  Disaster assistance funding—103
  Highway Administration, Federal—105, 243
  Highway Traffic Safety Administration, National—1356
  Maritime Administration—1355
  Research and Special Programs Administration—347, 1355
  Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation—167
  Secretary—99, 105, 120, 243, 264, 302, 1065, 1095, 1198, 1199, 1251
Transportation Safety Board, National—805, 1367
Travel and Tourism, White House Conference on—1129
Treasury, Department of the
  Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Bureau of—327
  Blocked accounts expenditures, report—1170
  Customs Service, U.S.—668, 779, 923, 1111, 1271
  Deputy Secretary—547, 927, 1310
  Foreign Assets Control, Office of—226, 369, 370, 676, 777-779, 923, 1110, 1111, 1270, 1271
  Inspector General—1357
  Internal Revenue Service—411, 1353, 1358
  Secret Service, U.S.—170
  Secretary—183, 262, 411, 542, 549, 676, 772, 773, 777, 851, 863, 975, 1024, 1065, 1113, 1114, 1132, 1288, 1324
  Under Secretary—698
Treaties and conventions. *See* specific country, region, or subject; State, Department of
Trinidad and Tobago, U.S. Ambassador—1365
Tunisia, U.S. Ambassador—901
Turkey
  Cyprus conflict. *See* Cyprus
  Foreign Minister—713
  Foreign Under Secretary—712
  Prime Minister—125, 698, 712, 713, 759, 1357
  Relations with Greece—759
Turkmenistan
  Ambassador to U.S.—1366
  Trade with U.S.—1019

Uganda, President—1366
Ukraine
  Arms control negotiations and agreements—21-23, 31, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 69, 86, 222, 372-374, 379
  Conversion of Defense Industry, U.S.-Ukraine Committee on the—382
  Economic assistance—44, 45, 222, 373, 376, 379, 380, 382, 1218, 1225, 1227
  President—16, 22, 24, 31, 42, 43, 47, 50, 54, 69, 77, 222, 372, 379, 1357

Ukraine—Continued
President Clinton's visit—43
Trade with U.S.—371, 380, 1019
U.S. private sector investment—381
Unemployment Compensation, Advisory Council on—1362
UNITA. *See* Angola
United Kingdom
Maritime boundary treaties with U.S.—418
Northern Ireland. *See* Northern Ireland
Nuclear energy agreement with U.S.—978, 979
President Clinton's visits—1023-1025, 1028, 1029, 1060, 1364, 1365
Prime Minister—30, 345, 346, 348, 480, 482, 698, 731, 733, 1023, 1025, 1355, 1357, 1358, 1364
Queen—1364
Terrorist attack at Israeli Embassy in London—1313
U.S. Ambassador—526
United Nations
Atomic Energy Agency, International—71, 73, 145, 234, 503, 505, 559, 636, 824, 1014, 1022, 1026, 1046, 1080, 1086, 1087, 1117, 1119, 1186
Food and Agricultural Organization—775
High Commissioner for Refugees—679, 1064, 1299, 1328
Labor Organization, International—1317
Peacekeeping, role—699, 853
Population and Development, International Conference on—1013, 1163, 1164
Population control programs—688, 1164
Regional conflicts. *See* specific country or region
Secretary-General—122, 124, 193, 219, 228, 232, 282, 287, 662, 712, 713, 760, 1047, 1299, 1364
Security Council—17, 75, 124, 282, 355, 369, 486, 679, 713, 728, 736, 737, 953, 1012, 1014, 1016, 1022, 1026, 1031, 1035, 1039, 1047, 1051, 1065, 1087, 1117, 1173, 1270, 1299
U.S. assessments and arrears—809
U.S. Representatives—6, 186, 223, 347, 1080, 1087, 1299, 1361
United Nations, U.S. Committee for the 50th Anniversary of the—1361
United Negro College Fund—428
U.S. *See* other part of subject
United Transportation Union—1095, 1357
Universities and colleges. *See* specific institution; Education
University. *See* other part of subject
US West Telephone Corp.—1201
Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission—1366, 1367
Uzbekistan
Ambassador to U.S.—1366
Trade with U.S.—1019

Vatican City. *See* Holy See
Veterans Affairs, Department of
Assistant Secretary—1360
Deputy Assistant Secretary—137
Deputy Secretary—1367
Secretary—944, 1115, 1369
Veterans Affairs, Department of—Continued
Under Secretary—1080
Veterans Health Administration—632, 687
Veterans Health Administration. *See* Veterans Affairs, Department of
Vice President
Energy and Space, U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on, role—896, 1188, 1219
Federal Government reform, role—365, 367
North American Free Trade Agreement debate—111
Victim Service Awards—772
Victims of Crime, Office for. *See* Justice, Department of
Vietnam
POW's/MIA's, cooperation with U.S.—179, 1367
Trade with U.S.—178, 183
Virginia
Ice storm and flooding—1358
President's visits—4, 702, 770, 978, 1361, 1363
Senatorial election—1037
Winter storms—1360
Virginia, University of—323
Visegrad Group—29, 39, 1354
Voice of America. *See* Information Agency, U.S.
Voluntarism—762
Volunteer Action Awards, National—762

Warsaw Uprising, 50th anniversary—1211
Washington, DC. *See* District of Columbia
Weapons. *See* Arms and munitions; Nuclear weapons
Welfare system, reform—129, 156, 203, 335, 551, 656, 780, 893, 918, 955, 1073, 1076, 1083, 1106, 1112, 1278
Western European Union (WEU)—20, 1053
Western New Independent States Enterprise Fund—1369
Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission—1370
Western Samoa, U.S. Ambassador—7
WFAN Radio—273
Whaling Commission, International—1001, 1355
White House, Committee for the Preservation of the—1362, 1365
White House Correspondents' Association—767
White House Fellowships, President's Commission on—1366
White House Office
Assistant to President and Press Secretary—76, 210, 245, 645, 692, 698, 834, 853, 948, 1022
Assistants to President
Communications, Director—486, 503
Deputy Chief of Staff—599
Economic Policy—567
Management and Administration—993, 1001
National Security Affairs—90, 643, 660, 703, 1296, 1298, 1329
Associate Counsel to President—546
Cabinet Affairs, Office of—469
Chief of Staff McLarty—366, 389, 547, 599, 909, 993, 1148, 1149
Chief of Staff Panetta—1148, 1149, 1252

White House Office—Continued
Counsel to President—384, 1354
Counselors to President—1148, 1149
Deputy Assistants to President
Cabinet Affairs—470
Economic Policy—469
Speechwriting and Research—419
Deputy Counsel and Legislative Affairs Director for Vice President—937
Deputy Counsel to President—389
Deputy Press Secretary—1359
Media Affairs, Office of—1362
News Analysis, Director—1362
Presidential Personnel, Director—38
Public Liaison, Office of—469
Special Adviser to President—1149
Special Adviser to President on Haiti—859, 1064
Special Assistants to President—1359, 1362
Special Counsel to President—402, 547, 599, 909
Staff misuse of helicopters—993
White House Office—Continued
Staff security clearances—547
White House travel office—546
Whitewater Development Corp. investigation—110, 277, 280, 366, 374, 376, 389-391, 393, 403, 544, 547, 550-552, 587, 588, 595, 688, 720, 1304, 1306, 1354
Wilbur Wright College—326, 332
Wisconsin, President's visit—704, 711, 1361
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars—1358
Worker rights. *See* specific country or region
World Bank. *See* Reconstruction and Development, International Bank for
World Jewish Congress—216
World War II, 50th anniversary—1003, 1008, 1019, 1023, 1024, 1029, 1038
Wyoming, Governor—497

Yugoslavia, former. *See* specific country

Name Index

Abdelmulla, Yousef Abd-El-Razegh—1271
Abdo, Judy—104
Abraham, Clifton—225
Abramowitz, Norman—1369
Abramson, Jerry—138, 695, 1072
Adair, Marshall—712
Adams, Aileen Catherine—772, 1361, 1381
Adams, Gerry—144, 161, 346, 351, 480, 997
Agee, James—422
Aikman, Troy—352
Akashi, Yasushi—660, 702, 1049, 1054
Albright, Madeleine K.—6, 7, 186, 223, 1080, 1087, 1361
Alexander, Jane—792, 1250
Alexander, Ken—225
Alexander, Kent Barron—1371
Alkalaj, Sven—1366
Altman, Roger C.—547, 924, 1310
Amador, Jose M.—1363, 1382
Amanpour, Christiane—833
Ames, Aldrich Hazen—297, 303, 320, 322, 323, 361, 476
Ames, Maria del Rosario Casas—297, 303, 320, 322, 323, 361, 476
Anderson, Brady—1377
Anderson, Frank James—1372
Anderson, Glenn—1317
Anderson, Jamal—1318
Anderson, Karen—1318
Anderson, Richard—130
Andrews, Dick—104
Andrews, Thomas H.—1273
Andrus, Cecil D.—148
Andrus, James G.—1252
Anoatubby, Bill—1368, 1382
Anschutz, Wendall—617
Antonovich, Mike—104
Arafat, Yasser—218, 319, 322, 361, 471, 692, 844, 1173, 1253
Arceneaux, William—1359
Archer, Dennis W.—138, 213, 903
Archuleta, Erlinda Paiz—1366
Arendt, Elizabeth—1363
Aristide, Jean-Bertrand—776, 816, 819, 832, 859, 976, 1000, 1065, 1114
Armacost, Michael—954
Arnold, Richard—847, 910, 911
Asad, Hafiz al- —81, 85, 86, 89, 113, 472, 474, 827, 1173, 1311-1313, 1358, 1359
Ashe, Victor—1073
Aspin, Les—123, 1364
Astore, Angela—645
Atwood, J. Brian—497, 1296, 1298, 1299, 1364
Aung San Suu Kyi—257, 1287
Avent, Loretta—793

Babbitt, Bruce—365, 697, 740, 801, 910, 911, 981, 1316, 1333, 1362, 1370
Babbitt, Harriet C.—1379
Baca, Joseph Francis—1370
Baccigaluppi, Roger J.—1362
Baena Soares, Joao Clemente—777
Baer, Donald A.—419
Baer, Harold, Jr.—783, 1377
Bagley, Elizabeth Frawley—1365, 1380
Bair, Sheila C.—834, 1379
Baiul, Oksana—372
Baker, D. James—1355
Baker, Pauline—754
Baldini, Thomas L.—38
Baldwin, Molly—426
Baldwin, Robert Nelson—1370
Balladur, Edouard—1050, 1221, 1365
Banks, Cecil James—1367
Barfield, Clementine—425
Barnett, Robert B.—1361
Barnette, Curtis H.—1362
Barram, David J.—102
Barrett, James—1339
Barrett, June—1339
Barron, Gary A.—1366
Bartlett, Donald—682
Bartnoff, Judith—140
Batchelor, Dick J.—754
Batiste, Norris, Jr.—1380
Batts, Deborah A.—137
Bayh, Evan—915
Bayh, Susan—38, 1371
Bean, Randy—772
Beeman, Josiah Horton—7, 1371
Belaga, Julie D.—692, 1378, 1379
Belatti, Frank—385
Benavides, Fortunato (Pete)—137
Benavides, Gina—331
Bennett, Lansing—5
Bennett, Mark W.—1113, 1381
Bennett, Robert—856
Bennett, William—967
Benson, Ezra Taft—1007
Bentsen, Lloyd—116, 186, 190, 192, 195, 262, 327, 411, 549, 772, 814, 850, 1114, 1132, 1224, 1288, 1310, 1324
Berberich, Henry—741
Berger, David—1366
Berger, Mitchell—1359
Berle, Peter—1369

Berlusconi, Silvio—998, 1010, 1018, 1035, 1181, 1221, 1224, 1230, 1364, 1368
Bernal, John M.—1365
Bernstein, Jim—572
Bevitt, Duane—468
Biden, Joseph R., Jr.—259, 1134, 1288, 1300, 1324, 1325, 1335
Biggins, J. Veronica—38
Bildt, Carl—273
Biley, Kenneth—1082
Bird, Lester—1367
Birenbaum, David Elias—1373
Bitterlich, Joachim—1183
Blackmun, Harry A.—597, 925
Blatnick, Jeff—1363
Blejwas, Stanislaus A.—1366
Blinder, Alan S.—246, 763, 1377
Blinken, Alan John—14
Blinken, Donald M.—147, 1371
Blitzer, Wolf—1030
Blix, Hans—1014
Block, Frederic—1302, 1382
Block, Sherman—105
Blome, Dennis H.—1382
Blumenthal, Michael—52, 1354
Blythe, William J.—1032
Bolden, Charles—199
Boorda, J.M.—285, 453, 988, 1030
Borman, Paul D.—554, 1375
Boross, Peter—39
Boston, Ralph—1363
Boucher, Richard A.—712, 713
Boucher, Rick—898
Boutros-Ghali, Boutros—122, 193, 219, 228, 232, 250, 282, 287, 663, 712, 713, 727, 1299, 1364
Bowden, Bobby—225
Bowles, Erskine B.—105, 309, 365, 519, 522-524, 579, 609, 834, 836, 837
Boxer, Barbara—100, 104, 243, 484, 967
Boykin, Keith—1362
Bracy, Terrence L.—1368, 1382
Bradford, John Michael—1380
Bradley, Valerie J.—1317
Brady, Chris—840
Brady, James S.—327
Brady, Sarah—327
Branstad, Terry E.—1283
Brazauskas, Algirdas—1145, 1201, 1365, 1367
Brennan, Charles—1129
Brennan, Joe—1273
Brewer, Pernell—743
Breyer, Stephen G.—909, 925, 1288, 1335, 1336, 1378
Bristo, Marca—1373
Britton, John—1339
Brokaw, Tom—1038
Bromwich, Michael R.—184, 1372
Brooks, Derrick—225
Brooks, Israel, Jr.—1371
Brooks, Jack—200, 850, 1134, 1300, 1319, 1324, 1325
Brown, Alicia—478, 493
Brown, Andrea N.—1370
Brown, George E., Jr.—201, 1293
Brown, Herbert Lee—1371
Brown, Jesse—1369
Brown, Joan—151
Brown, Kathleen—105, 1127
Brown, Lee Patrick—143, 213-215, 259, 772, 1324
Brown, Patricia Ann—1376
Brown, Ronald H.—52, 55, 164, 226, 243, 264, 306, 748, 750, 831, 849, 951, 1225, 1270
Brown, Sheryl—710
Brown, Stuart L.—1382
Brown, Trisha—1359
Brown, Willie L., Jr.—302
Browner, Carol M.—501, 851
Browning, Jane—1317
Brundtland, Gro Harlem—934
Bruno, George Charles—1363, 1379
Bryan, Richard H.—898
Bryant, Jim—1069, 1280
Bryant, Mary—1280
Bryson, John—1362
Bryson, William C.—1120, 1381
Bumpers, Betty—729
Burciaga, Cecelia Preciado—1366
Burke, Yvonne—105
Burrage, Billy Michael—419, 1374
Burroughs, John—246
Bush, George—694
Bush, John—429
Bush, Zoe—140
Buthelezi, Mangosuthu—348, 550, 727, 749, 830, 848
Butler, Josephine—740, 981
Byrd, Robert C.—1259, 1328

Cabe, Gloria—929
Cabranes, Jose A.—984, 1379
Calabresi, Guido—221, 1372
Caldwell, John W.—944, 1378
Calhoun, John A.—477, 1367
Califano, Joseph A., Jr.—211, 872
Camerlo, James—1362
Campbell, Bill—903
Campbell, Bonnie—1083, 1365
Campbell, Carroll A., Jr.—159, 1283
Campbell, Willie Grace—168, 1356
Canada, Geoffrey—425
Cantu, Norma—300
Carey, Hugh—1361
Carlson, Arne H.—158
Carmody, Carol Jones—1356, 1375
Carnahan, Mel—1075
Carper, Tom—1096
Carr, Bob—850
Carr, James G.—137
Carroll, Loretta—621
Carroll, Michael—468
Carter, Ashton—1363
Carter, Jimmy—819, 903, 993, 1081, 1086, 1087, 1098, 1102, 1117-1120

Carter, Rosalynn—458, 729
Casellas, Gilbert F.—1080, 1381
Casellas, Salvador E.—1113, 1381
Casey, Don—1363
Casey, Ginger—881
Casey, Mary Ann—901, 1378
Casey, Robert P.—148
Cassidy, William—1355
Castillo, Mona—520
Castillo, Ruben—137
Castle, Michael Newbold—156
Castro, Fidel—831
Castro, George—1366
Catuto, Anthony—878
Causey, Jeff—324
Cedras, Raoul—862, 1292
Cetin, Hikmet—713
Chafee, John H.—1282
Chai, Huali G.—1370
Chaiken, Jan M.—1360, 1375
Chamberlin, Alice—1356
Charles, Eugenia—1367
Chaveas, Peter R.—1360, 1375
Chavez, Darlene Chavira—1366
Chavez, Gilbert—300
Chavez, Nelba R.—319, 1377
Chernomyrdin, Viktor—60, 896, 1188, 1191, 1366
Chiles, Lawton—432, 507, 515, 875, 1123, 1277
Chin, Denny—554, 1375
Chirac, Jacques—1049, 1085
Chitester, Ken—1362
Choate, Steve—438
Chong, Rachelle B.—363, 1376
Chorba, Timothy A.—1360, 1375
Chretien, Jean—731, 759, 1182, 1368
Chretien, Raymond—1356
Christiansen, Don—1367
Christie, Deborah P.—1371
Christopher, Warren M.—84, 109, 186, 219, 248, 264, 303, 306, 319, 321, 436, 560, 643, 645, 660, 663, 827, 851, 905, 953, 991, 1115, 1224, 1253, 1309, 1312, 1361
Churkin, Vitaly—485, 670, 694, 699, 702, 703
Ciampi, Carlo Azeglio—998, 1221
Ciller, Tansu—125, 698, 712, 713, 759, 1357
Cisneros, Henry G.—91, 97, 99, 102, 104, 110, 119, 190, 197, 243, 262, 302, 341, 344, 365, 385, 415, 493, 635, 659, 663, 666, 685, 701, 793, 801, 851, 886, 1092, 1250, 1262, 1263, 1288, 1333, 1369
Clark, Jack—1367
Clark, Joseph—125, 712
Clarke, Charles C.—1357
Cleaver, Emanuel, II—1071, 1075
Clerides, Glafcos—125, 712, 756
Clinton, Chelsea—106, 323, 1181, 1305
Clinton, Hillary Rodham—65, 106, 273, 390, 404, 459, 510, 511, 513, 546, 548-551, 576, 587, 588, 671, 725, 790, 841, 849, 887, 1059, 1101, 1305, 1356
Clinton, Roger—106, 555
Clites, Chris—258
Coelho, Tony—363
Coes, Richard—225
Cohen, Charles I.—183
Cohen, Mike—565, 929
Cohen, Phyllis—981
Cole, Kenneth J.—1362
Coleman, Rodney A.—1371
Coleman, Stephen W.—740, 981
Coleman, William T., III—1358, 1374
Collins, Audrey B.—137
Collins, Barbara-Rose—903
Collins, James—223
Collonton, Debbie—438
Colosio, Luis Donaldo—542, 543, 549, 552
Condit, Gary A.—1073
Constantine, Thomas A.—1371
Constantinou, Clay—1365, 1380
Conyers, John, Jr.—903
Cook, Doyle—1365, 1380
Cooper, Clarence—419, 1374
Coreil, Bernice—555
Corlin, Richard—528
Coronado, Gil—137, 1370
Correa, Charles—1085
Corrigan, E. Gerald—55
Cote, Denise—783, 1377
Couric, Katie—1098
Courson, Patricia—1255
Courter, Jim—1171
Cowan, Geoffrey—476
Coyle, Philip Edward, III—1361
Craft, Hugh—668
Crampton, Beth—356
Crawford, Roger—1082
Creel, Harold Jennings, Jr.—1165, 1381
Crespo, Hilda—300
Crews, John David, Jr.—1380
Crocker, Ryan Clark—318, 1373
Crowe, William J., Jr.—526, 1374
Crown Prince Hassan—1309
Cruz, Miriam—1366
Cuomo, Andrew M.—1155
Cuomo, Mario M.—869, 1095, 1154, 1369
Currie, Cameron M.—137
Cutanda, Eddie—696
Cutler, Lloyd—402, 547, 599, 909

Dahaim, Ayad S.—1271
Daley, Richard M.—138, 214, 328, 330, 695
Dalton, John—528
D'Amato, Alfonse—404
Danforth, John C.—223
D'Anna, Vincent—1362
Darby, James—1259
Darling, Frank—5
Darling, Marian—315
D'Arms, John Haughton—1096, 1380
Darrah, Joan—903
Dart, Justin—810
Daschle, Thomas A.—653

Dash, Samuel—391, 550, 587
Davidson, Dick—154
Davis, Benjamin O.—1363
Davis, Devra Lee—1369
Davis, Lance—1355
Davis, N. Jan—201
Dawson, Marion M.—168, 1356, 1373
de Klerk, Frederik Willem—727, 749, 753, 830, 848
de la Garza, E (Kika)—791
de Leon, Rudy—312, 1374
Dean, Jack O.—1372
DeBose, Charles—94
Decker, Gilbert F.—126, 1374
Deets, Horace—1369
Dehaene, Jean-Luc—8, 16, 29
DeHerrera, Juan Abran—1382
Del Mundo, Joseph—210
Delacruz, James T.—1369
Delors, Jacques—32-37, 1057, 1242, 1243, 1368
Dempsey, David—1370
Denenberg, Tia Schneider—1357
Denktash, Rauf—125, 712, 755, 757
Dennis, James L.—1063, 1379
DeShazer, MacArthur—754
Desmaret, Jose—15
DeSurra, Desiree—963
Deutch, John M.—318, 1298
DeVillars, John P.—138
Diamonstein, Alan A.—1381
Dickman, Martin J.—1370
Diehl, Philip N.—1375
Diouf, Abdou—977, 1363
Dixon, Helen—353
Dixon, Homer—1152, 1162, 1163
Dobrof, Rose—1369
Dolan, Charles H., Jr.—38, 1372
Dole, Bob—161, 463, 783, 1036, 1167, 1177, 1278, 1279
Dominguez, Daniel R.—1113, 1381
Donahue, Edmund—328
Donaldson, Sam—1035
Donnelly, Brian J.—1365, 1380
Donovan, Tom—581
Dority, Doug—864, 869
Dotson, Daniel C.—1382
Downes, William F.—853, 1377
Dranow, John—837
Drennan, John—898
Drennan, Vina—871
Drinan, Robert F.—1365
Durenberger, Dave—841
Durmer, Kris—1359
Durr, Eisenhower—1380
Dutilleux, Henri—1085
Duval, Stanwood R., Jr.—1257, 1382

Earl, Anthony S.—1383
Earle, Ralph, II—1369, 1382
East, Raymond G.—212
Eaton, Gordon P.—7
Echohawk, John E.—1370
Edelman, Marian Wright—729
Edley, Christopher, Sr.—428
Edmisten, Walter Baker—1379
Eggenberger, A.J.—1359, 1375
Ehrlich, Thomas—1370
Eischen, Dana E.—1357
Eizenstat, Stuart—15
Ekeus, Rolf—146, 636, 1047
El-Fighi, El Hadi M.—1271
El-Khallas, Kamel—1271
Elders, M. Joycelyn—497, 730
Elisha, Walter Y.—1362
Elliott, Lee Ann—263, 1377
Ellison, Ralph—932
Emanuel, Rahm—850
Emerson, John B.—102
Emperor Akihito—1070, 1074, 1359
Empress Michiko—1070, 1074, 1359
Endara, Guillermo—1367
Enomoto, Jerry J.—1371
Esler, Gavin—1177
Espy, Mike—697, 849, 1250, 1251
Estrada, Steven—331
Eto, Takuma—568
Eu, March Fong—147, 1371
Evert, Chris—1370

Faden, Ruth R.—1357
Falwell, Jerry—1132
Fanfani, Amintore—1085
Farmer, Bob—149
Farmer, Sharon—169
Faulkner, Stephen—921
Fay, Michael—393, 694, 715, 847
Fazio, Vic—1132
Feinberg, Kenneth R.—1357
Feinstein, Dianne—100, 104, 243, 965, 1363
Feissel, Gustave—712, 713
Feldman, Ira Ronald—1359, 1376
Fernandez, Laura—1295
Ferro, Simon—1376
Fiester, Clark G.—1374
Figueres, Muni—432
Filner, Bob—563, 565
Finch, Raymond L.—527, 1374
Finney, Joan—148, 604
Fisher, Donald G.—1362
Fisher, Richard—1288
Fiske, Robert B., Jr.—110, 544, 1304
Flemming, Arthur—508, 784
Fletcher, Arthur A.—428
Flom, Joseph H.—1358
Florio, Jim—149
Floyd, Bobby O.—542
Fluker, Mimi—1077
Foley, Thomas S.—543, 563, 664, 766, 1253, 1332, 1338, 1359
Foote, Evelyn Pat—1361
Ford, Betty—458

Ford, Gerald R.—903, 919
Ford, Harold E.—157
Ford, Wendell H.—841
Ford, William D.—563, 841, 946, 1128
Fort, Denise D.—1370
Foster, Vincent, Jr.—112
Frampton, George—1370
Fraser, Arvonne S.—1373
Frechette, Myles—1360, 1375
Frederickson, Madelaine—1319
Freeh, Louis J.—232, 1243
Frei, Eduardo—1157
Freitas, Rockne—1363
Freudenthal, David D.—1371
Friday, Herschel—362
Friedman, Paul L.—526, 1374
Friedman, Paul R.—1353
Fu-Tong Hsu—1359
Fuller, Linda—385
Fuller, Millard—385
Fulton, Barry—956
Futterman, Jack—869

Gaines, Michael Johnston—1365, 1379
Gales, Robert—324
Gallagher, Christopher C.—1370
Gallegly, Elton—104
Galston, William A.—565
Garamendi, John—105
Garcia, Juliet—300
Garrison, Marge—360
Garrison-Jackson, Zina—1363
Garza, Trini—912
Gaydar, Yegor—87
Gebbie, Kristine M.—1222
Geier, Phil—477
Gejdenson, Sam—1178
Geller, Steven—548
Gephardt, Richard A.—1129, 1138, 1332, 1338, 1366
Gergen, David R.—1148
Getz, Stan—726
Gewertz, Bruce—330
Ghadban, Mohammed Mustafa—1271
Ghaffar, Muhammed Abdul—1356
Gibbons, Sam—1171
Gibril, Mustafa Saleh—1270
Gielgud, John—1085
Gilbert, Laurent F.—1372
Gilchrest, Wayne T.—986
Gilleland, Diane—1359
Gillette, Michael—1354
Gilmore, Vanessa D.—526, 1374
Ginsberg, William W.—48, 1371
Gist, Nancy E.—1362, 1377
Giuliani, Rudolph—138, 1358
Glatstein, Eli J.—1357
Gleeson, John—1302, 1382
Gleiman, Edward Jay—1371
Glenn, John—261, 1073, 1363
Gless, Darryl J.—1096, 1380
Glickman, Dan—611
Glover, Jere Walton—1373
Gnehm, Edward William, Jr.—347, 1373
Gober, Hershel—1367
Godley, Patricia Fry—1361, 1379
Goffney, Lawrence J., Jr.—1371
Goldberg, Jackie—104
Goldberg, Veronica—1364
Goldin, Daniel S.—201, 1294
Goldsmith, Steven—139
Goncz, Arpad—39, 1101
Gonzalez, Fabiola—742
Gonzalez, Henry B.—210
Gonzalez, Jose—1366
Goodling, William F.—563, 841, 946
Gordon, Gary I.—976, 1363
Gore, Albert, Jr.—24, 54, 60, 94, 98, 111, 139, 149, 212, 248, 253, 293, 303, 365-367, 415, 431, 490, 517, 742, 802, 823, 849, 852, 896, 935, 1148, 1150, 1164, 1188, 1191, 1211, 1294, 1299
Gore, Tipper—458, 621, 849
Gorelick, Jamie S.—311, 1373
Gorman, Joe—1102
Gorsline, Sally—875
Goss, Kay Collett—1372
Gott, Norman—927
Graham, Billy—731, 783
Graham, Bob—432, 517, 1288
Graham, Thomas W., Jr.—1364, 1380
Grandy, Fred—1122
Granic, Mate—354
Graveline, Denise T.—1353
Gray, Joseph—1135
Gray, William H., III—428, 429, 859, 1064, 1219, 1245, 1292
Graykowski, John E.—1355
Green, Ernest Gideon—476, 938, 1379
Greenberg, Maurice R.—1362
Greene, Richard L.—1381
Greenspan, Alan—144, 297, 307, 711, 1036
Greenstock, Jeremy Q.—125
Griffiths, Ann Mills—1367
Grossman, Barbara Wallace—1359, 1376
Guerra, Nancy G.—1367
Guerra-Mondragon, Gabriel—1361, 1368
Guinier, Lani—108, 725
Gumbel, Bryant—1098
Gunderson, Steve—841
Gunn, David—990
Gusman, Wayne—1294
Gutierrez, Ana Sol—1355
Gutierrez, Luis V.—300
Gutierrez, Ramon A.—1096, 1380
Guzman, Ana Margarita—1366

Haase, Bronson—710
Habyarimana, Juvenal—635, 659, 678
Hager, Tim—1138
Hahn, John—185, 296
Halberstam, Aaron—364

Hale, Robert F.—126, 1371
Hall, Betty—520
Hall, Jim—805
Halperin, Morton H.—25
Hamilton, Christy Lynne—303, 325
Hamilton, David F.—1063, 1379
Hammer, Mary—358
Hammer, Susan—1359
Hancock, Loni—48
Hancox, Karen—850
Hansen, Bernard—1370
Harkin, Tom—1084
Harlan, Carmen—649
Harper, Carlotta—169
Harris, Jeffrey K.—312, 1374
Harris, Martha Caldwell—1355
Harrison, Alonzo—612
Hart, Christoper A.—1356
Harwood, Judy W.—48
Hassmiller, Barbara—267
Hata, Tsutomu—896, 983, 1086, 1362
Hatch, Orrin G.—1288, 1335
Hatchell, Sylvia—1322
Hatfield, Mark O.—841
Hauge, Jennifer Chandler—1370
Havel, Vaclav—37, 39, 40, 77, 90, 1200, 1354, 1367
Havelange, Joao—1364
Hawkins, Michael D.—1253
Hawkins, Steve—584
Hawrylack, Egon—468
Hayes, Gene—357
Hearon, Donald M.—1367
Heath, Edward—1085
Hegerty, Nanette Holly—1372
Heiman, James—610
Heinz, Teresa—1370
Hendricks, Dennis—195
Henry, Charles Patrick—1096, 1380
Henry, Katherine Louise—1353
Henry, Robert Harlan—221, 1372
Herman, Alexis M.—305
Hernandez, Christine—1370
Hernandez, Maria—1366
Hernandez, Sonia—1366
Hernandez, Tony—1353
Herzog, Roman—1368
Heumann, Judith—1320
Heymann, Philip B.—142
Hicks, Irvin—1360, 1375
Hicks, John F., Jr.—168
Hicks, Lynn—1254
Hicks, Vicki J.—1353
Hightower, Stephen—523
Hill, Calvin—1363
Hill, Paul L., Jr.—1369, 1382, 1383
Hilsman, Roger—1359, 1374
Hindrew, Kim—582
Hipp, Ralph—621
Hoard, Ralph G.—1362
Hochberg, Faith S.—678, 1376
Hoffman, David—608
Hogle, Hugh H.—1366
Holbrooke, Richard—1366, 1383
Holiday, Sally—584
Holleman, Frank Sharp, III—1353
Hollenbeck, Eric—744
Holley, David—528
Holst, Johan Jurgen—76
Holt, Thomas Cleveland—1096, 1380
Hood, Anne—855
Hood, Denise Page—419, 1374
Hoog, Thomas W.—1359
Hooks, Linda Marie—1360, 1378
Hopkins, Amy—1319
Horowitz, Murray—521
Horrigan, Kevin—1129
Hosokawa, Morihiro—228, 229, 243, 247, 252, 264, 364, 367, 568, 643-645, 1355, 1356, 1358, 1360
Houphouet-Boigny, Felix—1356
Howard, Vicki—105
Howell, Beth—573
Howell, Martha Congleton—1096, 1380
Hrinak, Donna Jean—1360, 1375
Hubbell, Webster L.—446, 447
Hudson, Tiffany—1094
Huega, Jimmie—1363
Hug, Bob—315
Huggett, Robert James—1362, 1381
Hughes, William J.—1324
Hull, Frank M.—221, 1372
Hume, John—932
Hunker, Jeffrey—1353
Hunt, Jim, Jr.—582
Hunter, Robert—15
Hussein, Saddam—145, 636, 1046
Hutchins, Glenn H.—1369
Hutchinson, Donald—185
Hyatt, Joan—365
Hyatt, Joel—1346, 1370
Hyde, Henry J.—966
Hyman, Lester S.—1365

Igasaki, Paul M.—729, 1376
Imus, Don—273
Inman, Bobby R.—101, 107
Inonu, Erdal—125
Inouye, Daniel K.—547
Irvin, Michael—352
Izetbegovic, Alija—354, 485, 503

Jackovich, Victor—503
Jackson, Jesse—331, 425, 754, 1369
Jackson, Michael—253
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr.—915
Jacobson, Neil—363
Jaczynski, Louise—315
James, Matt—1368, 1382
James, Sharpe—695
Janetakos, Corrine—142
Jaramillo, Regina—611
Jarin, Kenneth Malerman—1359, 1379

Jayaraman, Saru—963
Jeffords, James M.—563, 841, 1067
Jenkins, Roy—1365
Jennings, Peter—488
Jennings-Roggensack, Colleen—1359, 1378
Jett, Kevin—133
Johnson, Janice M.—1365
Johnson, Jim—258
Johnson, Jimmy—352
Johnson, Limatine—325
Johnson, Paul—138
Johnson, Paul W.—1353
Johnson, Ralph R.—1373
Johnson, Robert—729
Johnson, Roger W.—365, 366
Johnson, Sarah—258
Johnston, Robert B.—468
Jones, Brereton C.—1285
Jones, Jerry—352
Jones, Napoleon A.—1063, 1380
Jones, Stephanie J.—48
Jordan, I. King—907
Jordan, Luise S.—1367
Jordan, Michelle Denise—1357
Jordan, Vernon—428, 932
Joulwan, George A.—29, 285, 1369
Joyner, Florence Griffith—690, 1356
Juppe, Alain—1362
Jurkas, Barbara C.—1373

Kabir, Humayun—1356
Kabir, Seddigh Al—1270
Kallos, Helen—267
Kalman, Laura—364
Kamarck, Elaine—366
Kaminski, Paul—1370
Kamman, Curtis Warren—1368
Kanellos, Nicolas—1096, 1381
Kantor, Michael (Mickey)—264, 275, 367, 895
Kaplan, Lewis A.—853, 1377
Karpan, Kathy—1356
Kashiwagi, Earl—837
Kassebaum, Nancy Landon—946
Katz, Jay—1357
Kauzlarich, Richard Dale—147, 1371
Kebich, Vyacheslav—1354
Keeffe, Mary Ann—1353
Keillor, Garrison—687
Kelley, Richard—106, 798
Kelley, Virginia—106, 114, 628, 798, 890, 894, 1353
Kelly, Eamon M.—1362, 1377
Kelly, Edward Joseph, Jr.—1383
Kelso, Frank B., II—726, 735
Kempthorne, Dirk—1073
Kendall, David—544
Kendall, Goldia—357
Kennedy, Edward M.—448, 450, 453, 563, 730, 841, 946, 1063, 1066, 1068, 1335
Kennedy, Patrick—1067
Kennedy, Robert F.—914
Kennedy, William H.—546
Kennelly, Barbara B.—903
Kern, Terry C.—419, 1374
Kerrey, J. Robert—179, 223, 224
Kerrigan, Nancy—1357
Kerry, John F.—179, 180, 448, 450
Kessler, Gladys—526, 1374
Kidder, Rolland—1361
Kieffer, Judith Pinero—1363
Kildee, Dale E.—563, 841
Kim Il-song—1087, 1098, 1118, 1224, 1230, 1235
Kim Jong Il—1226, 1236, 1237
Kim Yong-sam—505, 559, 1014, 1022, 1086, 1236, 1364, 1366
Kimble, Gary Niles—1361, 1383
King Albert II—1354
King, Callie—585
King Fahd—85, 263, 1355
King Hassan II—1056
King Hussein I—116, 362, 1114, 1173, 1253, 1307-1310, 1314, 1359, 1366, 1369
King, James B.—366
King, Larry—106, 798
King, Martin Luther, Jr.—94, 569, 914
King, Patricia A.—1357
King, R. Alan—1353
King, Reatha Clark—1370
Kinkel, Klaus—1368
Kinnard, Douglas—1361
Kinoshita, Cherry T.—1365
Kinsley, Carol—1370
Kipkorir, Benjamin Edgar—1366
Kirk, Michael Kane—1372
Kirkland, Joseph Lane—1207
Kissinger, Henry—783
Kizer, Kenneth W.—1080, 1383
Klaas, Marc—766
Klaaste, Aggrey—753
Klaus, Vaclav—37, 39
Klein, Joel—389
Klites, Chris—921
Knacht, Michael—805
Knobloch, Dennis—744
Koeltl, John G.—783, 1377
Kohl, Helmut—144, 731, 1172, 1181, 1233, 1238, 1242, 1245, 1248, 1355, 1356, 1368
Koldyke, Mike—1366
Koop, C. Everett—456
Koptev, Yuri—200
Koskinen, John A.—900, 1378
Koumoue, Moise Koffi—1366
Kouts, Herbert—1359, 1375
Kovac, Michal—39, 1101
Kozminski, Jerzy—1366
Kozyrev, Andrey—731
Kramar, Silvia—998
Kramek, Robert E.—135
Kravchuk, Leonid—22, 24, 31, 42, 43, 16, 50, 52, 54, 69, 77, 222, 372, 379, 1357
Krikalev, Sergei—200

Kristoff, Sandra—1359
Krueger, Robert—1376
Krump, Gary—1360
Krupp, Fred—362
Kuklinski, Ryshard—1191, 1195
Kuwayama, Yeiichi—1365

Lacey, John R.—1363, 1381
Lader, Philip—599
LaFalce, John J.—519, 521
Lahmar, Mohammed—1271
Lake, Anthony—264, 643, 660, 703, 1296, 1298, 1329
Lake, Joseph Edward—1360, 1375
Lamb, Robert—712, 713, 756
Lampert, Anita—875
Lane, Laurence W., Jr.—981
Lane, Vince—663, 666, 701
Lanier, Bob—139, 193
Laposata, Joseph S.—944
Larkin, Deborah Slaner—1363
Larson, Charles—179
Larson, Robert C.—1356
Lau, Valerie—1357, 1376
Lawson, Marc—695
Lazarus, Charles P.—1362
Leach, James A.—402, 545, 548, 549
Leahy, Patrick J.—1328
Leak, W. David—1362
Lebow, Cynthia C.—1353
Lederer, Susan E.—1357
Leesfield, Ira—1363
Lefkowitz, Eve—356
Leiberman, Irwin M.—1357
Lenkowsky, Leslie—1370
Leonard, Joyce—325
Levin, Carl—857
Lewis, Anthony—753
Lewis, Jerry—1293
Lewis, John—903
Leyden, John James—1371
Lichardus, Branislav—1366
Limbaugh, Rush—1133
Lindsey, Bev—1096, 1381
Lindsey, Bruce R.—408
Lipstadt, Deborah E.—1366
Lis, Tomasz—1187
Lisi, Mary M.—137
Lister, Sara E.—126, 1374
Lobo, Richard M.—221
Lockley, James W.—1372
Lockyer, Bill—302
Lodal, Jan—1369, 1382
Lodhi, Maleeha—1356
Loftus, Thomas—1356
Longe, Edith—315
Lord, Winston—1367
Los Banos, Alfred—1361
Lovins, Amory—742
Lubbers, Ruud—5
Luck, Gary E.—505, 550, 1027, 1036, 1087, 1227
Lugato, Giuseppe—998
Luterman, Jessica—1175
Luthuli, Albert—753
Lyle, John E.—1366
Lynch, Leon—1362
Lyons, Tom—1361
Lyttle, Donna—358

Maas, Chris—523
Mabus, Raymond Edwin, Jr.—900, 1367, 1378
Machtley, Ronald K.—986
MacKay, Buddy—432, 515
Macklin, Ruth—1357
Maddox, David M.—1248
Madi, Ragiab Saad—1271
Magaw, John W.—814
Magaziner, Ira—528
Magee, Yolanda—1076
Mahathir bin Mohamad—856
Mahony, Roger—120
Major, John—30, 345, 346, 348, 480, 698, 731, 1023, 1025, 1035, 1066, 1191, 1355-1357
Malloy, Eileen A.—1368
Mandela, Nelson—348, 727, 749, 753, 830, 848, 1152, 1357
Manilow, Lewis—38, 1371
Manning, Blanche M.—853, 1377
Marek, Michael—729, 1379
Mareno, Mario—300
Maresca, John J.—125, 712
Marks, Don—205
Marks, Marc Lincoln—1367
Maroney, Thomas Joseph—1381
Marshall, Thurgood—937, 942
Marshall, Thurgood, Jr.—937, 941
Martin, Marsha P.—1365
Martinez, Laudelina—300
Martinez, Ricardo—1373
Martinez, Vilma—1362
Martino, Antonio—998
Maryland, Russell—352
Mason, Dwight N.—1367
Mastowski, Louise—1254
Mathews, Elizabeth—425
Matlin, Marlee—1370
Matsura, Go—568
Matthews, David—1356
Mattingly, Shirley—104
Mattox, Larry Reed—1379
Mauro, Garry—192
May, John—330
McBrayer, Sandra—745
McCain, John—179, 180
McCarthy, Brian—522
McClinton, Delbert—276
McCowan, Rodney A.—1372
McCoy, Helen Thomas—1373
McCurdy, Dave—955
McDonald, Christine—1077
McDonald, Danny Lee—263, 1377

McDougal, James—545
McEntee, Gerald—1370
McGee, Roosevelt—330
McGuire, Sheila M.—1365
McKee, Theodore Alexander—526, 1374
McLain, Celeste Pinto—1366
McLarty, Thomas F. (Mack)—264, 366, 389, 390, 547, 599, 909, 993, 1148, 1149
McMichael, Robert Henry—944, 1378
McMillen, Tom—690, 1356
McRoberts, Deborah—668
McWherter, Ned Ray—149, 158
Meade, David C.—1358
Meciar, Vladimir—39
Meding, Margaret—267
Meed, Benjamin—1366
Meier, Randy—645
Meissner, Charles—1363
Mendouga, Jerome—1366
Menem, Carlos Saul—831, 1366
Mercado, Maria S.—912
Meri, Lennart—1145, 1201, 1203, 1204, 1230, 1246, 1314, 1365, 1367
Metzenbaum, Howard M.—261, 841, 1347
Metzler, Cynthia A.—1358, 1376
Meyer, Karen—363
Michaelides, Alecos—125
Miles, Kate—811, 859
Mill, Andy—423
Millard, Susan—710
Miller, Judith A.—1363, 1380
Miller, Lenore—1362
Miller, Lorraine—837
Miller, Paul Steven—729, 1378
Miller, Rich—170
Miller, Vivian—386
Miller, Zell—817, 1217, 1368
Mills, Jack—1363
Minami, Dale—1365
Minor, Tom—215
Mitchell, George J.—378, 563, 785, 841, 910, 946, 1253
Mitchell, Mary Faith—1353
Mitterrand, François—30, 698, 731, 1050, 1056, 1059, 1221, 1365
Miyazawa, Kiichi—644
Moe, Tommy—1356
Moffitt, Arlenda—1077
Moler, Elizabeth Anne—1367, 1382
Monroe, T.J.—1317
Monteau, Harold A.—1363
Montes, Antonio—741
Montoya, Regina—1359
Moons, Charles M.J.A.—924
Moore, Brenda—1361
Moore, James—1359
Moore, Robert—1383
Moore, William T.—1253
Moose, Charles—1324
Moose, George—754, 1328
Morales, Dan—1369
Moreno, G. Mario—912, 1381
Morgan, James—798
Morgan, Linda Joan—1372
Moseley-Braun, Carol—663
Mother Teresa—168
Motz, Diana—137
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick—156, 159, 216, 420, 865, 1063, 1068, 1180, 1365
Mubarak, Hosni—85, 86, 362, 844, 1359
Mueller, Karol—1179
Mullaney, Timothy Patrick, Sr.—1371
Muller, Elio E., Jr.—1357
Munoz, Cipriano—1366
Murayama, Tomiichi—1184, 1212, 1215, 1220, 1222, 1228, 1368
Murphy, Diana E.—1328, 1383
Murray, Florence K.—1370
Museveni, Yoweri—1366
Myers, John Michael—1355

Nacht, Michael—1378
Nakamura, Kuniwo—1316
Nakanishi, Don T.—1365
Nakasone, Yasuhiro—1085
Nantz, Jim—556
Naparstek, Arthur—1370
Nash, Bob—94
Nasukiewicz, Jennifer—1319
Natcher, William H.—368, 562, 599
Natividad, Irene—1359
Nazarbayev, Nursultan—21, 248, 1355
Neal, Stephen L.—846
Nelson, E. Benjamin—1284
Nelson, Robert C.—1365
Nelson, Robert K.—1366
Ness, Susan—469, 1376
Netsch, Dawn Clark—1089
Neuman, Janet C.—1370
Neumann, Ronald E.—562, 1378
Newman, Barry S.—1372
Newton, David George—1383
Nimetz, Matthew—755, 756, 758, 1359, 1362
Nitze, Willam A.—1364, 1382
Nix, John—1298
Nixon, Richard—412, 413, 731, 764, 765, 767, 782, 784, 799, 1361
Noble, Ronald K.—698, 1376
Norquist, John O.—706
Norris, Lois L.—1357
North, Oliver—1037
Norton, Eleanor Holmes—741
Norwood, Janet Lippe—1362
Nunez, Luis—300
Nunn, Sam—108, 121
Nussbaum, Bernard W.—384, 402, 404, 1354
Nuzum, Janet A.—1365
Nyaryamira, Cyprien—635, 678
Nye, Joseph—1369, 1383

Oakar, Mary Rose—1369

Oakley, Phyllis E.—1363, 1381
Obey, David R.—1328
O'Day, Bonnie—1375
O'Donovan, Leo J.—1359, 1375
Offen, Neil H.—1362, 1381
Ogata, Sadako—1299, 1328
O'Hern, Joseph J.—1353
O'Leary, Hazel Rollins—682, 742, 746, 951, 1356
Oleinick, Nancy L.—1357
Oliver, Solomon, Jr.—419, 1374
Olmos, Edward James—763
O'Meara, John Corbett—783, 1377
Onassis, Jacqueline Kennedy—949, 956, 957, 959, 966, 969, 977
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr. (Tip)—7, 126, 738
Onek, Joseph N.—1363
Osetek, Peter J.—1367, 1383
Osteen, Jo Anne—155
Oswald, Rudolph A.—1362
Otero, Maria—1375
O'Toole, Patrick—1370
Owen, David—485
Owen, Gus A.—1362, 1380
Owens, Wayne—1366
Oxman, Stephen—712

Pacheco, Manuel Trinidad—1361, 1376
Pachios, Harold C.—38
Packwood, Bob—1365
Padron, Eduardo—1366
Paez, Richard A.—419, 1374
Page, Clarence—754
Panetta, Leon E.—103, 105, 118, 120, 196, 235, 366, 895, 935, 1017, 1074, 1148, 1149, 1250, 1252
Paolino, Joseph R., Jr.—1361, 1377
Papandreou, Andreas—32-37, 713, 754, 755, 1356, 1361, 1362
Papandreou, George—713
Paparian, William M.—1370
Papoulias, Karolos—485
Paranto, Arthur—267
Parisi, Patricia H.—912
Parker, Barrington D., Jr.—783, 1377
Parker, Robert M.—137
Paschal, Janet L.—48
Pastor, Robert A.—1363, 1379
Patriarch Alexi II—1354
Patrick, Deval L.—160, 886, 1323, 1333, 1372
Patten, Chris—348
Patterson, Roger—365
Pavylukov, V.—382
Pawlak, Waldemar—39, 1368
Pawlikowski, John T.—1366
Paz, R. Samuel—554, 1375
Peabody, Malcolm—741
Pell, Claiborne—558, 791, 841
Pena, Federico—99, 102, 105, 119, 243, 264, 302, 1095, 1250
Penske, Roger—442, 445, 449
Peres, Shimon—218, 1309
Perez Balladares, Ernesto—1292, 1367
Perkins, Edward J.—805
Perlman, Larry—1102
Perry, Catherine D.—1257, 1382
Perry, Susan Berla—1367, 1381
Perry, William J.—122, 186, 282, 284-286, 377, 382, 528, 643, 645, 660, 663, 693, 698, 1027, 1087, 1227, 1252, 1328, 1369
Peters, Marilyn Fae—1361, 1376
Peters, Michael D.—903
Petersen, Anne C.—677, 1379
Peterson, Ann—619
Peterson, Pete—463
Petrenko, Viktor—372
Petrovich, Janice—1366
Petterson, Donald K.—246
Phelps, Vicki—1077
Pickering, Thomas R.—66, 223
Piercy, Jan—729, 1376
Piper, Kathleen—523
Pitt, Redding—678, 1376
Pittinger, Elizabeth—1317
Plaut, Jonathan—1369
Plumb, Amanda—1295
Podesta, John D.—407
Poje, Gerald V.—1369
Poles, Ray—172
Pollard, Jonathan—476, 541
Pooler, Rosemary S.—783, 1377
Pope John Paul II—1009, 1011, 1012, 1014, 1364
Poppe, Arthur—315
Porterfield, David—608
Powell, Colin L.—932
Press, Frank—1357
Price, Kathy—438
Prince Bandar—263, 264
Pryor, David—1369
Puller, Lewis B., Jr.—905, 1005
Putnam, Jim—465
Putnam, Spence—520
Putnam, Tom—464

Queen Elizabeth II—1364
Queen Noor—1309, 1366
Quinones, Edwin—1366

Rabin, Lea—1309
Rabin, Yitzhak—85, 86, 217, 319, 321, 322, 362, 471, 692, 827, 844, 1173, 1253, 1307-1310, 1314, 1358, 1369
Ramos, Suzanne G.—912
Ramsey, Charles—331
Ransom, David M.—363, 1373
Rao, P.V. Narasimha—949, 950, 1361
Rapley, Frank—438
Rapoport, Bernard—1359
Rappoport, D. Michael—1368
Raspberry, William—682
Rawson, David P.—661
Reagan, Ronald—180, 509, 904
Reals, Gary—1361

Redman, Charles E.—287, 354, 485, 699, 702, 1049
Reed, Anne F.T.—1355
Regula, Ralph—791
Reich, Robert B.—97, 165, 308, 365, 415, 528, 840, 886, 1095, 1320
Reid, Chris—468
Reinsch, William Alan—1353, 1372
Remus, Michael—1317
Rendell, Edward—138
Reno, Janet—108, 110, 160, 215, 258, 260, 301, 504, 541, 599, 635, 659, 663-666, 701, 719, 772, 801, 850, 851, 903, 1323, 1324, 1354
Reynolds, Albert—346, 348, 479, 481, 1358, 1363
Rice, Norman—138, 215, 1073
Richards, Ann W.—1362
Richardson, Bill—257
Richardson, Jean—1369
Richardson, John—1362
Richardson, Nolan—557, 1082
Richardson, Peggy—411
Ridgway, Delissa A.—1363, 1381
Ridgway, Rozanne—1201
Ridley, Carol—329
Riegle, Donald W., Jr.—841, 857
Riegle, Lori—729
Riley, Joe—315
Riley, Joseph P., Jr.—138, 527
Riley, Richard W.—97, 119, 165, 170, 294, 298, 308, 415, 563, 565, 936, 941, 945, 987, 1175, 1319
Riley, Ted, Sr.—936, 937
Riordan, Richard—91, 100, 103-105, 139, 243, 256, 302, 695
Rios, Frankie—425
Rivers, Patricia A.—1355
Rivlin, Alice M.—1148
Robb, Charles S.—179, 1037
Roberts, Barbara—140, 148
Robertson, Jack—1370
Robinson, Laurie O.—1360, 1376
Robinson, Randall—861
Rockefeller, David—1085
Rockefeller, John D., IV—161, 321
Roddy, Carol L.—1353
Rodham, Hugh, Jr.—362
Rodriguez, Gloria—1366
Rodriguez, Matt L.—328, 423
Rogers, Elizabeth Barlow—981
Rogers, Thomasina V.—1359, 1377
Romer, Roy—1217, 1284, 1368, 1369
Romero, Kathy—1076
Romero, Raymond G.—1358, 1376
Roosevelt, David B.—1365
Rose, Michael—285, 288, 289, 660, 661, 663, 670, 702-704, 736
Rosen, Cathy—875
Rosensaft, Menachem Z.—1366
Ross, Allyne R.—1302, 1382
Ross, Anne—258
Ross, Thomas B.—1359
Rostenkowski, Dan—322, 327, 330, 332, 336, 761, 948, 1007
Rotberg, Robert I.—1096, 1381
Roth, Stanley—1359
Rother, John—1370
Rowe, Ernestine—1373
Royal, Henry D.—1357
Ruberto, John V.—1355
Rubin, Judith O.—1359, 1375
Rubin, Robert E.—264, 305, 567, 895
Ruda, Jose Maria—924
Rudin, Lou—871
Rudman, Warren B.—463
Ruhnke, Pamela—1077
Ruiz, Vanessa—1250
Runyon, Marvin—1003
Rush, Bobby L.—663
Rush, Jeffrey, Jr.—1359, 1378
Russell, Philip K.—1357
Rutelli, Francesco—1364
Rutskoy, Aleksandr—412
Ryan, James A.—1355
Ryland, Harvey G.—1367, 1382

Sagner, Alan—410, 1376
Salim, Salim—1299
Salinas, Carlos—542, 549, 552
Sampas, Dorothy Myers—1377
Sampson, Tonya—1323
Samuel, Morris—741
Sanchez, Gonzalo—1181
Sanderson, Herb—1369
Sands, Amy—805, 1378
Sands, W. Louis—221, 1372
Santiago, Isaura Santiago—1366
Santos, John Phillip—1366
Sarbanes, Paul S.—1158
Sarokin, H. Lee—853, 1377
Sasser, Jim—1158
Satcher, David—730
Satur, Anna—438
Saunders, Kevin—1363
Scalfaro, Oscar Luigi—1023, 1364, 1368
Schaefer, William Donald—148
Schapiro, Mary L.—834, 1379
Scharping, Rudolf—1368
Schechter, Arthur L.—1366
Scheindlin, Shira A.—1328, 1383
Scheinman, Lawrence—805, 1378
Schenk, Lynn—563, 565
Schiffer, Lois Jane—184, 1372
Schmidt, Helmut—1085
Schmidt, John R.—1380
Schmoke, Kurt—719
Schneider, Claudine Perrin—1365
Schroeder, Fredric K.—737, 1378
Schultz, Richard F.—1367
Schumer, Charles E.—420, 847, 850, 866, 966, 1324
Schwaegerman, Barbara—329
Schwantes, Brianne—707

Scott, Cynthia—185, 296
Scott, Hal—572
Scroggins, Joe, Jr.—126, 1373
Seelman, Katherine D.—1353
Segal, Eli J.—424, 477, 764, 1138
Segal, Phyllis Nichamoff—800, 1378
Serra, Richard—1085
Serrano, Jose E.—300
Shalala, Donna E.—945, 946, 1075, 1369
Shalikashvili, John M.—5-7, 179, 220, 284, 285, 693, 698, 1027, 1087, 1211, 1227, 1252, 1298, 1329
Shallouf, Farag Al Amin—1270
Shamansky, Robert N.—1359, 1374
Shara, Farouk al- —84
Sharif, Bashir M.—1271
Sharma, Dharmendra K. (Dave)—347, 1376
Shattuck, John—1363
Shaw, Bernard—830
Shearer, Derek—312, 1373
Sheehan, David—265
Sheinbaum, Stanley K.—1359, 1374
Sheinkman, Jack—1359
Shelton, Henry H.—542
Shelton, Sally—347, 1377
Sheriff, Garth—522
Sherlala, Kassem M.—1271
Shevardnadze, Eduard—64, 386, 394, 1190, 1357
Shorenstein, Walter H.—1370
Shughart, Randall D.—976, 1363
Shushkevich, Stanislav—22, 1354
Siedenburg, Christopher—898
Siegel, Jerome—1362
Silajdzic, Haris—354
Silva, Norman Tony—921
Silvy, Glenda—620
Simon, Paul—841
Simpkins, Irby Clifford, Jr.—1356
Simpson, O.J.—1101
Sklar, Eric—522
Skramstad, Harold K.—1096, 1381
Skubiszewski, Krysztof—924
Slater, Rodney E.—102, 283, 1250
Slattery, Jim—609
Sleet, Gregory Moneta—678, 1375
Slocombe, Walter Becker—1369, 1382
Small, Lawrence M.—1366
Smedley, Lawrence—508, 1369
Smith, Arland—91
Smith, Birdella—1077
Smith, Charlotte—1322
Smith, Emmitt—352
Smith, Harry—1033
Smith, Jeffrey H.—1363
Smith, Leighton W., Jr.—453, 755
Smith, Roy Allen—944, 1378
Smith, Samuel—1135
Snoop Doggy Dogg—722
Snow, John—1102
Sokolowski, Walter D.—1380
Sol, Ana Christina—1356
Solarz, Stephen J.—1359
Sommer, John F., Jr.—1367
Soren, Tabitha—714
Sorenson, John—526
Sorkin, Donna—1369
Sotomayor, Marta—1369
Southwick, E. Michael—1380
Spearman, Molly—1295
Spears, Sherman—426, 478
Spera, Paul A.—1367
Sperling, Gene B.—469
Sposato, Steven—772
Spriggs, Danny—169
Squatrito, Dominic J.—1328, 1383
Squires, Gary—104
Stagman, Tami—710
Stansberry, Kevin—425
Stark, Fortney Pete—313, 551
Statter, Mindy—329
Steel, Dawn—1356
Steele, James—682
Steinberg, Donald—1359
Stephanopoulos, George—3
Stern, Paula—1359
Stevenson, Mary Ann—1357
Steward, Alison—714
Stewart, Carl E.—137
Steyn, Richard—753
Stich, Otto—1354
Stiglitz, Joseph E.—246
Stith, Charles—754
Stokes, Carl Burton—1365, 1379
Stokes, Louis—1293
Stoltenberg, Thorvald—485
Stone, Elaine—521
Stuart, Sandra Kaplan—1363, 1381
Stupak, Bart—857
Suettinger, Robert L.—1359
Sullivan, Arlene—316
Sullivan, Emmet G.—526, 1374
Sundlun, Bruce—876
Sutton, Judy—1077
Sweeney, James—1364, 1379
Swenson, Janet—840
Swett, Dick—791
Swihart, James W., Jr.—1369, 1383
Sykes, James—790
Synar, Mike—847

Tabbarah, Riad—1366
Talbott, Strobe—1372
Tannen, Deborah—933
Tarnoff, Peter—125
Tarnow, Rick—141
Tate, Daniel C., Jr.—1353
Tatel, David S.—1101, 1381
Tatum, Jackie—104
Taylor, Andrea Kidd—1369
Teshabaev, Fatikh—1366
Teske, Vera—359

Thayer, Ronald—1359
Thomas, Arthur E.—754
Thomas, Christopher—432
Thomas, Duncan—1357
Thomas, Gail—1005
Thompson, Sidney—104
Thornburg, Lacy H.—1363
Thurman, Scotty—1083
Thursz, Daniel—1369
Tiller, George R.—990
Tillman, Michael F.—1355
Timlin, Robert J.—783, 1377
Torano, Maria Elena—1356, 1373
Torres, Edwin—421
Torres, Esteban Edward—104, 1262
Townsend, Kathleen Kennedy—428
Townsend, Tom—574
Travis, Jeremy—1360, 1376
Travsky, Amber—1363
Trent, Viola—428
Troutman, David William—944, 1378
Truesdale, John C.—1355
Trupo, Leonard—1374
Tsongas, Paul—463
Tucker, Jim Guy—1305
Tuckson, Reed V.—1357
Tudjman, Franjo—354, 485, 503
Tutu, Desmond—753
Twining, Charles H.—371, 1373
Tyson, Laura D'Andrea—246, 895

Udall, Anne—1368
Udall, Norma—1368, 1382
Ugur, Khalil—1366
Ulmanis, Guntis—810, 982, 1145, 1200, 1201, 1355, 1365, 1367
Urbina, Ricardo M.—526, 1374
Uwilingiyimana, Agathe—635, 660

Valdez, Joel D.—1367
Valenti, Jack—478
van der Stoel, Max—146, 637, 1047
Vance, Cyrus—485, 755, 756, 758, 1362
Vance, Sarah S.—1063, 1380
Varney, Christine A.—470
Varron, Tracy—1077
Vessey, John W.—179
Viadero, Roger C.—1367, 1382
Vigil, Samuel—1366
Villines, Evelyne—1360
Vincent, Leonard—1360
Vivona, Joseph F.—562, 1379
Voigt, Francis—837
Volkmer, Harold L.—1179
Von Edwards, William Henry, III—1382
Vranitzky, Franz—731, 1360

Waihee, John—148, 158
Walesa, Lech—6, 39, 42, 77, 1188, 1194, 1205, 1207, 1367, 1368
Walker, Edward S., Jr.—324, 1373
Walker, Robert S.—201, 1293
Wallace, Becky Jane—1379
Waller, William—331
Wallman, Steven M.H.—228, 1376
Walsh, Mike—857
Walters, David—148
Walters, Gary—982
Walther, Klaus—1172, 1181
Wang Jontao—774
Ward, Charlie—225
Washington, Rose W.—1367
Wasserman, Diana Cendoya—1366
Watangia, Kepas Ismael—1366
Waters, Dan—104
Watkins, W. David—993, 1001
Watson, Dianne—105
Watson, Jack H., Jr.—805
Watson, Peter S.—1365
Watson, Ronnie—331
Webb, Wellington E.—138
Webber, Karen—837
Wedewer, Donald—1360
Wells, Melissa F.—1363
Welsome, Eileen—682
West, Charles—316
West, Timothy—995
West, Togo—1370
Wexner, Abigail S.—1366
Wheat, Alan—1075
Wheeler, Clyde Arlie, Jr.—1362, 1378
White, Doug—880
White, Jason—133, 325
White, Michael R.—139, 214
Whitehead, John Paul—1353
Whitehouse, Sheldon—1372
Wicks, Judith Ann—522
Wieder, Harriett M.—1370
Wilcher, Shirley J.—47
Wilder, L. Douglas—149
Wilhelm, David—1120
Wilkerson, Isabel—682
Willard, Robert S.—1356, 1372
Williams, Audrey—1077
Williams, F. Haydn—1364
Williams, Irv—982
Williams, J. McDonald—1362
Williams, Ocelia—438
Williams, Stan—48
Williams, Willie—105, 695
Willis, Carroll—793
Wilson, Blenda—255
Wilson, Larry—527
Wilson, Pete—91, 99, 100, 103, 104, 143, 243, 302, 783
Wilson, William J.—1366
Windham, Jeanette—205
Winston, Rhonda Reid—677, 1375
Wirtanen, Bruce—438
Wirth, John—1369
Wirth, Timothy E.—1162
Wisner, Frank G.—900, 1378

Witt, James Lee—91, 99-102, 104, 110, 119, 243, 368, 557, 899, 1250
Woerner, Fred F.—1364
Woerner, Manfred—20, 23, 28-30, 34, 286, 287, 755, 756, 1354
Wofford, Harris—841
Wohl, Faith A.—1353
Wohlford, Sheryl—609
Wold, James W.—1363, 1367
Wolters, Kate Pew—1374
Won, Delmond J.H.—1165, 1382
Woo, Y.C.L. Susan—1359
Wood, Lionel John—1366
Woodbury, Deb—185, 296
Woodruff, Judy—823
Woolsey, R. James—304
Worby, Rachel—1359, 1379
Wright, Harold—438
Wright, Stephen—428

Xuto, Manaspas—1366

Yates, Ronald W.—1248
Yates, Sidney R.—791
Yellen, Janet L.—1380
Yeltsin, Boris—16, 22, 41, 43, 46, 49, 50, 61, 63, 65, 66, 69, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 87-89, 109, 216, 219, 223, 228, 232, 284-288, 304, 412, 413, 559, 661, 670, 702, 726, 727, 731, 733, 734, 810, 983, 1014, 1022, 1035, 1086, 1102, 1190, 1191, 1197, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1216, 1230, 1243, 1246, 1314, 1354, 1365, 1367
Young, Andrew—1362
Young, Henry L.—1383
Young, James—898
Young, Johnny—1360, 1375
Young-Holmes, Pamela—1369
Yozell, Sally—1353
Yun, Philip W.—1355
Yzaguirre, Raul—300, 1266, 1366

Zacarias, Ruben—1366
Zacharakis, Christos—713
Zao Wou-Ki—1085
Zhirinovsky, Vladimir—22, 43, 88, 89
Ziegler, Ron—316
Zonana, Victor—1358
Zou Jiahua—829, 1362
Zubak, Kresimir—354, 486
Zun, Leslie—331

Document Categories List

Addresses to the Nation

State of the Union—126

Addresses and Remarks

See also Addresses to the Nation; Bill Signings; Interviews With the News Media; Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials
Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations—895
Air collision at Pope Air Force Base, NC—542, 553
American Association of Retired Persons, Edison, NJ—265
American Cancer Society's Cattlebarons children's party in Houston, TX—187
American Council on Education—289
American Hospital Association—150
American Legion Boys Nation—1335
American Legion Girls Nation—1295
American Nurses Association—889
American Society of Association Executives—395
American Society of Newspaper Editors—680
Americans with disabilities—810
Americans with Disabilities Act, 4th anniversary—1318
AmeriCorps public safety forum in New York City—419
Ameritech Corp. employees, Milwaukee, WI—704
Andrew W. Mellon Dinner—845
Anticrime legislation
  Justice Department—1324
  Roundtable discussion in Chicago, IL—326
Antiviolence public service announcements—477
Assault weapons, legislation—813, 846, 849
Association for a Better New York, New York City—866
Atlanta, GA—816, 818
Baltic peoples, video address—1145
Belarus, future leaders in Minsk—77
Belgium, Brussels
  American business community—25
  American diplomatic community—14
  Citizens—14
  Future leaders of Europe—8
  North Atlantic Cooperation Council—18
Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement Reform—223
Bosnia-Herzegovina
  Federation Constitution and agreement with Croatia, signing ceremony—484
  Gorazde, Serbian attacks—660, 702, 703, 726, 755, 770
  Potential NATO air strikes—218, 285

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Bosnia-Herzegovina—Continued
  Sarajevo marketplace attack—186
Boston, MA—448
Brown v. *Board of Education*, 40th anniversary observance in Beltsville, MD—935, 940
Business Council—305
Business Roundtable—1102
Byrd, Senator Robert, dinner—1259
California, earthquake
  Disaster assistance—99, 242, 301
  Roundtable discussion in Burbank, CA—102
  Teleconference—119
California Medical Association, teleconference—528
Celebration of Ireland Dinner—481
Central Intelligence Agency
  Ames espionage case—297
  Employees, Langley, VA—4
Cinco de Mayo celebration—851
Cleveland, OH—1345
Community policing grants, teleconference—903
Congressional barbecue—1129
Congressional elections—818
Congressional Medal of Honor, presentation ceremony—976
Defense Department, Secretary, nomination announcement—122
Defense diversification grant for Charleston, SC, teleconference—527
Democratic campaign reception in Portland, ME—1272
Democratic Congressional Dinner—737
Democratic Governors Association
  Dinner—148
  Jefferson-Jackson Day luncheon in Indianapolis, IN—915
Democratic National Committee
  Dinner—1120
  Reception in New York City—1153
  Saxophone Club, reception—1124
Detroit Diesel, Detroit, MI—444
Earned-income tax credit, administrative order signing ceremony—410
Earth Day—740
Economic recovery—1021
Economic Report of the President, signing ceremony—246
Economic summit—1195
Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, Executive order signing ceremony—298
Empowerment zones and enterprise communities—91
Feinstein, Senator Dianne, dinner in Beverly Hills, CA—965

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
1st Infantry Division, ceremony at monument—1008
Fisher, Richard, Texas senatorial candidate, dinner—1288
Flooding in the Southeast, disaster assistance announcement in Albany, GA—1250
Focus: HOPE, Detroit, MI—434
Fort Drum, NY—467
France
D-Day 50th anniversary in Normandy
Pointe du Hoc—1042
U.S. cemetery in Colleville-sur-Mer—1044
U.S. Navy role—1041
Utah Beach—1043
Paris
Dinner hosted by President Mitterrand—1059
National Assembly—1051
Gallaudet University
Commencement—906
Telephone relay conversation with Board of Trustees Chair—1317
General Motors employees, Shreveport, LA—202
Gephardt, Representative Richard, reception in St. Louis, MO—1138
Germany
Berlin
Arrival—1241
Citizens—1247
U.S. troops—1248
Bonn, luncheon hosted by Chancellor Kohl—1238
Oggersheim, citizens—1239
Ramstein Air Base, U.S. military personnel—1239
Video address to citizens of Berlin—1146
GI bill of rights, 50th anniversary—1115
Goals 2000: Educate America Act
Remarks—929
Teleconference—563
Greater Houston Partnership, Houston, TX—192
Groton, CT—312
Group of Seven nations (G-7) jobs conference in Detroit, MI—436
Habitat for Humanity, home dedication ceremony—385
Haiti
Economic sanctions—1064
U.S. Special Adviser, appointment announcement—859
Health care reform
Administration goals—2, 1290
Congressional action on legislation, telephone conversations with Senators Kennedy and Jeffords—1066, 1067
Family caregivers, teleconference—355
Forum in Deerfield Beach, FL—506
Health care providers—537
Medical educators—1146
PictureTel, video conference call—927
Rallies
Greensburg, PA—1254
Minneapolis, MN—638
Roundtable discussions
Chicago, IL—326
Small business leaders—519

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Health care reform—Continued
Roundtable discussions—Continued
Topeka, KS—605
Troy, NC—571
Senior citizens in Norwich, CT—314
Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform—1165
Health Security Express participants in Independence, MO—1342
Hillcrest High School, Country Club Hills, IL—337
Housing and Urban Development Department, crime briefing—838
Hyatt, Joel, senatorial candidate, reception in Mayfield Heights, OH—1346
Illinois Victory '94, dinner in Chicago, IL—1088
Independence Day celebration—1186
Iraq, American helicopter tragedy
Memorial service at Fort Myer, VA—770
Remarks—693, 698
Israel-Jordan peace talks
Announcement—1253
Reception—1314
State dinner—1309
Washington Declaration, signing ceremony—1307
Welcoming ceremony—1307
Italy
Nettuno Beach, ceremony commemorating liberation of Italy—1019
Rome
Citizens—1017
Dinner hosted by President Scalfaro—1023
Dinner hosted by Prime Minister Berlusconi—1018
U.S. Embassy community—1020
Japan, resignation of Prime Minister Hosokawa—643
Justice Department, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Division, nomination announcement—160
Kansas City, MO—615
Korea, North, nuclear weapons inspections—1080, 1086, 1117
Kramer Junior High School—169
Labor Department, conference on reemployment—165
Landmark for Peace Memorial, groundbreaking ceremony in Indianapolis, IN—913
Latvia, citizens in Riga—1204
Law enforcement community, London, OH—257
Law enforcement officers—664, 695
Legislative agenda—670
Mark Twain Memorial Lighthouse, teleconference on rededication—1179
Markem Corp. employees, Keene, NH—464
Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday observance—94
Mayors—138, 214, 695, 1274
Memorial Day
Breakfast and proclamation signing ceremony—1003

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Memorial Day—Continued
Ceremony in Arlington, VA—1004
Mexico, assassination of Presidential candidate—542
Middle East peace process—559, 1114
Moon landing by *Apollo 11*, 25th anniversary—1293
NAACP Legal and Defense Educational Fund Dinner—931
Natcher, William H., funeral service in Bowling Green, KY—599
National Academy of Sciences—1161
National Conference of Black Mayors—793
National Council of La Raza, Miami, FL—1263
National Council on Aging—783
National Fire and Emergency Services Dinner—897
National Governors' Association—142, 154, 1276
National Infant Immunization Week, proclamation signing ceremony—729
National Park Week, reception—980
National Performance Review—364
National Police Officers Memorial Service—921
National Prayer Breakfast—168
National Volunteer Action Award recipients—762
Native American tribal leaders—800
NCAA champions
Basketball, University of Arkansas Razorbacks—1081
Football, Florida State Seminoles—225
Hockey, Lake Superior State University Lakers—857
Soccer, University of Virginia Cavaliers—323
Women's basketball, University of North Carolina Tar Heels—1322
Nixon, Richard
Announcement of death—764
Funeral service in Yorba Linda, CA—782
Nonprofit organizations, reception—671
Olympic winter games, U.S. athletes—689, 690
Onassis, Jacqueline Kennedy
Gravesite service in Arlington, VA—978
Remarks on death—956
Pathmark Grocery Store employees, New York City—864
Poland, Warsaw
Children's Memorial—1211
Parliament—1208
Praemium Imperiale Arts Award recipients—1084
Presidential Awards for Design Excellence, presentation ceremony—791
Presidential dinners
Houston, TX—190
Miami, FL—513
New England, Boston, MA—450
Presidential Scholars, awards presentation ceremony—1174
President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, swearing-in ceremony—1006
Prince Georges County Correctional Center, Upper Marlboro, MD—210
Public housing, telephone conversation—662

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Radio addresses—1, 76, 117, 140, 184, 244, 283, 324, 382, 433, 487, 555, 568, 658, 701, 766, 806, 858, 912, 969, 1001, 1028, 1068, 1096, 1143, 1177, 1223, 1258, 1302, 1340
Radio and Television Correspondents Association, dinner—673
Reemployment system, proposed legislation—414
Robert Taylor Homes, Chicago, IL—1092
Russia, Moscow
Reception—48
Town meeting—58
Welcoming ceremony—47
Rwanda
Civil conflict—807
Refugee assistance—1298, 1328
Safety of U.S. citizens—643
Sacramento, CA—971
St. Patrick's Day ceremony—479
San Bernardino, CA—957
Sarbanes, Senator Paul, dinner—1158
Sasser, Senator Jim, dinner—1158
Saudi Arabia, aircraft contract with U.S. companies, announcement—263
Senior citizens
Brunch—279
Norwich, CT—314
Small Business Coalition for Health Care Reform—1165
Small Business Person of the Year, award presentation ceremony—834
South Africa
Economic assistance, announcement—848
Elections—780
Space shuttle *Discovery* astronauts, telephone conversation in Houston, TX—199
Summer of Safety program participants, St. Louis, MO—1134
Summit of the Americas
Announcement—431
Executive Committee, Miami, FL—1261
Super Bowl champion Dallas Cowboys—352
Supreme Court of the U.S., Associate Justices
Nomination—909, 925
Retirement—597
"Take Our Daughters to Work Day" luncheon—791
Teacher of the Year Award, presentation ceremony—745
Technology reinvestment project—301
Thomas Jefferson Dinner—667
Topeka, KS—601
Town meetings
Charlotte, NC—581
Children's—488
Cranston, RI—879
Kansas City, MO—617
Minneapolis, MN—645
Moscow, Russia—58
Nashua, NH—454
Troy, NC—575
Ukrainian-Americans—221

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
United Kingdom
President's visits
Arrival at Royal Air Force station, Mildenhall—1023
Oxford University—1060
U.S. cemetery in Cambridge—1024
U.S.S. *George Washington* crew, Portsmouth—1029
Prime Minister Major, welcoming ceremony in Pittsburgh, PA—345
United Negro College Fund Dinner in New York City—428
U.S. Conference of Mayors, teleconference—1071
U.S. Naval Academy, commencement in Annapolis, MD—984
Unity '94 Convention—1329
University of California, 75th anniversary convocation in Los Angeles, CA—959
Vatican City, American seminarians—1009
Victim Service Award recipients—772
Vietnam, lifting of U.S. trade embargo—178
Warwick, RI—876
Welfare reform, remarks in Kansas City, MO—1075
White House Conference on Africa—1150
White House Correspondents' Association, dinner—767
White House Easter egg roll—570
White House Office, Special Counsel to President, appointment announcement—402
White House staff changes—1147
Wilbur Wright College, Chicago, IL—326, 332
Women's health care—854
World Cup Soccer, opening day ceremonies in Chicago, IL—1095
World Jewish Congress—216

Announcements

See also Addresses and Remarks; Statements by the President; Statements Other Than Presidential; Digest (Appendix A); Nominations Submitted (Appendix B); Checklist (Appendix C)
White House Conference on Aging—280

Appointments and Nominations

See also Letters and Messages; Digest (Appendix A); Nominations Submitted (Appendix B); Checklist (Appendix C)
African Development Foundation, Board of Directors
Chairman—476
Member—168
Air Force Department
Assistant Secretaries
Financial Management—126
Space—312
Under Secretary—312
American Battle Monuments Commission, Secretary—944
Army Department, Assistant Secretaries
Manpower and Reserve Affairs—126

Appointments and Nominations—Continued
Army Department, Assistant Secretaries—Continued
Research, Development and Acquisition—126
Commerce Department, Assistant Secretary (Economic Development)—48
Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Chair and Commissioner—834
Coral Sea Week, U.S. representatives—805
Corporation for National and Community Service, Chief Financial Officer—527
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Board of Directors, member—410
Defense Department
Allied Forces, Southern Europe, commander in chief—453
Deputy Secretary—318
Secretary—122
District of Columbia Appeals Court, judge—1250
District of Columbia Superior Court, associate judges—140, 677
Education Department
Assistant Secretary—912
Deputy Regional Representatives—48
Regional Representatives—48, 912
Rehabilitation Services Administration, Commissioner—737
Energy Department, Chief Financial Officer—562
Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Administrator—138
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Chairman—1080
Members—729
Export-Import Bank of the U.S., Board of Directors, member—692
Federal Communications Commission, Commissioners—363, 469
Federal Election Commission, Commissioners—263
Federal Labor Relations Authority, member—800
Federal Maritime Commission, Commissioners—126, 1165
Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Vice Chairman and member—763
Health and Human Services Department, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Administrator—319
Interior Department, U.S. Geological Survey, Director—7
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
Alternate U.S. Executive Director—729
U.S. Executive Director—729
International Joint Commission, U. S. and Canada, members—38
Justice Department
Assistant Attorneys General
Civil Rights Division—160
Environment and Natural Resources Division—184
Deputy Attorney General—311
Inspector General—184
U.S. Attorneys—677, 678
U.S. Marshals—944

Appointments and Nominations—Continued
Labor Department, Federal Contract Compliance Programs Office, Director—47
National Council on the Humanities, members—1096
National Labor Relations Board, member—183
National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), Board of Directors, member—1096
National Science Foundation, Deputy Director—677
National Transportation Safety Board, Vice Chair—805
Navy Department
Chief of Naval Operations—453
U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, commander in chief—453
Office of Management and Budget
Deputy Director for Management—900
Director—1147
Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, member—364
President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities
Chair—363
Vice Chairs—363
President's Committee on Mental Retardation
Members—1317
Vice Chair—1317
Securities and Exchange Commission, Commissioner—228
Small Business Administration, Regional Administrator—353
State Department
Ambassadors
Algeria—562
Azerbaijan—147
Bahrain—363
Cambodia—371
Egypt—324
Finland—312
Hungary—147
India—900
Kuwait—318
Micronesia—147
New Zealand—7
Saudi Arabia—900
Tunisia—901
United Kingdom—526
Western Samoa—7
Special Adviser to Secretary—1147
Special Adviser to Secretary on Haiti—859
Supreme Court of the U.S., Associate Justice—909
Transportation Department
Research and Special Programs Administration, Administrator—347
U.S. Coast Guard, Commandant—135
Treasury Department, Under Secretary (Enforcement)—698
United Nations, Deputy U.S. Representative—347
U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, members—38

Appointments and Nominations—Continued
U.S. Appeals Court, judges—137, 221, 526, 853, 984, 1063, 1101, 1120, 1253, 1328
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Assistant Directors—805
U.S. District Court, judges—137, 221, 419, 526, 554, 783, 853, 1063, 1113, 1253, 1258, 1302, 1328
U.S. Information Agency
Associate Director—956
Cuba Broadcasting Office, Director—221
Voice of America, Director—476
U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Agency for International Development, Assistant Administrator (Global Programs, Field Support and Research Bureau)—347
Veterans Affairs Department
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs)—137
Under Secretary (Health)—1080
White House Office
Chief of Staff—1147
Counselor to President—1147
Deputy Assistant to President for Speechwriting and Research—419
Presidential Personnel, Director—38
Special Adviser to President—1147
Special Adviser to President on Haiti—859
Special Counsel to President—402

Bill Signings

Emergency supplemental appropriations legislation for California earthquake relief, remarks—242
Farmers Home Administration Improvement Act of 1994, statement—901
Federal Housing Administration legislation, statement—1199
Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994, statement—561
Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, statement—807
Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994, remarks—989
Goals 2000: Educate America Act, remarks—564
Highway bridge seismic retrofitting legislation, statement—483
Human Services Amendments of 1994
Remarks—944
Statement—946
Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994, statement—1168
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1995, statement—1301
School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994
Remarks—840
Statement—843
Transportation legislation, statement—1198

Communications to Congress

See also Digest (Appendix A); Checklist (Appendix C)
Aeronautics and space activities, message transmitting report—896

Communications to Congress—Continued
Alaska, mineral resources, message transmitting report—300
Albania, Mongolia, Romania, and certain states of the former Soviet Union, trade with the U.S., letter transmitting report—1019
Angola, U.S. national emergency with respect to UNITA, message—675
Army Department, certification of sufficient forces, letter—964
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Conflict resolution, letter—281
Gorazde, Serbian attacks and NATO response, letter—679
No-fly zone enforcement report, letter—354
Bulgaria, trade with the U.S., messages transmitting reports—135, 1298
Chemical and biological weapons proliferation, message—979
Chemical Weapons Convention
Environmental impact review, message transmitting—353
Impact on use of riot control agents, message—1127
China
Rhinoceros and tiger trade, letter—668
Trade with the U.S.
Letter transmitting report—1018
Message—747
Commodity Credit Corporation, message transmitting report—1063
Conventional weapons restrictions, message transmitting convention and protocols—905
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, messages transmitting reports—410, 947
Cyprus conflict
Letter transmitting report—1212
Letters reporting—124, 712
District of Columbia, budget requests, message transmitting—845
Export control regulations, continuation, messages—1169, 1339
Federal Advisory Committees, message transmitting report—852
Federal budget
Deficit adjustment, letter—117
Rescissions and deferrals, messages—201, 815, 1062
Federal Council on the Aging, message transmitting report—900
Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, message transmitting report—1080
Fishing conservation and management measures, compliance by vessels on the high seas, message transmitting international convention—775
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, letter—833
Great Egg Harbor River, message transmitting report—181
Greece, Social Security agreement with the U.S., message transmitting—136

Communications to Congress—Continued
Haiti, economic sanctions
Letter—736
Messages—776, 863, 975, 1064, 1113
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, letter transmitting report—167
Health and Human Services Department radiation control, message transmitting report—300
Health care reform, letter—1176
Housing and Urban Development Department, message transmitting report—897
Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, message transmitting report—363
International exchange and training activities, letter transmitting report—1327
Iran, U.S. national emergency, message—923
Iraq
Compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions, letters—145, 636, 1046
U.S. national emergency, message—368
Israel, loan guarantees, letter transmitting report—4
Kazakhstan, trade with the U.S., letter—272
Labor administration convention, message transmitting—1317
Libya, economic sanctions, messages—226, 1269
Lithuania, fishery agreement with the U.S., message transmitting—1272
Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of, peacekeeping operations reports, letters—17, 728
Maurice and Manumuskin River and Menantico Creek, message transmitting report—182
National Endowment for Democracy, message transmitting report—853
National Endowment for the Humanities, message transmitting report—947
National security strategy report, message transmitting—1298
Nixon, Richard, announcement of death, message—765
Nuclear cooperation with EURATOM, message—417
Nuclear proliferation prevention, message transmitting report—931
Organization of American States, charter amendment protocols, message transmitting—136
Palau, compact with the U.S., letter transmitting documentation—1315
Panama Canal Commission, message—676
Privacy Act implementation, letter transmitting report—181
Railroad safety, message transmitting report—167
Reemployment system, message transmitting proposed legislation—470
Romania, trade with the U.S., letter—272
Rwanda, evacuation of U.S. citizens, letter—678
Science, technology, and American diplomacy, letter transmitting report—208
Serbia and Montenegro
Economic sanctions, message—1109
U.S. national emergency, message—989

Communications to Congress—Continued
Small business, message reporting—162
South Africa
Elections, message—1062
Trade with the U.S., message—747
South Asia, regional nonproliferation, letter transmitting report—209
State Department, international agreements, letter transmitting report—469
Taiwan, rhinoceros and tiger trade, letter—668
Trade
Future free trade area negotiations, letter transmitting report—1176
Policy and agreements, message transmitting reports—410
Trade and Development Agency, letter transmitting report—899
Transportation Department, message transmitting report—362
Treasury Department, blocked accounts, letter transmitting report—1170
Ukraine, trade with the U.S., message—371
United Kingdom
Atomic energy agreement with the U.S., message transmitting amendment—979
Caribbean maritime boundary treaties with the U.S., message transmitting—418
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, letter transmitting report—558
Welfare reform, message transmitting proposed legislation—1112

Communications to Federal Agencies

See also Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register (Appendix D)
Agriculture Department, use of private attorneys, memorandum—901
California, disaster assistance declaration, letter—101
Earned-income tax credit, memorandum—413
Environmental justice, memorandum—241
Federal Government employees, absence due to Tropical Storm Alberto, memorandum—1257
Haiti, U.S. air service ban, memorandum—1065
Landscaping practices on Federal grounds, memorandum—781
Presidential Awards for Design Excellence, memorandum—1249
Research involving human subjects, memorandum—281
Soviet Union, former, economic assistance, memorandum—17
United Kingdom, atomic energy agreement with the U.S., memorandum—978
Vietnam, trade with the U.S., memorandum—183
White House Conference on Small Business, memorandum—469

Interviews With the News Media

See also Addresses and Remarks

Interviews With the News Media—Continued
Exchanges with reporters
Atlanta, GA—818, 819
Boston, MA—446, 1286
Brussels, Belgium—8, 15, 24
Charlotte, NC—597
Chicago, IL—1091
Christ Episcopal Church—285
Cleveland, OH—570
Dallas, TX—554
Deerfield Beach, FL—505
Detroit, MI—436
Fort Bragg, NC—553
Geneva, Switzerland—81
Hot Springs, AR—1304, 1305
Miami, FL—503
Milwaukee, WI—711
Minneapolis, MN—643
Moscow, Russia—49
Naples, Italy—1224
Nashua, NH—463
New York City—875
Newport News, VA—702
North Aylesbury, England—1025
Norwich, CT—313
Paris, France—1049
Pittsburgh, PA—346
Prague, Czech Republic—37, 39
Riga, Latvia—1200
Rome, Italy—1010, 1021
San Diego, CA—559, 567
St. Louis, MO—1134
Troy, NC—571
Warsaw, Poland—1205
Washington Hilton Hotel—790
White House—2, 5, 99, 116, 121, 122, 144, 160, 164, 178, 186, 214, 218, 223, 228, 242, 246, 248, 263, 272, 279, 283, 297, 301, 326, 351, 360, 364, 372, 386, 402, 410, 479, 542, 552, 597, 660, 661, 670, 693, 698, 703, 726, 731, 754, 764, 770, 772, 780, 816, 846, 849, 856, 859, 903, 909, 925, 934, 948, 977, 982, 1080, 1083, 1086, 1101, 1114, 1117, 1127, 1147, 1157, 1290, 1292, 1298, 1328
Interviews
ABC News—1035
BBC—996
California newspaper publishers—235
CBS News—1033
CBS Sports—556
CNN—820, 1030
Foreign journalists—1181
French media—1055
Italian media—998
Journalists on South Africa—748
KABC Radio of Los Angeles, CA—253
KMOX Radio of St. Louis, MO—1129
Larry King—106, 798
MTV—714
NBC News—1038

Interviews With the News Media—Continued
Interviews—Continued
Polish media—1187, 1189
Print journalists aboard Air Force One—85
"Today" show—1098
WFAN Radio of New York City—273
ZDF German television—1172, 1181
Joint news conferences
Baltic leaders—1200
European Union
Commission President Delors and Council President Kohl—1242
Commission President Delors and Council President Papandreou—32
Georgia, Republic of, Chairman Shevardnadze—387
Germany, Chancellor Kohl—1233
Greece, Prime Minister Papandreou—755
India, Prime Minister Rao—949
Israel, Prime Minister Rabin—471, 1310
Italy, Prime Minister Berlusconi—1010
Japan
Prime Minister Hosokawa—229
Prime Minister Murayama—1212
Jordan, King Hussein—1310
Kazakhstan, President Nazarbayev—248
Russia, President Yeltsin—50, 1230
Syria, President Asad—81
Ukraine, President Kravchuk—43, 372
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Major—348
Visegrad Group, leaders—39
News conferences
No. 39 (January 10)—21
No. 40 (January 11)—28
No. 41 (January 11)—32
No. 42 (January 12)—39
No. 43 (January 12)—43
No. 44 (January 14)—50
No. 45 (January 16)—81
No. 46 (February 11)—229
No. 47 (February 14)—248
No. 48 (February 21)—287
No. 49 (February 25)—319
No. 50 (March 1)—348
No. 51 (March 4)—372
No. 52 (March 7)—387
No. 53 (March 16)—471
No. 54 (March 24)—543
No. 55 (April 20)—732
No. 56 (April 22)—755
No. 57 (May 19)—950
No. 58 (May 26)—991
No. 59 (June 2)—1010
No. 60 (July 6)—1200
No. 61 (July 8)—1212
No. 62 (July 8)—1215
No. 63 (July 9)—1224
No. 64 (July 10)—1230
No. 65 (July 11)—1233
No. 66 (July 12)—1242
No. 67 (July 26)—1310

Joint Statements

Republic of Georgia-U.S., declaration on relations—394
Russia-U.S.
Human rights—73
Moscow Declaration—74
Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery—71
Russia-Ukraine-U.S., statement by the Presidents—69
Ukraine-U.S.
Development of friendship and partnership—379
Economic and commercial cooperation—380

Letters and Messages

See also Communications to Congress; Communications to Federal Agencies; Resignations and Retirements
Americans with disabilities, letter—804
Armed Forces Day, message—974
Assault weapons ban, letter to hunters and sportsmen—804
Burma, National League for Democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi, letter—257
Defense Department
Assistant Secretary nominee, letter accepting withdrawal—25
Secretary nominee, letter accepting withdrawal—101
Easter, message—561
Id al-Fitr, message—416
Independence Day, message—1153
Passover, message—554
St. Patrick's Day, message—483
Sweden, Prime Minister Bildt, electronic mail message—273

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials

See also Joint Statements
Argentina, President Menem—1366
Austria, Chancellor Vranitzky—731
Belarus
Chairman Shushkevich—77, 1354
Prime Minister Kebich—1354
Belgium
King Albert II—1354
Prime Minister Dehaene—8
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bosnian Croat representative Zubak—484
President Izetbegovic—484, 503
Prime Minister Silajdzic—484
Chile, President Frei—1157
China, Vice Premier Zou—1362
Croatia, President Tudjman—484, 503
Czech Republic
President Havel—37, 39, 1354
Prime Minister Klaus—39
Estonia, President Meri—1200, 1367
European Union
Commission President Delors—32, 1242, 1354

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials—Continued
European Union—Continued
Council President Kohl—1242
Council President Papandreou—32, 1354
France
Foreign Minister Juppe—1362
President Mitterrand—1059, 1365
Prime Minister Balladur—1050, 1365
Georgia, Republic of, Chairman Shevardnadze—386, 387
Germany
Chancellor Kohl—144, 1233, 1238, 1239, 1247, 1248, 1356, 1368
President Herzog—1368
Vice Chancellor Kinkel—1368
Greece, Prime Minister Papandreou—754, 755, 1361
Group of Seven nations (G-7)
Leaders—1368
Representatives—436, 1358
Holy See, Pope John Paul II—1009, 1012
Hungary
President Goncz—39, 1101
Prime Minister Boross—39
India, Prime Minister Rao—949, 950
Ireland, Prime Minister Reynolds—479, 481, 1358, 1363
Israel, Prime Minister Rabin—471, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1314, 1369
Italy
President Scalfaro—1023, 1364, 1368
Prime Minister Berlusconi—1010, 1364, 1368
Japan
Emperor Akihito—1070, 1074
Prime Minister Hosokawa—228, 229, 1356
Prime Minister Murayama—1212, 1368
Jordan, King Hussein—116, 1114, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1314, 1366, 1369
Kazakhstan, President Nazarbayev—248
Latvia, President Ulmanis—982, 1200, 1204, 1367
Lithuania, President Brazauskas—1200, 1367
Malaysia, Prime Minister Mahathir—856
Netherlands, Prime Minister Lubbers—5
North Atlantic Cooperation Council—18
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Secretary General Woerner—18, 1354
Norway, Prime Minister Brundtland—934
Panama, President-elect Balladares—1292
Poland
President Walesa—39, 1205, 1207, 1368
Prime Minister Pawlak—39, 1368
Russia
President Yeltsin—47, 49, 50, 69, 71, 73, 74, 1230, 1354
Prime Minister Chernomyrdin—1366
Senegal, President Diouf—977
Slovakia
President Kovac—39, 1101
Prime Minister Meciar—39
Switzerland, President Stich—1354
Syria, President Asad—81
Turkey, Prime Minister Ciller—698

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials—Continued
Uganda, President Museveni—1366
Ukraine, President Kravchuk—43, 49, 69, 372
United Kingdom
Prime Minister Major—345, 346, 348, 1025, 1357, 1358, 1364
Queen Elizabeth II—1364
United Nations, Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali—1364
Visegrad Group, leaders—39, 1354

Resignations and Retirements

AIDS Policy Coordinator, statement—1222
Justice Department
Associate Attorney General, letter—447
Deputy Attorney General, letter—142
Supreme Court of the U.S., Associate Justice, remarks—597
White House Office
Assistant to President for Management and Administration, letter—1001
Counsel to President, letter—384

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings; Resignations and Retirements
Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, meeting—746
Africa, White House conference—1119
Air collision at Pope Air Force Base, NC—541
Alabama, disaster assistance—368
Anticrime legislation—1300
Argentina, attack at Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires—1269
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Muslim-Croat Federation, framework agreement—354
Results of NATO action—286
Sarajevo marketplace attack—186
Budget vote by House of Representatives—433
Burma, 5th anniversary of arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi—1287
Burundi, death of President Nyaryamira—635
California, disaster assistance for earthquake—486, 700, 1060, 1128
Chicago Housing Authority's search policy, U.S. District Court decision—635
Cuban Independence Day—964
Deaths
Airmen at Fairchild Air Force Base, WA—1137
Barrett, James—1339
Benson, Ezra Taft—1007
Britton, John—1339
Kim Il-song, President of North Korea—1224
Natcher, William H.—562
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr.—7
Puller, Lewis B., Jr.—905
Walsh, Mike—857
West, Timothy—995
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission—1171

Statements by the President—Continued
Education legislation, congressional action—209, 746
Energy efficiency and water conservation at Federal facilities—409
Environmental justice in Federal programs, Executive order signing announcement—242
Federal Interagency Council on the Homeless—943
Fishing industry in the Northeast, emergency assistance—519
Flooding in the Southeast—1212, 1269
Forest management plan for the Pacific Northwest—697
Health care reform
Congressional committee action—1063, 1128, 1171
Legislation—1180, 1338
Iraq, American helicopter tragedy, report—1252
Israel, terrorist attacks on civilians—635, 692
Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles, implementation—844
Lebanon, church bombing—326
Long Island Rail Road strike—1095
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—245
Maritime industry, proposed legislation—431
Mexico, assassination of Presidential candidate—552
National African-American History Month—183
National Performance Review—367
National Rural Conference—1324
National security strategy report—1297
Native American tribal leaders, meeting announcement—541
Navy Department, Chief of Naval Operations, nomination announcement—453
New York, attack on Jewish students in Brooklyn—364
Nonprofit liaison network—673
Oregon, Governor Roberts' decision not to seek reelection—140
Pollard, Jonathan, denial of executive clemency—541
Presidential Awards for Design Excellence—792
Presidential Citizens Medal, presentation to Representative William H. Natcher—368
Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty headquarters relocation—1200
Renewable fuels, EPA decision—1170
Rostenkowski, Representative Dan—1007

Statements by the President—Continued
Russia, withdrawal of troops from Latvia—810
Rwanda
Closing of Embassy in U.S.—1257
Deaths of President Habyarimana and Prime Minister Uwilingiyimana—635
South Africa
Civil conflict—557
Elections—727, 754, 781
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—764
Supreme Court of the U.S., Associate Justice, Senate Judiciary Committee vote—1288
Taiwan, trade with the U.S.—669
Technology reinvestment project—304
Tornadoes in the South—557
Trade expansion priorities identification, Executive order signing announcement—368
Travel and tourism, White House conference—1129
Treasury Department, Deputy Secretary Altman—1310
Voting rights protection, Justice Department action—301, 1323
Whale sanctuary agreement—1101

Statements Other Than Presidential

See also Announcements
Bosnia-Herzegovina, meeting with President Izetbegovic—503
Counterintelligence effectiveness—834
Croatia, meeting with President Tudjman—503
Draft registration and Selective Service System—948
Iraq-related documents, access by House Banking Committee—210
Israel, telephone conversation with President Rabin—692
Japan, resignation of Prime Minister Hosokawa—645
Korea, South, telephone conversation with President Kim—1022
Multilateral peace operations reform—853
Norway, death of Foreign Minister Holst—76
Russia, telephone conversation with President Yeltsin—1022
Sudan, civil conflict—245
Turkey, meeting with Prime Minister Ciller—698
United Nations Security Council action on Hebron massacre—486